



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> )	
Speech by Mr. Sattar (Maldives Islands) . . . . .	1
Speech by Dato Mohamed Ismail (Malaysia) . . . . .	3
Speech by Mr. Huot Sambath (Cambodia) . . . . .	7
Speech by Mr. Uqba (Southern Yemen) . . . . .	10
Statement by the representative of Afghanistan . . . . .	17
Statement by the representative of Thailand . . . . .	21
Statement by the representative of Pakistan . . . . .	21
Statement by the representative of Cambodia . . . . .	21

**President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).**

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Diallo (Guinea), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 9**

**General debate (*continued*)**

1. Mr. SATTAR (Maldives Islands): Allow me, at the very outset, to congratulate Mr. Arenales on his election as President of the General Assembly of the United Nations at its twenty-third session. While wishing him a speedy recovery from his illness, my delegation is fully confident that under his wise and able guidance our deliberations will be conducted in an atmosphere of understanding, and that with the sincere co-operation of representatives here they will be brought to a successful conclusion. I wish also to convey the gratitude and respects of the Maldivian delegation to His Excellency Foreign Minister Manescu of Romania, who conducted the proceedings of the twenty-second session so tactfully.

2. I should like here to take this opportunity to record our deep appreciation of the untiring efforts of the Secretary-General, who leaves no stone unturned in finding methods to solve the many problems that confront this body and the world as a whole.

3. Permit me also to offer our felicitations to the Vice-Presidents, who have an unenviable task before them.

4. We are happy to welcome Swaziland as the 125th Member of this Organization and to count Equatorial Guinea amongst the independent countries of the world.

5. I am fully conscious of the fact that I speak here on behalf of the smallest Member of this Organization. However, the Maldivian Government and people are no less anxious than the greater nations to add their contribution, however small it may be, to that of the rest of the world

towards the cause of world peace and the settlement of vital problems.

6. As we gather in assembly here, we are all sadly aware of the struggles going on in different parts of the world—struggles in which man is confronted by his fellow-beings with weapons of destruction; struggles in which human blood is flowing freely; struggles caused by generations of enmity and mistrust. This has been, and continues to be, a situation which constitutes a threat to world peace, international harmony and the very survival of mankind.

7. One of the most explosive issues confronting us exists in the Middle East. The Maldivian Government is deeply concerned at the gravity of the situation, which remains virulent. It should not be permitted to worsen any further. The Maldives therefore welcomed the unanimous decision taken by the Security Council on 22 November 1967 [*resolution 242 (1967)*]. We support that resolution in all its parts and consider it a very sound basis for a lasting peace in the Middle East. We were fully aware of the difficult task that lay ahead of Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, when he accepted this most challenging assignment. We are deeply appreciative of his efforts to bring peace to the region. We admire his patience and tactful handling of the issue. However difficult the task may be, we believe that a lasting peace can and should be achieved in the Middle East, based on justice, with due consideration being given to the root factors underlying the entire problem. We appeal to all the countries involved to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the creation of conditions leading to a permanent peace in the area. We should like to remind you that this is the best method of solving the issue, and that any action which conflicts with the spirit and the principles of the Security Council resolution 242 (1967) would only jeopardize the chances of an early settlement.

8. We welcome the preliminary peace talks now being held in Paris on the Viet-Nam war. However, it is most regrettable that the passing of each day brings more deaths and a greater flow of human blood in that country. This war is a tragic reminder to us all of the evil forces which attempt to wreck international peace and harmony. It is our view that peace can be achieved only by peaceful means.

9. Although the lack of progress in the Paris talks has caused considerable concern, we are hopeful that they will lead to an acceptable cease-fire. Nevertheless, we are convinced that a final settlement of the issue can be reached only through the noble process of self-determination by the Viet-Namees themselves. The people of North and South Viet-Nam should, after a cease-fire, be allowed to decide on their future. That decision must be made

according to the free will of the Viet-Nameese, free of any force or pressure from any foreign country. It could be supervised by a United Nations commission or by a special representative of the Secretary-General.

