

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**1689th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 10 October 1968,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	
Speech by Mr. Harmel (Belgium)	1
Speech by Mr. Khoman (Thailand)	5
Speech by Mr. Mahmoud Riad (United Arab Republic)	9

President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

i. Mr. HARMEL (Belgium) (*translation from French*): We all take pleasure in paying tribute to the new President of the Assembly and to the outgoing President. My country is privileged to know well and to think very highly of both these statesmen, one of whom today succeeds the other in one of the highest posts attainable for the successful guidance of world affairs.

2. Consequently, Mr. President, the good wishes that we address to you are accompanied by a fervent belief. You represent a nation like our own, destined by its size, history and geography to moderate its ambitions so as to devote its best efforts to its progress, to support of the principles of the Charter, and to the rule of justice in international life. We know that those ideals guide you in carrying out the all-important office you have assumed.

3. At the same time I want to pay a sincere tribute to the President of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, my colleague and friend Mr. Manescu. In a stormy international climate he presided with firm and calm authority over our discussions; the unanimous respect he inspired redounded to the benefit of the United Nations; the esteem and gratitude that we had already felt for him have grown even greater.

4. If, following the example set by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report [A/7201/Add.1], we were to evaluate which of the items in our work is of the greatest importance in establishing a new order of justice and thus for world peace, I should have to mention here the contributions that each of our States must make towards co-operation between countries at different levels of development; and I should be obliged to devote my whole statement to that subject.

5. This year, however, Belgium has already twice expressed its views in detail, first at the Conference at New Delhi¹ and then during the Economic and Social Council's

¹ Second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held from 1 February to 29 March 1968.

session at Geneva. Suffice it therefore for me to state solemnly that the Belgian people intends to devote an ever-increasing part of its national effort to solving the human, commercial and financial problems created by the inequality of opportunities among countries.

6. This year my Government has once again increased—for 1969—its contribution to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). That is an increase of 25 per cent over two fiscal periods; but it is only a token. If further proof were needed of the determination I have just mentioned, I would recall that the Belgian Government has just made provision for one of its most qualified members to devote his entire time to those problems. I am referring to Mr. Scheyven, former President of our Economic and Social Council.

7. Consequently, I wanted to mention that fundamental question of development co-operation at the beginning of my statement in order to stress the importance our country attaches to it—for it is vital—and our determination to make a firm contribution within the Second Committee to the planning of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

8. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs who have spoken one after the other from this rostrum have stressed, following your example, Mr. Secretary-General, the negative and disappointing aspects of the developments that have occurred in international life over the past twelve months. How can we deny the facts? The Belgian delegation's disappointment is all the greater since in several important areas it had seen evidence that its hopes might be fulfilled.

9. Last year we were concerned with three international conflicts: Cyprus, the Middle East, and South East Asia. During the past year discussions have at least been started with regard to each of them. Over the delicate problem of Cyprus the Turkish and Greek leaders have wisely begun a reconciliation; their accomplishment is all the greater considering the heat of the passions that were aroused. Similarly, with regard to the Middle East we are still grateful to the authors of the Security Council resolution of 22 November last [242 (1967)] for the course of international justice they marked out, although they have unfortunately not yet evoked any suitable response. I want to say how disappointed would be our expectation if our colleagues from the countries concerned were to fail to arrive at some preliminary understanding during the current session.

10. Lastly, with regard to the third subject, hope was aroused for the pacification of South-East Asia. President Johnson stopped the bombing of the greater part of North Viet-Nam and intended to devote his last months in office

to the search for peace. The Paris talks opened and gave us reason to hope that, by further generous acts inspired by political insight, that distressing conflict might soon be ended for good. I cannot refrain from recalling that three years have already gone by since the world's conscience spoke here [1347th meeting] with the illustrious voice of Pope Paul VI and we heard his appeal to desist and negotiate.

11. Since no favourable event that has occurred during this year must be overlooked, let us then recall the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the international Conference held at Teheran² which solemnly reminded us that, as members of the human family, every nation and every one of its citizens has equal, inalienable and inviolable rights. And on that occasion everyone—and who could be more pleased than my own country?—could note that an increasing number of States were acceding to our Organization's international agreements concerning civil, political, economic and social rights.

12. Lastly, a further step seemed to have been taken on the road to disarmament: the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [see resolution 2373 (XXII)], drawn up at the special instance of the two intercontinental nuclear Powers, has already been signed by more than eighty States. At the same time Europe seemed prepared to take a step towards acting in such a way that each State, whatever its régime, would respect the others. The path to peaceful coexistence and *détente* was being seriously and effectively marked out, to such an extent that at the Reykjavik Conference³ in June 1968 fifteen Western States concluded that mutual and balanced reductions of forces could lead to the creation of new confidence in Europe. They asked the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries to join in that project.

13. We took a resolute part in all those events, even when they were only a timid promise of progress; and we can even say that Belgium put forth its best efforts on the international level.

14. And now it is Europe's turn to throw away its chances. We deplore and condemn in equal measure all that has recently occurred on our continent to frustrate that progress. The military occupation of Czechoslovakia, the pressures brought to bear on other States, the presence of Soviet divisions on the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany, the threat to invoke against it texts that are no longer applicable, the unrest concerning Berlin: those are never-admissible acts of force that, in the present context of our work, appear to us irreconcilable with the role the USSR has chosen for itself in the world.

15. Consequently we wondered what we were supposed to accomplish here in such deplorable circumstances. Having taken thought we decided to say as clearly as possible what we believe we can expect from the great States. I shall now describe what in our view we must urgently accomplish together, all our nations jointly, in order if possible to advance along the road to peace.

² International Conference on Human Rights, held from 22 April to 13 May 1968.

³ Meeting of the NATO Council (24 and 25 June 1968).

16. Everyone well knows why the States that signed the United Nations Charter twenty-three years ago invested the victors in the Second World War with a permanent primary responsibility within the Security Council. Since that time two of those States have acquired an intercontinental nuclear destructive power whose use would be devastating. It was principally those two States that proposed for our signature the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and promised us to come to the assistance of whomever might be attacked or even merely threatened by atomic weapons if we renounced their manufacture and possession.

17. Thus in twenty-four years we shall have twice recognized, in law, the special status of the very great Powers by endowing them with an extraordinary authority and power and thereby with an extraordinary responsibility. In return, we feel we have the right to obtain an unequivocal commitment that there shall be no abuse of power. That is why the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, of non-interference, of unwarranted intervention, must in face of the facts be respected with special strictness by those who have asked the rest of the world to sanction their power and to repose special confidence in them. History teaches that strength which is not tempered by moderation and respect for law can easily turn into tyranny.

18. We considered that the principle of non-interference had been defined and agreed to once and for all in December 1965, when our General Assembly resolution [2131 (XX)] on the inadmissibility of interference in the domestic affairs of States was adopted by 109 votes to none. That unanimous resolution clearly stated:

“... all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty ...”

It added:

“... armed intervention is synonymous with aggression ...”

In it our Assembly declared:

“No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State.”

And the Assembly further declared:

“The strict observance of these obligations is an essential condition to ensure that nations live together in peace with one another ...”.

In short, we considered that that resolution as a whole adequately defined what was, in the unanimous opinion of the community of nations, the duty of non-intervention.