10. Just as the people of Viet-Nam has a right to self-determination, so does the people of Czechoslovakia to chart the course of its destiny. These are basic rights which cannot be denied to anyone, be it in Asia or in Europe. Indeed, no country has the right to determine what is good for another. Nor should a people be subjected to unpopular minority rule, suppressing its basic freedoms. I refer to the peoples of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the African Territories under Portuguese administration. We, the Members of this Organization who have dedicated ourselves "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights... to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest", should make a collective and concrete effort to practise these very noble principles and bring about conditions in which these issues can be solved in conformity with the free will of the peoples of the respective countries.

11. I now come to another question which has evaded an acceptable solution in this Assembly for many years: the representation of China in the United Nations. The Maldivian Government cannot support any move to expel the Republic of China, which is a founding Member of this Organization. However, if the People's Republic of China desires membership of this Organization, and this body aiming at its goal of achieving universality wishes to include the 700 million people of the People's Republic of China, it is time for this Assembly to strive genuinely to find an acceptable and practical solution to this most important question.

12. This year has been declared the International Year for Human Rights. While we continue to discuss human rights and adopt numerous resolutions to end racial discrimination, we are gravely concerned that a highly deplorable practice is being followed even today. I refer to the policy of *apartheid* practised in South Africa. A halt must be brought to this inhuman practice, and an end must also be put to other acts of racial discrimination and religious intolerance in all parts of the world.

13. The Maldivian Islands has a foreign policy based on goodwill towards all who value our friendship—irrespective of size, political ideology or cultural background. Our consideration of vital issues is not weighed down by the greatness or power of any country. It is therefore with sincerity that we appeal for the understanding and whole-hearted co-operation of one and all to make a determined effort to solve these international problems which have brought untold suffering to millions throughout the world. It is with the same sincerity that the Maldivian Government endorses and extends its most vigorous support to the steps taken by the Secretary-General to relax tension and harmonize strained relations between conflicting parties, since our concept of world peace is based on the continued goodwill of all countries.

14. While I have thus far commented on some of the most acute international issues, there are other major world problems which need equally serious consideration. Much concern has been expressed at the disappointments of the first United Nations Development Decade. The increasing gap between the rich and the poor countries has been viewed with the same concern. While a considerable increase was registered in agricultural production in 1967, with record rice and wheat crops, the race between population explosion and food production still continues. In his introduction to the annual report the Secretary-General has observed:

"Still, the population problem remains a major source of anxiety for it has to be viewed in a much wider context than the food population equation" [A/7201/Add.1, para. 69].

And again,

"Even if the most optimistic predictions about a decline in the rate of population increase should be realized and even if the most hopeful predictions of a significant increase in food production should come true, millions of people would continue to suffer from malnutrition" [*ibid.*, para. 71].

15. Although population has not posed any difficulties to the Maldivian Islands as an individual country, we join in the chorus of voices expressing alarm at the rapid growth of the world population. We must take every measure not only to win the food-population race, but also to save coming generations from protein deficiency.

16. Two of the greatest enemies of progress, right thinking and social progress are illiteracy and ignorance. A worldwide campaign must be launched to wipe out illiteracy and to bring the torch of education to the innumerable dark corners of the world, for development cannot be achieved without a basic education. We were heartened to note that the *1967 Report on the World Social Situation*<sup>1</sup> showed an improvement in the conditions of educational sectors in developing countries. Continued improvement in those sectors will undoubtedly lead to permanent development of these countries, for it is only through education that an awareness can be created among their people of the need for an over-all development.

17. The year 1968 has seen some significant achievements. The work on the study of the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor is highly commendable. We deeply appreciate the excellent report of the *Ad Hoc Committee* [A/7230] and congratulate the Chairman, Ambassador Amerasinghe and the members of the Committee for this excellent document. The initiative taken in this respect by the delegation of Malta deserves much credit. The Maldivian Islands fully supports the proposal for the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor underlying the high seas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Further measures connected with this study should be considered as a matter of high priority.