19. Yet some other theories are appearing. It is said that the Yalta agreements of 1945 authorize and legitimize intervention by the great Powers within their spheres of influence. We read that the principles of international law are not applicable among socialist countries, or that they are not applicable to States that were defeated in 1945. We must declare that those are alarming and dangerous theories, which I should like to examine with you.

20. First, the Yalta agreements. Is it true that they sanctioned the system of spheres of influence and that by

tacit agreement the great Powers left each other a free hand with the States in their respective spheres? For our part we must very loudly declare that this interpretation of the Yalta agreements is historically false, as the United States Government has not failed to point out. I think we have to say that many myths have grown up around the Yalta Conference. Must we prove that to ourselves by re-reading here the joint statement made by the three Governments on the results of the Crimean Conference, expressly mentioning the right of all European peoples "to choose the form of government under which they will live" and "the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations"?⁴ Yalta thus grants no State a privileged right over another State.

21. It is true that since Yalta the principles I have just mentioned have often been ignored and that spheres of influence have been created by acts of power and force, while our nations, which had disarmed, were forced to form an alliance in order to build a protective wall against them. It is also true that our efforts in Europe in recent years have been devoted to replacing relations based on the mere balance of power by a system based on stability that can bring peace. The Atlantic Alliance has clearly indicated that, along with legitimate security considerations, its member States were guided by a desire for relaxation of tension. In other words, in Europe we want a system of relations founded not on fear but on regional security agreements and reciprocal commitments that will include disarmament. That also means that in those relations there is no room for policies based on spheres of influence.

22. On the other side it has been contended—and I am thinking in particular of an article that appeared in *Pravda* on 26 September 1968 and whose philosophy seems to be echoed in the recent statement made by my colleague from the Soviet Union [*1679th meeting*]⁵—that all the classical concepts of non-aggression, non-intervention, sovereignty and independence are valueless in relations among socialist countries because they are abstract and devoid of class content. In that connexion I should like to say two things.

23. First: this is, so far as we know, the first time the Soviet Union has made such a clear statement of that thesis. I would recall that the statement on non-intervention which I mentioned earlier was adopted by our Assembly at the suggestion of the Soviet Union.⁵ I would further recall that the initial draft submitted by the USSR to the first Committee contained an article inviting "all States to be guided in their international relations by the principles of mutual respect and of non-intervention in domestic affairs for any reason"—and the proposal was very clear: "whether economic, political or ideological".⁶

24. I should like to recall that at the twenty-first session, returning to this question of non-intervention, the USSR representative, Mr. Kuznetzov, stated: "We should recog-

nize that every State has the inalienable right to settle for itself without any foreign intervention, questions concerning its future". He added that that was "a fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter".⁷

25. Those statements are categorical. They make no mention of a special law existing among socialist countries.

26. Belgium is of the opinion that the only interpretation compatible with the decision taken at the twentieth session is that those principles thenceforward have a universal meaning. They must be acknowledged to apply among States with different political, economic and social systems as well as among States adhering to the same system. Any other interpretation must inevitably mean that within a given system there are no legal relationships but only relationships based on submission, dependency and inequality and typical of a colonial system that the Organization is doing its utmost to eliminate.

27. Lastly, in another context, it has been maintained that Articles 53 and 107 of the Charter, together or separately, would allow a unilateral intervention in the domestic affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany. In our opinion those articles, which we have re-examined, have no relevance to present world conditions. No one can ignore that their unforeseen and unilateral invocation is in itself a source of tension. I should like to state very clearly that the German people has as much right as other peoples to protection from foreign pressures and threats. Having regretted on several occasions the absence of the largest Asiatic Power from this Assembly, I feel no awkwardness at saying that we deeply regret the absence of one of the great European countries, the world's fourth largest economic power, namely the Federal Republic of Germany.

28. What conclusions are we to draw from this survey? It is that the path of peace, in other words our own path, lies through scrupulous respect for the principle of non-intervention as set forth by our Assembly. That principle cannot be applied to operations like the one we have witnessed around Czechoslovakia; along with very many of our colleagues, Belgium is asking that it be terminated in the interest of everyone. Security will be continuously endangered if the Powers persist in creating exceptions to the most widely accepted and most solemnly enshrined principles of the law of nations.

29. However, if the Assembly will allow me, I should like to go further and to say this: the great States are well aware that non-interference is not enough; the world expects from them, and welcomes when they offer, positive contributions to the cause of peace, which are necessary if they want to increase—or, if need be, restore—the serene authority that is expected from those to whom an exclusive power has been granted.

30. In submitting the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons the great Powers there and then accepted a solemn primary obligation: to take resolutely and without delay the road to nuclear disarmament. However, we should like to express three further ideas.

⁴ United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States—The Consequences at Malta and Yalta, 1945* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 977.

⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 107, document A/5977.

⁶ *Ibid.*, document A/C.1/L.343/Rev.1, para. 4.

⁷ Statement made at the 1473rd session of the First Committee, whose official records are issued in summary form.

31. The first involves the right to veto and, Mr. Secretary-General, echoes wholeheartedly a recommendation you formulated in the introduction to your annual report. For our part we would state that if the great Powers, whether rightly or wrongly, feel obliged to follow the policy of the balance of power in order to protect world peace, they must at least refrain from acting in place of United Nations bodies; they must not present those bodies with *faits accomplis*, and they must, in certain cases at least, agree to the rule of supranationality that other States accepted in 1945. We believe that the increased trust for which the great States have just asked other States by opening to signature the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons constrains them to make a comparable act of increased trust in the Security Council.

32. Would it not be logical for the possessors of the right of veto to refrain from employing it when, owing to their acts, the sovereignty and independence of a State are in issue before the Security Council? I recall that we have seen the Government of the United States abstain from exercising the veto in the matter of the Dominican Republic—a good example. We trust that the question we are thus putting to the permanent members of the Security Council will not be left unexamined or, we hope, unanswered.

33. Our second suggestion is that the great States shall make a joint examination and submit to us as soon as possible immediate plans for reconstruction and economic development in the troubled areas of South East Asia, the Middle East and Nigeria. Here I want to repeat the proposal of my eminent compatriot the President of the Belgian Senate, Mr. Paul Straye, who rightly recommended to the Assembly of the Council of Europe a type of Marshall Plan that would assist the millions of Middle East refugees through a programme of land irrigation and fertilization. If the great States jointly made a similar proposal, they know that they would meet with eager co-operation throughout the world—in other words, within our Assembly.

34. The third idea has to do with the same areas: that, in the areas of recent conflict the great States should themselves propose, and call forth from the other States, acceptance of a limitation of the supply of conventional weapons and their means of delivery. Belgium has already modified its national legislation in anticipation of that move.

35. That is what seems to me natural and normal to ask of the great States: strict respect for what Mr. Debré called the prime safeguard of human rights [*1683rd meeting*], namely the principle of non-intervention; and positive contributions to the strengthening of our institutions, to economic development and to disarmament. If the great States could commit themselves jointly to the goals I have just mentioned, we believe that not only would they erase the lamentable picture of spheres of influence, but also that this would be of great consequence for the cause of peace.