18. In the field of nuclear disarmament, the year witnessed the memorable resolution [2373 (XXII)] commending the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.IV.9.

ons, adopted by 95 votes in favour at the resumed session of the twenty-second General Assembly. The Treaty has now been signed by more than eighty countries. The Maldives is proud to have supported the resolution commending the Treaty and to have signed it since then. While the Treaty is far from being perfect, it is a major step towards nuclear disarmament. However, much remains to be accomplished. We were therefore encouraged by the report appearing in the *Washington Post* on 2 July that "agreement had been reached to begin, in the nearest future, discussions on the limitations of both offensive and defensive nuclear weapons" and on the "urgent measures for stopping the arms race"—the remarks being attributed to President Johnson and Premier Kosygin respectively. We were further heartened during this debate to hear from the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union of their readiness to work on these lines, despite the repercussions of recent developments in Eastern Europe on East-West relations. It is our fervent hope and prayer that concrete measures will be taken without undue delay. Too much is at stake for any postponement.

19. Finally, let me recall that we constitute a forum which was set up to achieve international co-operation to solve international problems and to preserve world peace. Let us therefore set aside our desire for individual gains and work collectively to dissolve the problems that pollute the international atmosphere. Let us resolve here and now to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and work together in all earnestness to achieve fully the objectives to which we are dedicated as one family—the family of mankind.

20. Dato Mohamed ISMAIL (Malaysia): It is a great pleasure for my delegation and my Government to offer to Mr. Arenales, in our first intervention in the general debate of this Assembly, our warmest felicitations on his unanimous election to the office of President. Enough has already been said by the representatives who have preceded me at this rostrum, about the experience he has had in United Nations affairs and the talents he has brought to the various tasks that preceded his assumption of this office. This is indeed the crowning achievement of his career. The coming year holds no promise of an easy passage, if one remembers events of the year just closed. We may therefore look forward hopefully to his guidance of the Assembly through the daunting tasks that lie ahead.

21. Let me also take this opportunity at the very outset to offer our felicitations and good wishes to Swaziland, whose accession to full statehood has been perfected by its being accepted as a Member of this Organization.

22. The past year has not been a year of any singular achievement. We had better look that fact squarely in the face. Much that was hopefully expected to be achieved remained elusive and unattainable. One need only read the sombre introduction of the Secretary-General to his annual report [A/7201/Add.1] to realize that international relations still remain in the penumbra of human affairs, with no immediate hope that the shadows will lift or pass over. At the moment no ray of light relieves the darkness.

23. Not many months ago the world cheered the conclusion of a nuclear non-proliferation Treaty. There were of

course doubters and sceptics, but by and large it gave reasonable hope for optimism that even if the nuclear arms race cannot be reversed, the trend towards arresting it in its course has commended itself to the super-Powers. Even such limited optimism now appears to be merely wishful thinking, a terribly frightened and frustrated world seeing only what it wants to see, through rose coloured spectacles.

24. The resumed session of the twenty-second General Assembly commended the Treaty and recommended the widest possible adherence to it in spite of its obvious weaknesses, particularly with two of the five known nuclear Powers sulking away from it. The remaining three nuclear Powers have to sign and ratify the Treaty before it can come into force; and signs are not wanting that some, if not all of these Powers are losing their earlier enthusiasm for it, if one is unwilling to say they are having second thoughts.

25. Many pandits, knowledgeable in these affairs, have assured the world that the next logical step towards a complete cessation of the arms race is to extend the partial nuclear test ban Treaty of 1963 to include a ban on underground testing. This problem has been bedevilled over the years by the difficult question of verification, but the report of the latest meeting of experts which met in Tällberg, Dalarna, in Sweden,<sup>2</sup> makes it possible to conclude that the techniques of detection and verification of underground explosions has now reached a stage where these difficulties are no longer insurmountable. In so far therefore as this impediment to verification now appears to have been removed, there is no longer any excuse for the creation of intellectual road-blocks aimed at barring the inclusion of underground testing in the partial nuclear test ban Treaty also in order to make the ban complete and effective.

26. This, my Government feels, will effectively dissipate the doubts and hesitations the potential nuclear Powers have understandably felt in accepting at face-value the protestations of the nuclear Powers that they mean what they say when they confidently claim that the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty will indeed advance and promote disarmament. It will also effectively counter the notorious arguments which the potential nuclear Powers have used to gain a semblance of respectability, by showing the real distinction existing between horizontal proliferation, which is prohibited, and vertical proliferation, which is permitted. My Government urges the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, which for long has only functioned with seventeen members, to proceed with this programme leading to a ban on underground tests. When all is said and done the persistent problem of problems is that of peace-keeping.