36. I have until now spoken of the role of the great States because we are prepared to grant them a special authority and responsibility. However, that does not mean that other States—and my own country certainly—are prepared to abandon initiative within the United Nations. In that

connexion I shall restrict my remarks to the efforts that we consider basic and positive, and by means of which we, for our part, wish to bind ourselves to the community of nations.

37. At the present time—and this is my first comment—eighty specialized scientific agencies all over the world are devoting themselves to studies on peace; UNESCO is assisting them. All of us, in thoughtful moments, have of course wondered how and why in one case peace has led to war, and how and why, in some other case conflict has been resolved or avoided. So now a new science is attempting to provide objective and valid answers to those questions; its goals are those of the Charter; in fact, its very object is a search for ways to achieve United Nations goals.

38. How, then, is our Organization going to demonstrate its interest in those studies? There we see scientists from all countries attempting to establish, without prejudice or passion, how and why conflicts arise and end. Here politicians and diplomats from all countries meet throughout the year to study how to resolve some conflicts and avoid others. Would it not be ridiculous—and, given the importance of what is at stake, unforgivable—to pretend that the studies of the former have no bearing on the efforts of the latter?

39. For that reason we believe that our Organization can and must co-ordinate those studies and provide an exchange of information among their makers, who have up to now often worked in isolation from one another. Our Organization can and must see to it that those studies turn from the abstract to the concrete in order that the science of survival may become a technology of peace that we may all employ.

40. I should like to propose that we ask our Secretary-General to make an annual summary report on the studies of the eighty-odd centres scattered throughout the world. We should hope that the United Nations might request those institutions to study matters of special benefit to us. In a word, I wish that a current of mutual exchange could be established between those theoretical research centres and our Organization for the greater good of all; and I know that in saying this I am once again repeating proposals that were submitted here by the Secretary-General two years ago.

41. We also feel a duty towards the universality of the United Nations. Several States are still absent from our international community, and a few moments ago I stated how much we regret the absence of Germany. From this very rostrum two years ago [*1432nd meeting*] I shared with you our hope that the voluntary or imposed isolation of mainland China would cease; it does not seem right to us that a nation which is the most populous on earth and possesses one of the world's oldest civilizations should remain apart.

42. Mainland China's participation in the work of the international agencies poses a serious problem, which must be seriously studied without delay. For its part, Belgium is raising that problem in the interests of peace and of our Organization, with the political determination that a positive response shall be given to two connected preliminary questions that everyone is asking and to which no one yet knows the answer.

43. You all know what those questions are: Does mainland China desire to participate in the work of our Organization and observe its rules and principles? Further, how can we make sure that the Republic of China, which has been seated in the United Nations since its inception, can remain a full Member with all the rights of Membership? Belgium is asking that those two questions be examined by an *ad hoc* United Nations body set up for that purpose. That body should be guided in its conclusions by the opinion of all the parties concerned, who must therefore be consulted.

44. Allow me to conclude with some brief remarks concerning the continent of which my country is a part, Europe. Indeed, and this is perhaps paradoxical, the United Nations is the only place where for the present all European nations can speak amongst themselves, whether they be committed or neutral, aligned or non-aligned. It is here that we, for example, have forged bonds with men from European States whose opinions we do not share; they have always listened to us attentively, and we have also tried clearly to understand them.

45. Now that Europe is once again being buffeted, that many of its peoples are being tested, that it is threatened by a new phase of the cold war, it seems necessary to us to restate how, in our opinion, peace and due understanding among European nations can be established.

46. First—and this has been the main burden of my statement—normal and stable relations can exist only between States that are equal in law. Consequently inter-European relations cannot be those of power for some and subservience for others.

47. Next, because history has created a large number of European States, many of which occupy small areas, those States must seek to form among themselves all kinds of solidarity that can enable them, in the twentieth century, to deal as larger aggregates with the problems they cannot solve in isolation. In Western Europe it is normal that interdependencies should be created where feasible among countries with the same market economy, the same concept of democracy, the same defence requirements and the same degree of technological development. However in forming those interdependencies we are careful to maintain a balance of powers and rules protecting each State, so that integration may not bring about either the hegemony of some or the subservience of others. Consequently we think it would be highly hypocritical to pretend to be shocked at our associations of countries or to speak of them as blocs, as tools for reciprocal confrontation and combat. In the state of affairs that has begun and must continue to evolve, fragments of Europe are drawing closer together in accordance with their interests. That is legitimate, natural and necessary; and for our part we shall continue to strive for the establishment of the broadest union among the Western European countries.

48. What I have just said is in no way inconsistent with our previous careful investigation of every feasible relationship of peaceful coexistence with countries having different régimes. Belgium has been working in that direction for years and does not propose to stop doing so. We have never attempted to introduce into those relationships a Trojan

horse in the guise of détente to destroy fellowship among other nations that have adopted political or economic systems different from our own. Our concepts and prescriptions can prevail only by their merit and by the example they offer. However, the Europe which Belgium wants to see “wherever possible” will have a better economic understanding through bilateral relations and the European Economic Commission, a better military understanding through a parallel and balanced regional disarmament by every European State, and a better European political understanding. In pursuit of that aim to which we are committed, however, nothing can be accomplished before equality of rights among States is re-established.

49. Belgium’s contribution to the general debate of the General Assembly’s twenty-third session has had but one object, to state what we consider essential: that is, to set up the machinery for economic and social exchanges to ensure the development of the still less favoured nations; to restore international order based on the equal and sovereign rights of all States; to accept the strength of the largest States and their special responsibility when their actions embody the spirit of the Charter and take the form of projects beneficial to distressed regions; to reinforce the search for peace, and to start building it where we should start—in Europe.

50. A year that has been a painful one in many ways has made us realize that when that prospect vanishes we fall back on old recipes—the balance of forces, power, desire to dominate. Then come violence and discouragement. Then the men who embody a great ideal—the Kennedys, Martin Luther King—are sacrificed; then armies march again and their noise precedes the silence of death for hundreds of thousands of innocent people, today in Viet-Nam and Biafra, tomorrow perhaps elsewhere. Then, above all, the youth of our nations revolt because we are taking from them their reason for living and their reason for hope. If it is the role of the small countries to speak up in this Assembly with the voice of moderation and sincerity, for what we have expressed here, and if here we must undertake to act in conformity with our ideals, then I also can make that promise to you on behalf of Belgium.

51. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand): Mr. President, I should like, in the first place, to offer you the warm congratulations of my delegation and my personal hearty felicitations upon your election to this high office. Those who, like myself, have seen you at work for long years in this Organization and admire your outstanding talents and wisdom are confident that the General Assembly and the United Nations stand to gain a great deal from your rich and varied experience. We wish you complete success in your new responsibility.

52. I should like also to place on record the appreciation of my delegation for the valuable services rendered to the United Nations by the outgoing President, the Foreign Minister of Romania.

53. My delegation would like also to express its warm welcome to the new Member, Swaziland.

54. Almost a quarter of a century has elapsed since the Second World War ended and the United Nations, the hope

of mankind for a more peaceful and orderly world, came into being. Yet the problems which beset various parts of the globe and our Organization have lost neither their acuteness nor their alarming capacity to upset the precarious peace and the free existence of many nations. Indeed, as the General Assembly convenes for its twenty-third session, there are few tidings over which we can rejoice, and still fewer signs which promise a greater tranquillity to this troubled world or a brighter hope to the countless millions of human beings yearning to exchange the daily life of terror and sudden death for a life of greater security, decency and dignity which they and their families would like to enjoy.