27. It is unnecessary at this stage to recount the considerations that have revolved around the exercise of the veto in the Security Council or the search for remedies, by recourse to the General Assembly, against the veto disabling the Security Council and preventing it from taking prompt and effective action when a situation threatening to disturb the peace has arisen or is likely to do so. One may concede for the sake of argument that when the Charter conferred

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1967 and 1968, document DC/231, annex I, sect. 6.*

“primary” responsibility for peace-keeping on the Security Council it meant “exclusive”, and, for the sake of peace among the permanent members, even grant that “primary” means “exclusive”—a position volubly asserted but validly denied by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. But the fact remains that the Security Council, more often than not, turns away from its peace-keeping power unless the interest of one or other of the permanent members cries out for intervention.

28. The recent conclusion of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty was accompanied by a declaration by the nuclear Powers in the Security Council that should a non-nuclear Power be threatened with nuclear attack the nuclear Powers in the Security Council would immediately act through the Security Council to deter aggression or threat of aggression. For twenty-three long years, since the Security Council began its life, attitudes to action, or more appropriately inaction, in the Security Council have inevitably fanned the flames of war, not, of course by direct incitement but indirectly. This happens when the permanent members indulge in the rhetoric of mutual bitterness and hostility, take hostile and antagonistic positions in debate, and ignore the fate of the victim who, having had the temerity to invite the Security Council to determine the existence of aggression, must inevitably stand helpless and see itself more and more irretrievably engulfed in the flames of war.

29. The Security Council resolution 255 (1968), unanimously adopted on 19 June 1968, takes the matter no further than a recognition by the nuclear-weapon-State permanent members that such aggression or threat of aggression would create a situation in which they would have to act immediately. One does not need to be a cynic to read the resolution as an admission that the permanent members had always in the past regarded themselves as having to discharge a duty in similar circumstances only dilatorily. They would now appear to have realized that a measure of urgency has been imparted to their primary duty because nuclear aggression has substituted swift destruction for the more painful processes of slow death by the employment of conventional arms. It is useful to remind ourselves that it has been stated on high authority that a nuclear holocaust would leave the few living envying the many dead.

30. Perhaps the sting of the operative part of the resolution is in its concluding words, that the nuclear-weapon-State permanent members would not only have to act immediately, but so to act in accordance with their obligations under the United Nations Charter. The history of twenty-three years has blazed a trail which permits no hope judging from the result of past expectations and therefore no comfort for the future.

31. During the debate in the General Assembly, States which proposed to sign the non-proliferation Treaty asked for the logical and minimum assurance that in return for their self-denial of the right to manufacture or acquire nuclear arms the nuclear Powers would undertake not to use nuclear arms against them. One would have thought that in the circumstances no more reasonable demand could have been made. However, the voices of those States seemed wasted and lost in the air, leaving only their echoes for an answer. Nothing could be more illustrative of the

attitude of the nuclear Powers than the fact that their primary and, may I say, ill-concealed interest in the non-proliferation Treaty is to secure for themselves a nuclear monopoly for ever and ever.

32. When it is remembered that France has not only ostentatiously turned away from the purposes of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament but is diligently and purposefully pursuing its lonely path, through which it hopes to break into the nuclear club from within the United Nations, and that another great State hopes to do so from without, what guarantee is there for the protection of the small State whose lot is cast on this pitiful planet and which feels bound by the shackles of the Treaty and the obligations of the Charter but is unable to say “a plague on both your houses” to the nuclear Powers, those which have signed the Treaty and those which have not and, so far as one can see, will not?

33. I do not intend to be hypercritical of the good intentions of the nuclear States but in the midst of all this euphoria we need to stand firm on our feet and not allow ourselves to be carried away into the turbulent seas of insecurity by the good intentions of others.

34. My country lives on the periphery—if that term has any validity in the era of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles—of a nuclear Power of immense, unknown and as yet uncontrollable potential. Only the other day it indulged its political generosity by offering North Viet-Nam tactical weapons with nuclear warheads should the leaders of North Viet-Nam need them in what it called North Viet-Nam’s struggle for survival against American aggression. How would the Security Council deal with a situation such as that when all the combatants claim that the United Nations, and certainly the Security Council, has no competence to deal with the Viet-Nam war?

35. It is therefore a matter of urgent concern to the non-nuclear Powers which cannot find the wherewithal to arm themselves adequately or appropriately that the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty be brought down from the abstract regions of vague idealism to the level of practical and predictable applicability. My Government desires to take this opportunity to commend to the consideration of the seventeen members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament the immediate problems, political and military, arising out of the conclusion of the non-proliferation Treaty so that the real benefit it was intended to promote can be brought within the reach of States—and indeed this means all the rest of us—which live under the menacing shadow of nuclear war.

36. My Government would in this connexion also recommend to the Security Council, enlarged as it has been since 1966 so as to be more representative of the wider membership that the United Nations has achieved, that it should be more responsive to their needs.

37. Every addition to the membership of the United Nations increases the complexities of international life and the possibilities of victimization of the smaller States by big Power attitudes in the perpetuation of power. My Government would suggest that the Security Council should not wait until a threat knocks at its doors or the shock waves of

a developing threat impinge on its consciousness. It should be willing to meet periodically and take stock of world conditions, preferably with a monthly, or more frequent, report by the Secretary-General, as foreshadowed by Article 99 of the Charter. Recent experience denies us the complacency to rest inactive. The world of small States and mini-States, whose problems in their individual context are just as pressing and as urgent as those of any others, would then lie within full view of the wide open windows of the Security Council and not as now under the shadows of its enclosing walls until someone is able to breach them and let in the blinding light of reality.

38. Moreover, the Security Council cannot afford to set adrift in international waters so many States, for the acceptance of whose membership it bears primary responsibility, and leave them to their own devices in a cannibalistic international society where appetite grows by what it feeds on. It should be vigilant of international freedom and liberty and take prompt measures, if not to prevent bush fires from being lighted, at least to quench the fires at their birth and not let them spread and consume ever-widening areas of the earth and their peoples, while suffering itself to be borne on a flood of eloquence through uncertain waters.

39. Long years ago my delegation made a suggestion to the Security Council that, at the initial stage of assuming jurisdiction over any problem under Charter VII, it should practise self-denial by not using the veto power so that the rake's progress of unpredictable war might be arrested betimes. Rhetoric can be indulged in after the quenching of the fires, the apportioning of blame, or the effort to reverse the event. The process of determination of which Article 39 speaks might then be undertaken at leisure without aggravating the risk of the continuance of aggression. My delegation respectfully recommends to the Security Council that it should embark on that purposeful endeavour towards preserving peace in the world.

40. That brings me to a consideration of some of the particular problems that continue to endanger international security and engulf large segments of the world. First and foremost there is Viet-Nam, about which enough and more than enough has been said in successive debates in this Assembly over the years. Legalistic attitudes have prevented the matter from being brought directly before this Assembly for debate. My Government indeed wonders what the framers of the Charter had in mind when they wrote into it Article 2, paragraph 6, which reads:

“The Organization shall ensure that States which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.”

41. We are not concerned with apportioning blame, but humanity owes it to itself to see that the long and tragic shadow that has stretched across that unhappy country for over a generation does not become permanent, as it threatens to do, but is lifted so that the peoples of Viet-Nam, North and South, can still find it possible to have the freedom to pursue their own destiny in their own way. To us this is no indulgence of a pious hope or a pipe dream. We live too close to Viet-Nam to let the canker that seems to have eaten into its being fester and corrode its soul

and remain for ever a historical precedent for the ineffectiveness of the United Nations.

42. The other trouble spot, also in Asia, is the Middle East. My Government's position was made clear to representatives during the debates at the Fifth Emergency session of the General Assembly. It still adheres to the position which it then took. It has seen no change in the frozen attitudes of that time that would require a re-examination of its position. No State occupying territory as the result of hostilities, however provoked, should be allowed to continue to occupy such territory as a powerful bargaining counter in multilateral negotiations designed to lead to the restoration of peace in the area, whatever justification or excuse such State can by ingenious reasoning summon to its aid, in order to persist in its wrongdoing. This position is untenable and indeed inexcusable in the face of Article 25 of the Charter, by which every Member of the United Nations agreed in advance, when it sought membership in the Organization, to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council.

43. In recent weeks, another situation arose in central Europe threatening the peace and security of the world by reactivating the cold war. Hopeful signs of a *détente* between the NATO and Warsaw Powers had appeared on the horizon and this latest development quite obviously cannot promote such *détente*.