55. Nowhere, from Europe to the Middle East and Asia, does the international situation really present any worthwhile improvement or progress. Rather, nations and peoples, even though they may wrap themselves in new garbs, seem to cling to old habits and the conservatism of by-gone days. The fact that they brandish the garish revolutionary banner cannot hide their motivations, which remain strangely feudalistic. In fact, the Europe of 1968, like that of 1938, seems unable to extricate itself from the worn-out axiom that "might is right", of smaller nations being crushed or cowed into submission by larger ones with which they are linked by so-called "unbreakable ties" of almost feudalistic fealty.

56. Thus people of good-will and deep conviction in the principles and purposes of the United Nations and the norms of international law were stunned by the news last August that the Soviet Union and four of its Warsaw Pact allies had rushed their armed forces to occupy Czechoslovakia. Their action, taken without the consent, request or knowledge of the Government and leaders of the country, cannot be said to be in conformity with the United Nations Charter and international law. It also demonstrates the precarious existence of small nations around the globe which are at the mercy of larger Powers which put their interests above the rights of other nations.

57. In this connexion, it is opportune to recall the wording of the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Article 2, paragraph 4 states:

"All Members shall refrain in their 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."

58. The United Nations Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty also states in explicit terms in its first paragraph that:

"No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements are condemned."

59. It is painful and disappointing to us that the Soviet Union, which is a founding Member of the United Nations and which took the initiative three years ago in inscribing

on the agenda the item on non-intervention that subsequently resulted in the Declaration that I have just referred to, should decide in its own wisdom to stifle the United Nations Charter and the provisions in the Declaration which it helped to bring about. This is a sad occasion, in our opinion, for the rest of the world to judge the consistency between words and deeds.

60. The people of Czechoslovakia may be the ones who are immediately affected. But, in the long run, it is the Power that has taken unwarranted action which will continue to suffer grievously in the eyes and minds of the peoples of the world. For it is wrong to assume that, because a country has adopted a certain social system it should be completely isolated from the rest of the world and subjected arbitrarily to the law that the lord and leader of the "commonwealth", to use the unexpected and novel terminology for that group of nations, may decree. For humanity is one, and no political or social system or doctrine on earth can succeed in breeding separate species of human beings, be it the *homo socialis* or *homo communis*. Therefore, even though the Czechoslovak people live under a socialist régime, they evoked the sympathy and compassion of many non-socialist peoples when their rights as a sovereign nation were trampled upon. That is why the call is now heard from many quarters for the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet and other Warsaw Pact allies' troops from Czechoslovak territory and an appeal is made to the Soviet Union to allow its sister socialist nation and ally to determine its own future and destiny free from external interference and coercion.

61. Similarly, in South-East Asia, there are those who claim to follow a progressive course but who, in fact, cannot shake themselves free from the most obnoxious tradition of the past: colonialism. Their aims are merely to step into the shoes of the Western colonialists who have already left the region and thus to prolong, if not to perpetuate under a new label and false pretences, the old-style colonialism. Pretending to be progressive and even revolutionary, the totalitarian régimes in Asia are, in fact, the most reactionary and retrograde that have ever existed. For under the misnomer of national liberation, they seek nothing more than to impose their control and domination over unwilling peoples by committing brazen aggression as well as subversive and other illegal activities against South Viet-Nam, against Laos and even Cambodia, as well as against many other South-East Asian countries, including my own. Because of such shameless actions, a war is now raging in Viet-Nam, from which the aggressors must be repelled. For the same reason North Viet-Nam, one of the sources from which aggression was launched has been subjected to air attacks to reduce its capability to commit further depredations and unwarranted assaults against the South. The bombing of military installations in the North has produced the desired result and has induced the aggressive régime of Hanoi to agree to enter into preliminary talks instead of persisting exclusively in obtaining a military solution to the Viet-Nam situation. The bombing is therefore not an end in itself, but a means to bring about the peaceful conclusion of the conflict.

62. Those who are realistic and who genuinely desire peace—a full and complete peace, not half a peace—will urge not only the cessation of air bombardment of North

Viet-Nam but also the immediate halting of indiscriminate slaughter of innocent civilians, of women and children in many cities of South Viet-Nam as a result of aimless rocket attacks and mortar fire by the communist attackers. The peace-loving people of South-East Asia, who abhor the war which has been imposed upon them by those who seek to satisfy their lust for conquest, want an end to the fighting, not merely in the air over North Viet-Nam but everywhere in South Viet-Nam, in Laos and in many other places in Asia. Therefore those who truly and honestly stand for peace will not fail to apply a single moral standard of judgment to all acts of war now being perpetrated in South-East Asia. Otherwise, the suffering people of Asia will look upon them as blatantly false prophets of peace seeking to further their selfish personal or ideological aims.

63. Already the restrictions in air attacks against North Viet-Nam have given the Hanoi régime considerable advantages which an impartial analyst of the Asian situation, Professor P. S. Honey, has described as relieving the tension in the population of North Viet-Nam, enabling the Hanoi authorities to repair shattered communications and to restore the heavily damaged port of Haiphong to normal use as the principal inlet for foreign aid.

64. If, therefore, a total halt in the bombing of North Viet-Nam without a corresponding communist reduction in the hostilities in South Viet-Nam were to occur, it would have the effect only of increasing the war potential of the Hanoi régime and that of the Viet-Cong with incalculable risks for the defensive side in South Viet-Nam. Furthermore, a one-sided halt in air attacks against the North will not bring about an end to the hostilities. As can be judged by the attitude presently adopted by the North Viet-Nameese in the course of the current talks in Paris and the recent statement by the Soviet Foreign Minister, the other side will almost certainly claim that even such a concession will not be sufficient to induce Hanoi to negotiate more seriously and in substance. The North Viet-Nameese will require further concessions, such as the recognition of the National Liberation Front as the sole qualified representative of the South Viet-Nameese people, and the complete withdrawal of external forces which are helping South Viet-Nam defend its independence and integrity.

65. To consent to those demands would be hardly different from surrender. In order to accomplish such a purpose, I believe that the South Viet-Nameese would need no help from outside. If they wished to do just that—which I know they do not—they could do it themselves. They would require no assistance from the United Nations, or from any other Government. The nations of Asia, and now those of Europe, are fully conscious of the limitations of the world Organization and are aware that the United Nations cannot save them from external aggression or internal subversion. All they ask is that no arrangement be made under the blue banner, or any national flag, serving as a flag of convenience for the smooth delivery of free nations to aggressive totalitarian régimes.

66. Under existing circumstances, peace will be restored in Viet-Nam and in the rest of South-East Asia only if North Viet-Nam and its supporters renounce their designs of expansion and conquest, or if their capacity to carry out these nefarious schemes has become substantially reduced.

In the meantime, the defending free nations have no alternative except to persist in their present heavy responsibility.

67. There is a forgotten area of the world, an area where the saddest kind of tragedy has for years been played out and is still being played out. The plight of the Tibetan people came up three times for consideration by the General Assembly, the last time during the nineteenth session, not so very long ago. But it may already have slipped altogether from the minds of many people; or if it does remain, it remains only as a vague memory.