44. Malaysia deeply regrets the action taken in Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries and views with deep concern the intervention of their troops in that country. Malaysia believes in the principles of peaceful coexistence, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the inviolability of the territorial integrity and political independence of States, as enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Malaysia urges the withdrawal of these troops and hopes that differences between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will be settled peacefully on the basis of those principles.

45. These are some of the major problems which the United Nations has had to face in the past year and my Government ventures to hope that some of the suggestions made by us earlier in this statement might help to contain these disturbances of the peace and security of the world. These are but the plainest symptoms of the attitudes of men and people in the mass to their environment, untrammelled by the ideals that found a voice in the Charter. We urge the utmost use of the regulatory mechanisms with which the creators of the Charter provided the United Nations, since, in a rapidly shrinking world, no problem and no development in any area can be isolated as unrelated to any other part of the world. The world is one and each one of us, large or small, has a duty to see that it endures and survives the errors and irritations created in any part of it.

46. With regard to Sabah, my Government's position was fully explained on Wednesday last [1698th meeting], when my delegation, in exercising its right of reply, answered arguments put forward in support of the claim by the Philippine delegation. While reserving the right to make any further intervention that we consider necessary, I do not wish to add anything at this stage.

47. I now pass to other matters by no means of less importance. I should like, if I may, to make a brief mention of the second session of UNCTAD recently concluded in New Delhi.<sup>3</sup> It is common knowledge and has often been repeated from this rostrum that the expectations created by the Conference were far from fulfilled. The problems discussed and debated at the Conference were perhaps too complex to lend themselves to simple solutions, and deep disappointment may have resulted, if only because the expectations were too high. I shall mention in that connexion at least two matters which, in our judgement, were direct results of the New Delhi Conference.

48. First, I shall recall to this Assembly that the Conference accepted the principle that developed countries as a whole should grant preferential treatment to the exports of developing countries as a group which enter the markets of the former. Malaysia welcomes that assurance. Then there was the ending of the controversy about the 1 per cent target for the net transfer of financial resources from the rich to the poor countries. That has now been agreed as a percentage of gross national product and not of national income. Some may consider that these were marginal achievements of vague content, and it is true enough that no one can yet see a precise picture with identifiable contours even at the end of the tunnel. However, in so far as those two results gave direction and purpose to the process of development of the developing States, they were not without significance. We grant that much remains to be done in filling in the details as well as maintaining the momentum towards further endeavours.

49. One matter germane to this problem of financing development which has over the years bedevilled those concerned with it is the question of whether such aid should continue to be negotiated in bilateral terms, between donor and recipient countries, and whether such assistance could not more effectively be channelled through multilateral agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme. The obvious advantages of the latter and the notorious problems and pitfalls of the former are too well known for me to list them here. My delegation is concerned to point out that these problems exist, that they should not be allowed to drift but should be tackled and that the obstacles to the harmonious development of all the developing States, each according to its needs, should be overcome.

50. There is one matter of vital importance, particularly to the developing countries, to which I should like to make a brief reference. That is the protein gap, to which of late great attention has been and is being paid, thanks to the significant initiative of our Secretary-General. The realization that the growth in world population is alarmingly outpacing the growth in food production has led to many studies not only in the techniques of growing more food but also in regard to the compulsive necessity of controlling what has been aptly called the population explosion. Until recently the problem of food production was regarded only as a quantitative problem, that is, a problem of how to increase production. However, the latest research has shown that the more crucial problem crying out to be tackled is the qualitative improvement of human food resources. We

know that adequate protein is required for the maintenance of body tissues and functions—and in this the world, through lack of thought and planning, has allowed itself to be left dangerously below the line of sustenance—but the application of science and technology has now disclosed that the lack of protein in the intake of food is directly productive of mental ill-health and retardation, particularly in children. This is a disaster that threatens to overtake all plans and programmes for free and compulsory education.

51. The specialized agencies have co-operated in setting up expert groups, and the results of the studies by the Advisory Committee on the application of science and technology to development, which are to be found in the latest publication by the United Nations, *Feeding the Expanding World Population: International Action to Avert the Impending Protein Crisis*,<sup>4</sup> are truly frightening. The fact that there are over 300 million children in the developing world today who, for lack of sufficient protein, suffer retarded physical growth and mental development underlines the urgency of the problem, which, in terms of population control, is far from being tractable.