68. Meanwhile, the systematic and brutal persecution conducted against the fundamental human rights and freedom of the Tibetan people by the Peking régime has continued unabated, perhaps with increased intensity. The launching of the cultural revolution wreaked even greater havoc in the distinctive cultural and religious life of the spiritual people of Tibet. Revered places of worship have practically all been destroyed or converted into headquarters for conducting suppression and oppression. Famine and starvation stalked the land and wiped out the native Tibetans at the same fast rate as forcible exile or murder by the Peking authorities. Only the fortunate few managed to flee to neighbouring countries to seek asylum.

69. In fact, the systematic genocide of an ancient race with a rich and distinctive culture is being efficiently carried out and yet, unlike some other issues on which the United Nations Members voiced deep indignation, the situation in Tibet at present causes hardly a ripple of concern in the United Nations, which bases its existence, *inter alia*, on the promotion of fundamental human rights and freedom. One is surely entitled to ask: Where is the conscience of mankind on this issue?

70. We deeply deplore the tragic development in Tibet and strongly hope that practices which lead to the deprivation of the fundamental human rights and freedom of the Tibetan people will cease.

71. The delegation of Thailand also views with increasing concern the unresolved and dangerous situation still obtaining in the Middle East. Anomalies of the most blatant kind continue to exist there, as has been pointed out in the past by several delegations, including my own, and yet those immediately concerned seem reluctant to move towards a realistic and just solution. No wonder, therefore, that the Jarring mission has to tread most warily and most patiently and cannot be expected to achieve any swift success. But the mission, in our opinion, is still the best hope for a solution to the knotty problem, or at least our best means of keeping a volcanic situation from erupting.

72. My delegation considers that one of the most tragic facets of the Middle East situation is the plight of the innocent civilians, especially the refugees, who have been driven from their homes and their land and have, in addition, to endure enormous suffering brought about by the relentless conflict between the more militant of their own kind. Whereas, in all other facets, only the rules of international law and international relations are called into question, with the refugees and the civilians it is humanity itself which now is the question.

73. Equally tragic is the plight of civilian victims caused by local conflicts in the eastern part of Nigeria. My delegation wishes to express its fervent hope that a reasonable settlement will soon be arrived at and that the Nigerian people will be spared further suffering and hardship.

74. Humanity is the big question with the situation in another region fraught with dangerous possibilities, the southern half of the continent of Africa. The people and Government of Thailand can see no justification whatsoever for the policy of *apartheid* which continues to be pursued by the racist minority group in southern Africa. My delegation has consistently deplored and condemned the *apartheid* policy. We are disturbed that the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly in this direction have had almost no practical effect. On the contrary, the pattern of *apartheid* seems to become more hardened and even more varied and vicious. It is now being used not only to suppress the human rights of the people of South Africa, but also to perpetuate the rule of the South African Government over the people of Namibia, in total defiance of the United Nations resolutions on this matter.

75. It is furthermore difficult to expect that this disease of racial segregation cum colonialism can be contained within the area under the effective control of South Africa. Where similar situations exist, the same methods are bound to be used and it is so with the area of Southern Rhodesia under the illegal régime of Ian Smith. The intransigent attitude of the Smith régime and its continued ability to exist in spite of the sanctions of the United Nations owe much to the moral and physical support given to it by neighbouring Governments.

76. Although prevented by distance and circumstances from exerting more effective or immediate pressure, my Government has faithfully carried out the sanctions imposed by the United Nations on the two régimes and we are dismayed that no better results have been achieved. My delegation, however, will continue to support further measures which this General Assembly may decide to apply against such inhuman policies.

77. There is no need, however, to despair that perennial questions will remain forever so in the present framework of the United Nations for, in the past year, we have seen one instance when a general will to succeed has resulted in rapid progress in a perennial subject—that of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The achievement of the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly and the conclusions of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States are indeed, as several speakers before me have termed it, truly historic, not only for the United Nations but for mankind as a whole.

78. The Government of Thailand welcomes the emergence of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [see resolution 2373 (XXII)] and endorses its spirit. Obviously, there are flaws in a treaty of this nature which even its most ardent admirers would admit and, in coming to a decision on the matter, the Government of Thailand would regard most of these flaws with sympathetic understanding. We cannot, however, be less than inflexible in matters which affect the vital security of our nation, and the

security pledges by the three nuclear Powers which accompany the Treaty as yet beg many difficult questions, fundamental to which is, of course, the very large doubt whether universal and unrestrictedly valid rules do exist as to respect for the sovereignty and the right of self-determination of nations. Such rules are already embodied in the principles of the United Nations Charter, but there are those near and dangerous to Thailand who neither practise nor subscribe to the principles of the Charter. There are also Members of the United Nations which profess strict adherence to the Charter principles and yet, by their actions and unacceptable justifications, have shaken the confidence of the community of nations about their real respect for the security and independence of other States, specially small and non-nuclear ones such as ours.

79. Another perennial problem of the United Nations, the question of peace-keeping operations, seems now to have taken over the position of being the slowest moving as well as affording the least expectation of success. The constitutional rigidity which created the problem in the first place still blocks any significant and real progress, and the deliberations of the last session of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations during the past year could not produce anything more than an agreement to study a small observer-type aspect of the question.

80. My delegation considers the lack of progress towards an agreement on this question as a great tragedy for the United Nations, for it not only impedes future actions by the United Nations in the field which must be its strongest *raison d'être*—that of keeping the peace in this world—but it also calls into question the validity of a Charter which is obviously subject to ambivalent and seemingly irreconcilable interpretation. My delegation thus believes that a decisive step towards the solution of this question is long overdue and that a positive result would immeasurably raise the prestige and effectiveness of our Organization in the areas where such a rise is most urgently needed. For that reason, we would willingly join in any movement towards that end which offered a reasonable chance of success.

81. Parallel with problems of international politics and security are those of international economic co-operation. In this connexion, the preamble of the United Nations Charter proclaims the determination of the peoples of the United Nations “to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom” and “to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples”.

82. We should, therefore, expect that those countries which are in a position to help, namely, the developed countries, be more sensitive and responsive to the legitimate needs and aspirations of the less privileged peoples who are far from being a minority but constitute instead the overwhelming majority of mankind. However, it is a matter of regret to note that the policies and activities of the developed countries offer little inspiration to the developing countries. On the contrary, the former, and particularly the larger Powers, have grown more inward-looking, more assertive about their own rights, and more reticent about their responsibilities. The communications gap between the rich and the poor nations is still as wide as the income gap.

In our view, development and mutual help would lay a firm and concrete basis for peace-building in the world.

83. Therefore, it is our considered view that the developed countries should renew serious attempts to deal with, among other things, the question of international trade. Obviously, since the future and stability of the developing countries depend on expanding their exports of agricultural and manufactured goods, the developed countries should do more to help them to attain these desired goals, at least by allowing their access to the markets of the developed countries. I need hardly mention here that about 85 per cent of the export earnings of the developing countries come from primary products. But the market for these exports remains sluggish and subject to considerable price fluctuations. Besides this, most of the primary products exported by the developing countries must compete with commodities produced and exported by the rich countries.

84. In this connexion, elimination of agricultural protection in the highly developed countries could usefully stimulate the exports of the less developed countries. Although complete elimination is unlikely in the foreseeable future, a timely and prompt follow-up on the beginning made in connexion with the Kennedy Round of negotiations would be helpful.

85. It is in this context of discouraging facts and prospects that the highly developed countries must try to understand and appreciate the efforts of the developing countries to meet the requirements of social progress and economic justice. These requirements, which amount to human aspirations or rising hopes, cannot be kept in check indefinitely.

86. While the present drive for economic development has been and is being conducted on all fronts, the United Nations, by virtue of its wide scope and world-wide activities, may play a vital role in creating conditions of stability and social and economic well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations. As is generally known, we are now living in a world in which the forces of nature have been channelled to greater productive use. It is our hope that these unprecedented forces will serve to ensure the welfare and security of mankind rather than contribute to its misery and destruction.

87. It can be seen from the foregoing that our Organization has its hands full and has to face innumerable delicate and weighty problems. At the same time, the means placed at its disposal, especially in regard to its peace-keeping role, have been greatly reduced by those who are in the best position to lend their support. While we have to be realistic and conscious of this Organization's limitations brought about by the larger and more influential Members, we smaller nations still place our abiding faith and support in the United Nations, in its ideals and purposes, as the only existing hope of humanity for a better existence.

88. For us, the only politics we can indulge in, as our contribution to and participation in the Organization, is the politics of peace and international co-operation. That is why, fully realizing the shortcomings and limitations of the United Nations, a small country like Thailand, with its

modest resources, has borne more than its fair share in making the United Nations as effective and functional an Organization as possible. Thailand has offered for the past two decades or so numerous facilities to many United Nations regional agencies which are presently located in Bangkok, our capital city, as well as substantial contributions to various United Nations programmes. At the same time, and in order to further the aims of the United Nations of supporting and promoting regional interdependence and co-operation, Thailand has been working tirelessly with its neighbours to forge and enhance the implementation of the idea of regional solidarity and partnership. Towards that end, Thailand has helped in the creation of many regional organs such as the Association of Southeast Asia, which has recently been merged with the newly established Association of Southeast Asian Nations, as well as larger groupings of nations such as the Asian and Pacific Council.

89. In so doing, our objective is not to supplant the United Nations with these regional organizations, but rather to strengthen the hand of the world Organization by supplementing and complementing the latter's functions and activities. I regret to say, however, that these peaceful and constructive efforts have been constantly undermined and hampered by those expansionist régimes which desire to make division and dissension between the nations of the area a permanent feature of the Asian continent. Their motivations are evident. They are following the old adage of "divide and rule". Without these multifarious impediments, Southeast Asia and perhaps the entire Asian continent, could become a small world of harmony where military alliances and military bases and installations would inevitably yield their places to peaceful co-operation for the economic and social progress of the people.

90. If these military alliances and their corollary are still required, it is because of the threats and acts of expansion and conquest by those aggressive and predatory régimes. It is nevertheless our hope that our determination to preserve our freedom and independence and to bring to fruition a future life of progress and well-being will ultimately convince those militant leaders who still dwell on the past by following the old policy of imperialistic domination that a more profitable path lies in working together and co-operating together instead of seeking mutual destruction. If they can renounce the old feudal policy of suzerain overlordship, the free nations of Asia will undoubtedly let them join in constructive endeavours for the tranquillity and progress of our part of the world.

91. If such a settlement can be arrived at in the future, the ideals of the United Nations will be greatly enhanced and its lofty principles will receive a more meaningful expression. We are convinced that these ideas and ideals which seek to project themselves into the future will replace and outlive the old concept of power politics and international inequality.

92. Mr. Mahmoud RIAD (United Arab Republic):⁸ Mr. President, it is my pleasure to congratulate you on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly at its twenty-third session. We are confident that your vast

⁸ Mr. Riad spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

experience, together with the generous qualities which you are known to possess, will ensure your successful and skilful leadership of the present session.

93. On this occasion I also wish to express to Mr. Manescu, the Foreign Minister of Romania and President of the General Assembly at its twenty-second session, the appreciation of the United Arab Republic delegation for the ability and objectivity with which he steered the last session of the General Assembly.

94. The twenty-third session of the General Assembly takes place in a gloomy atmosphere as regards the future of international relations as well as the future role and efficacy of the order and institutions laid down by the United Nations Charter. In such an atmosphere there emerges the great importance of what we can all do here to recover the confidence in an order based on the principles of the Charter. For our part, we have an unlimited faith in what the human will can achieve for the sake of human welfare and progress. The starting point in facing our responsibilities might well be that we maintain an absolute faith in our ability to face up to the challenge presented by those forces which are determined to impose upon us a state of despair and surrender.

95. In the United Arab Republic, at a time when we refuse to give in to the dictates of aggression and we insist on the absolute necessity of achieving peace based on justice, we have continued to subscribe to every international effort aimed at freeing the human race from aggression and racism, upholding the international system of collective security and recognizing the basic rights of every individual to live in peace and equality, as well as his right to elevate himself in every realm of human progress.

96. We have continued to work for the realization of the principles of non-alignment and international co-operation to which we are committed through our participation in the successive conferences of non-aligned countries, the last most recent of which took place in Cairo in October 1964.

97. A few weeks ago the United Arab Republic took part in the fifth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, meeting in Algiers, and joined in expressing the will of free Africa in its determination to liberate the African continent from every form of colonialism, racism and foreign domination.

98. We have also been following, with grave concern, the developments in Asia. On every occasion we have insisted that the United States put a complete and final end to the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, in order to achieve peace in Viet-Nam and to enable the people of Viet-Nam to decide their own future.

99. We have equally participated in the international effort, pursued this year, to achieve a degree of nuclear security and the establishment of an international régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The United Arab Republic was among the first countries to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a positive step towards the ultimate target of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, the realization of general and complete disarmament and the transfer of the enormous

human and material resources at present utilized for the making of war to the making of peace and the promotion of development for the peoples of the world.

100. It is my duty to outline to you the grave situation which exists today in the Middle East, as a result of the continued occupation by Israeli forces of Arab territories, a fact which constitutes a continued aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of three Member States of the United Nations.

101. Every day that passes without the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab territories constitutes in fact a new aggression and a new violation of the rule of the Charter. It also constitutes a situation fraught with the gravest dangers for peace and security in the Middle East. Indeed, we are facing in the Middle East a colonialist wave emanating from a racist philosophy constantly attempting to impose its will upon the Arab peoples.

102. The deliberations which have taken place in the United Nations throughout the last year, following the Israeli aggression of 5 June, have only emphasized that fundamental principle of the Charter which prohibits the acquisition of territory by force. Resolution 242 (1967) unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 22 November last year, has only reaffirmed that principle and, consequently, affirmed the necessity for the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the territories they now occupy as a result of their aggression on 5 June 1967.

103. Ever since the adoption of the Security Council resolution, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, has continued to exert great efforts in the discharge of his mission. But it has become quite clear that Israel has been following a policy of obstruction to the implementation of the peaceful settlement laid down by the Security Council. This policy is manifested in Israel's refusal to implement the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, Israel's refusal to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied as a result of its aggression on 5 June 1967, Israel's insistence on following an expansionist policy which has already led to the annexation of some Arab territory, Israel's refusal to recognize the rights of the refugees as stated by the United Nations in numerous resolutions, and Israel's continued expulsion of Arab citizens from their territories and villages, with the aim of establishing Israeli settlements therein.