52. It is a matter of some comfort that the United Nations specialized agencies have now made a co-ordinated effort to tackle this problem with vigour and determination. However, the solution of the problem bristles with multifarious difficulties, more particularly by reason of the fact that the solution has to begin with educating the world into a change from its long-held food habits—a notoriously difficult task. It has been said that there is perhaps no aspect of personal life less flexible than one's eating pattern. Practical and specific proposals to tackle this problem have been studied, and the results of the studies published, so that Governments may have the direction and purpose of their activity intelligently turned towards urgent and feasible goals. However, in the view of my delegation, it is even more important to educate Governments in the developing countries to an awareness of the depth and magnitude of the problem and its inescapable urgency, for without that education begun in their minds nothing else can or will begin.

53. This year has been designated the International Year for Human Rights, thereby providing a point in time from which to look before and after. The problem of racial discrimination, the pernicious doctrine of *apartheid*, renamed by South Africa into respectability as "separate development", still persists and makes a mockery of human rights. Like all infections and diseases, it tends to spread and fester, and obviously mere resolutions of the United Nations periodically repeated cannot and will not put an end to it. Quite recently we looked on in disbelief as it entered the arena of international sports and South Africa demonstrated to the world that it could unabashedly brave the world.

54. The time has come, we venture to think, for more effective measures to be taken, as some of the specialized agencies have done. The Charter makes provision for this course, and the United Nations must avail itself of those provisions and not merely mouth the Universal Declaration of twenty years ago with periodic piety if it wishes to

<sup>3</sup> Held from 1 February to 29 March 1968.

<sup>4</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.XIII.2.

continue to remain a purposeful and effective agency for the promotion of human rights. Such a step might even, hopefully, lead to an amelioration of the condition of the people of Namibia who remain chained, against their will, to the chariot wheels of South Africa and therefore to *apartheid*.

55. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): The delegation of the Kingdom of Cambodia, which, in accordance with established tradition, is participating in the work of the General Assembly as it does every year, is called upon today to set forth its country's views on the problems facing it and on those problems that concern all of us. We do so with the equanimity that results from the enjoyment of absolute political independence and with the sole desire to serve the ideals that justify the existence of the United Nations.

56. First of all, I should like to draw your attention to the situation of Cambodia and the 7 million Khmers that make up its population. As you know, we are one of the few nations that became States at the beginning of the history of mankind, and we created one of the most resplendent civilizations of Asia. Over the course of 16 centuries, we have learnt a good deal about the development of societies, and I believe that our past experience, our present situation, and our open-hearted nature entitle us to speak frankly about the burning questions of the time.

57. The threat hanging over Cambodia has not lessened; on the contrary, it has increased during the course of the past year. The propaganda of the United States and some of its allies still refuses to recognize the reality of Cambodian neutrality. Thus, we are accused of being a secret ally of the Viet-Nameese resistance and the party mainly responsible for the set-backs experienced by the invading American troops in South Viet-Nam. Despite our protests and notwithstanding all the contrary reports of the International Supervisory and Control Commission it is alleged, both orally and in writing, that Cambodia is the privileged sanctuary and the great logistical base of the Viet-Nameese popular forces. We must therefore emphasize that the United States is resorting to falsification in order to justify the aggression of its armed forces against our country.

58. I would remind you that the civilian population of Cambodian frontier villages is still being subjected to terrorist attacks by the American Air Force, to artillery bombardments and to the fire of infiltrated American and South Viet-Nameese units. Yet the American command has never been able to produce any evidence of damage to Viet-Nameese troops allegedly stationed on Khmer territory, and in every case the victims of these attacks have been Cambodian peasants, women and children.

59. The American Government's refusal to acknowledge its full responsibility for these attacks and to accept the normal consequences seems to us to be a grave matter in international law. For instance, following the massacre of fourteen Khmer peasants by two American helicopters on 29 June 1968, a massacre that was officially reported to the United Nations, the United States rejected the Cambodian protest which it described as unfounded. Such an attitude on the part of a country that has subscribed to the United Nations Charter should by rights be denounced by those

who oppose a return to the practices that led to the Second World War.