104. Equally, Israel continues in its defiance of the United Nations by declaring its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the Palestine question, as well as the other resolutions concerning the refugees and displaced persons. Israel insists on obstructing their return to their homes. It resists the mission of the Secretary-General's representative charged with the task of examining the conditions of the Arab population in the occupied territories. It defies the various resolutions adopted by this Organization on Jerusalem, a defiance which has gone as far as to inform the Secretary-General that its annexation of Jerusalem is "irreversible and not negotiable".

105. At the same time, Israel continues its aggression against the civilian population of the United Arab Republic

in Suez and Ismailia, as well as its attacks against the factories in the Suez Canal area, and the Canal's installations. These attacks have been taking place regularly. Israel did not even hesitate to use force against the civilian boats of the Suez Canal Authority, while they were engaged in surveying the Canal's floor with a view to releasing the stranded ships in the Canal. This operation has been undertaken by the Suez Canal Authority in response to the request of foreign countries and owners of the stranded ships. In blind selfishness, Israel continues to cause great losses and damage to many peoples and countries of Africa, Asia and Europe, whom the Suez Canal is a vital means of international transportation and commerce.

106. In Jordan, Israel commits aggression upon aggression against the civilian population and the refugees, almost on a daily basis. In its attacks, it resorts to the use of airplanes and tanks. Not only does Israel continue its wave of terror and destruction against the people of Palestine, but it also follows the refugees and attacks them in their camps and tents across the cease-fire lines.

107. The Israeli aggressions against Al Karamah in March, Irbid in June, and As Salt in August, are aggressions which Israel adds to the list of massacres which it has committed before against the people of Palestine at Deir Yassin, Tiberias, Haifa, Jaffa, Safd, Gaza, Khan Yunis, Qibya, Hula and As Samu. In the occupied Arab territories, Israel continues its policy of bombardment and destruction of houses and populated areas, as well as demolishing entire villages, torturing refugees and Arab citizens, throwing them into prisons by the thousands, throwing them into concentration camps, looting their property and, ultimately, their expulsion across the cease-fire lines.

108. I do not believe that the world has ever witnessed, since the Nazi occupation of European territories, a policy where, in a mad exercise of force, every rule of law, be it a law of peace or war, has been systematically violated and every right of man been violently denied, such as the policy followed by Israel in the occupied Arab territories. It was only natural, therefore, that the International Conference on Human Rights, meeting in Teheran last May, condemned the Israeli policy in the occupied territories.

109. As for the Israeli policy of evicting the Arab citizens from their territories, and changing the character of these territories and replacing them with Israeli settlements, we believe that this policy constitutes the most ominous form of Israeli racist colonialism exercised in the second half of the twentieth century.

110. While Israel continues its policy of occupying more of the Arab territories and transforming more of the Arab citizens into refugees, it has been undertaking a campaign of international deception in which it claims a desire for peace. Israel occupies Arab territories and claims peace. It resists the return of the refugees and displaced peoples, and claims peace. It carries on a campaign of terror and oppression against Arab citizens in the occupied territories and claims peace. It annexes Jerusalem and claims peace. It plunders Arab property and claims peace. It refuses to implement the peaceful settlement approved by the Security Council, and claims peace. It lays down one obstacle after another to the peace mission of Ambassador Jarring, and it claims peace.

111. Peace, in Israel's view, is the surrender of the Arab peoples to its will and their acquiescence in its territorial ambitions. But Israel's concept of its international obligations, whether emanating from the Charter or from its contractual commitments under international agreements, is no different from its concept of peace. Israel declared its renunciation of the armistice agreements to which it affixed its signature in 1949, when it realized that those agreements stood in the way of its ambition to acquire territory beyond the 1949 lines. The Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Ben-Gurion, declared, during the aggression against Egypt in 1956, that the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement was "dead and buried".

112. Today, the Israeli officials declare that all the Arab-Israeli armistice agreements no longer exist. Israel proceeds on the basis that it is entitled to conclude international agreements and then to renounce them, by its unilateral will, as soon as it finds in them a limitation on its freedom to what it considers its right of territorial expansion.

113. During the aggression against Egypt in 1956, at the same time that the Prime Minister of Israel denounced the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement, he likewise proclaimed the annexation of a part of the Egyptian territory, namely, the Sinai Peninsula. Today, at the same time that Israeli officials declare their renunciation of the Arab-Israeli armistice agreements, the present Prime Minister speaks of the "greater Israel", which includes many Arab territories. Not a single day passes without an Israeli official's revealing Israel's intentions of expansion. Merely as an example, the Defense Minister of Israel declared, on 5 July of this year, in a speech before the Kubbutzim Youth Federation meeting in the occupied Syrian territories, the following:

"Our fathers reached the frontiers that were recognized in the partition plan of 1947. Our generation reached the 1949 frontiers. But the 'six-day generation', that is the generation which unleashed the 5 June aggression, were unable to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights in Syria."

Mr. Moshe Dayan added:

"This is not the end; for after the present cease-fire lines there will be new lines, but they will extend beyond the Jordan River, maybe to Lebanon and perhaps to central Syria as well."

114. These are not mere words. But the words here do express the actual policy of Israel manifested by its occupation of Arab territories and its eviction of Arab citizens from those territories, and the establishment, in their place, of Israeli settlements.

115. Israel's renunciation of the armistice agreements that it signed is in line with its renunciation of the Protocol of Lausanne, which it signed with the Arab States, also in 1949. That Protocol was aimed at the solution of the refugee problem. Israel renounced it as soon as it achieved the purpose for which it affixed its signature, namely, admission to membership in the United Nations.

116. This is Israel's attitude towards international agreements to which it affixes its signature. Today it calls upon

the Arab States to hand it the instrument of their surrender. Israel relies upon its occupation of Arab territories to impose this surrender upon the Arab States. We refuse to surrender while at the same time insisting on the termination of aggression and the realization of peace.

117. The entire international community is called upon to reject Israel's policy of imposing a *fait accompli*, based on the use of force and aggression, as a substitute for international legality.

118. We cannot imagine that Israel could have continued its policy of aggression and defiance of the United Nations and its resolutions, had it not been receiving the political and material support of the United States. The provision, by the United States, of weapons and planes to Israel, while Israel insists on the occupation of the territories of three Member States of the United Nations, can in no way contribute to the achievement of peace in the Middle East. Any military or economic assistance provided to Israel while it occupies Arab territories is nothing but support for the Israeli aggression and an act against the Arab countries and peoples.

119. There is no precedent in contemporary history for Israel's policy in the Middle East, except the policy of Nazi Germany against the peoples of Europe in the first half of this century. Both policies emanate from a blind, racist philosophy which imagines that a group of people are entitled to impose their will upon other peoples. Israel today is compiling, against the Arab peoples in the Middle East, the same record that Nazi Germany compiled against the peoples of Europe.

120. Israel considers itself entitled, as Nazi Germany considered itself before, to cross any national frontier by force for the purpose of imposing a *fait accompli* and, consequently, demanding from the occupied countries negotiations to confer legality upon its territorial gains. Equally, Israel proceeds from the premise that it is entitled to evict Arab citizens from Arab territories and to transform those territories into Israeli settlements, in the same way as Nazi Germany imagined itself entitled to empty European territories of their original inhabitants for the purpose of transforming them into German territories. Israel's policy of deception aimed at international public opinion, follows in the footsteps of Nazi Germany in its mastery in the uttering of words of peace to cover up its policy of aggression and occupation.

121. The catalogue of crimes being systematically committed by Israel against the people of Palestine and other Arab peoples, such as launching wars of aggression in which tens of thousands have died, and violating Arab territories, together with the policy of oppression and terror in the occupied territories, constitutes, in fact, the same catalogue of crimes for which the Nazi war criminals have been tried.

122. In fulfilment of the role of the Charter and in defence of all the values for which the struggle of the peoples of the United Nations has been waged, the peoples of the world, who have stood up to the Nazi menace in the first half of the twentieth century, are called upon today to stand up and resist the wave of colonialists and racists who are raiding the Arab peoples in the Middle East.

123. The policy of defiance and disrespect for the United Nations resolutions and renunciation of international agreements which it has signed, a policy systematically followed by Israel, is the same policy it follows with regard to the Security Council resolution of 22 November and the peace mission of Ambassador Jarring. At the same time, Israel declares that it wishes to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, it continues, in fact and in deed, to undermine the resolution of 22 November and Ambassador Jarring's mission.

124. Co-operation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General could mean only the acceptance and the undertaking to implement the Security Council resolution of 22 November, and entering into serious and substantive talks with him for the implementation of that resolution. In short, something which Israel so far has failed to do.

125. While Israel continues to insist on its aggression and its refusal of the peace settlement approved by the Security Council, the United Arab Republic has taken a clear and consistent position, namely, to implement the peace settlement as embodied in the Security Council resolution of 22 November. We have informed the Special Representative, from the very beginning of our talks with him, of our full acceptance of the Security Council resolution as well as of our readiness for its implementation. We have formally proclaimed that position on more than one occasion. I declared our acceptance of the Security Council resolution on 13 March last in a declaration which was circulated as an official document of the Security Council⁹ and reaffirmed, on a later occasion, in a letter which I addressed to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on 9 May last.

126. Throughout the talks, which started almost a year ago, we have exerted every effort to co-operate with the Special Representative for the implementation of the Security Council resolution. We have affirmed to him that the faithful implementation of the Security Council resolution represents the road to peace, and that, as far as we are concerned, we are ready to implement that resolution.

127. We have also proposed to the Special Representative that he set up a timetable for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November. We have indicated to him that the setting up of such a timetable would provide the framework of time within which all provisions of the Security Council resolution would be implemented.

128. We have formally conveyed this proposal to Ambassador Jarring, in a letter which I addressed to him on 9 May last. Throughout the talks with the Special Representative, and in connexion with the proposed timetable, we have set forth our detailed views on the substance, the form and the timing for the implementation of every provision of the resolution of the Security Council. Israel, however, has been deliberately refusing to consider, with Ambassador Jarring, any programme for the implementation of the Security Council resolution.

⁹ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1968, document S/8479.

129. Our proposal to set up a timetable to implement the resolution still stands. It still offers an opportunity to bring about peace in the Middle East under the supervision and guarantees of the Security Council.

130. We consider it necessary that the Security Council undertake the supervision, and guarantee the implementation, of the resolution of 22 November, for the achievement of peace in the Middle East. For Israel's traditional policy of unilaterally renouncing its signature of international agreements, and its contractual obligations deriving therefrom, together with its record of territorial expansion, make it all the more imperative for us, and for peace in the Middle East, to secure the supervision and the guarantee of the Security Council in the implementation of its resolution.

131. The systematic violation and organized usurpation by Israel of the rights of the Palestine people stands in complete violation of all the values and rules which bind the family of man. It equally represents a source of permanent threat to peace and security in the Middle East. Historically, legally and morally, this Organization bears an inescapable responsibility towards the people of Palestine, a responsibility which commits the United Nations to continue to be a principal party to the Palestine question.

132. Similarly, the big Powers, which bear the responsibility for their decisions concerning the people of Palestine, continue to be bound to the recognition of the rights of the people of Palestine and to putting an end to Israel's aggression against those rights.

133. The people of Palestine who are subjected to the Israeli aggression and exposed to the instruments of massacre and destruction which Israel possesses, continue to struggle for the right of the Palestinian man to live securely in his home, to till his land, and to exercise his fundamental and national rights. Those people are engaged today in a struggle against a new stage of Israeli aggression; they are engaged in that struggle under the most difficult and arduous circumstances which any people could possibly endure in the struggle for their rights. The people of Palestine deserve the support and admiration of all peoples that have struggled against aggression, racism and tyranny.

134. The situation in the Middle East could be summarized as follows: First, Israel launched its aggression against the Arab States on 5 June for the purpose of territorial expansion; Second, the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 affirmed that Israel must withdraw its forces from the territories it has occupied as a result of its aggression of 5 June 1967. It also laid down a settlement of the various questions in the area for the realization of peace; Third, we have declared our acceptance and readiness to implement that resolution, as well as our support of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring; Fourth, Israel refuses to imple-

ment that resolution, for it frustrates its ambitions for territorial expansion and the annexation of Arab territories; Fifth, Israel continues to follow a policy aimed at undermining the mission of Ambassador Jarring, while it cloaks that policy in semantic manoeuvres and deceptive statements; Sixth, Israel, which threatened world peace when it committed its aggression on 5 June 1967, continues to persist in its aggression and in its refusal to achieve peace.

135. It is our duty, and the duty of this international Organization, to suppress Israeli aggression and to bring peace to the Middle East. We have, however, to distinguish between a true peace based on justice and the respect of all rights and a situation in which one State aims at imposing its domination upon the destinies of other peoples. Any attempt to impose a solution by force and occupation is not peace. It is a fiction in the minds of those who believe that in their total domination and the surrender of others lie their own peace and security. In our opinion, that is an illusion, an escape from reality, and a way of ignoring history.

136. The withdrawal of the Israeli forces from every inch of the Arab territories occupied by them as a result of the aggression of 5 June is an obligation that belongs among the highest and most sacred category of international obligations. Every State Member of this international Organization is committed, under the Charter and in the interest of international relations, to stand up against aggression and against the policy of territorial expansion.

137. This is not the first time that the people of the United Arab Republic have faced destructive raiders; neither is it the first time in our history that a foreign Power, blinded by racism, has attempted to impose its will upon the people of the Nile Valley. But the history of our people is the history of an ancient people who have always stood up to the raiders and refused to surrender. We are no different from many other peoples which, in the absolute belief that to give in to the rule of force and tyranny would only be tantamount to a negation of the very will to live, have refused to surrender.

138. Our people, who have given to humanity one of its oldest civilizations and contributed to the growth of human knowledge, consider that peace is a basic necessity in order to continue to build, construct and share positively in the movement for progress. Every man and woman of the people of the United Arab Republic is committed, because of its past, present and future, to the recovery of every square inch of the territory occupied today by the forces of aggression of Israel.

139. The faith of our people is absolute that the forces of goodness and justice throughout the world shall stand by us for the achievement of peace based on justice.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.