60. In order to put a stop to the territorial ambitions of Thailand and the Saigon régime, Cambodia asked all countries for a declaration acknowledging its present frontiers. Those frontiers are certainly not favourable to us either geographically or ethnically, nor do they correspond any better to our juridical and historical rights, but they do have the merit that they exist, that in the case of the Khmer-Thailand frontier they have been fixed by an international treaty confirmed by the International Court of Justice, and that in the case of the frontier separating Cambodia from Viet-Nam and Laos they were delimited by France. Thus it would be sensible of both sides to accept the situation as it is and to put an end to those continual frontier changes that for centuries have accompanied the ups and downs of history.

61. Most of the countries interested in Asian problems have finally recognized the justice and logic of the Cambodian position and have made the declaration we asked for. But the Saigon régime still persists in its senseless territorial demands on Cambodia, while Thailand still declines our proposal to sign a joint declaration of respect for our common frontier. The American Government, in turn, lends unequivocal support to its allies in Saigon and Bangkok by refusing to recognize the permanent character of Cambodia's frontiers. So I must remind them now that Cambodia, already reduced to its simplest geographical terms, will never yield an inch of its national territory, and will never under any pretext whatsoever enter into discussions on so-called frontier rectifications.

62. Unqualified recognition of Cambodia's present frontiers is and will continue to be the primary condition for the establishment or the maintenance of normal diplomatic relations with any foreign State. In the letter and in the spirit of our policy of neutrality, we are most anxious to create bonds of friendship with all the countries of the world, but it is obvious that we cannot regard as friends those who directly or by implication support the expansionist policy of our neighbours. For us Cambodians, independence and territorial integrity form a single whole upon which our survival depends, and they are not therefore negotiable.

63. In the introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly the Secretary-General of the United Nations notes that the world is faced with a marked decline in international morality and that States are coming to rely to an increasing extent on force and violence in settling their international disputes. On the basis of that admirably lucid analysis of the current situation, His Excellency U Thant goes on to say that "... if the principle of non-intervention in the free destiny of nations is not re-established, the future of international peace and security itself is indeed a very dark one" [A/7201/Add.1, para. 174].

64. The Cambodian delegation shares that view and would like to point out that ten years ago, from this very platform [756th meeting], the Cambodian Head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, drew the attention of the United Nations to the serious consequences of intervention by the great Powers in the affairs of other countries. Alas, we are

compelled to observe that intervention, not only political and economic but also military, has become so common that it provokes nothing more than purely formal protests, either in the United Nations or by international public opinion. Indeed, it would appear that violations of a country's sovereignty today inspire nothing more than disillusioned reactions that amount to an acknowledgement that might is right.

65. Like His Excellency U Thant, we are convinced that, if a great Power only has to claim that its security is being threatened in order to arrogate to itself the right to invade another country, the outlook for the world is black indeed. This habit of talking about security is getting more and more absurd and offers only a very flimsy disguise for colonialist ambitions. Do we not hear the United States claim that its security is threatened by Viet-Nam and, following that eminent example, do we not hear Thailand, protected by its powerful army and by the American occupation forces, assert that 35,000 poorly equipped Cambodian soldiers are a formidable threat to it?

66. Faithful to its policy of peace and true independence, Cambodia has never ceased to condemn foreign intervention in the affairs of others. We believe that every country has the right to full sovereignty, that every people is free to adopt the institutions and the régime of its choice, and that no one is entitled to interfere—especially by armed force—in the domestic affairs of an independent nation. We are told that the United Nations was founded in order that never again would one country impose its will on another, weaker country; well, today we have to recognize that that fundamental principle is being deliberately ignored.

67. The division of the world into two ideological camps, into zones of influence for the super Powers, remains the drama of our age and a tragedy for countries which, like Cambodia and many other non-aligned countries, cannot accept any restriction on their independence. Nationalism is undoubtedly, and will be for a long time to come, the basis on which all countries, large and small, must develop. To deny that, or to attempt to break it by force or any other means can only provoke interminable disputes, or even that third world war that threatens us. Consequently, we believe that the great Powers must have the wisdom to understand that they have neither a monopoly of pride and national dignity nor the right to interfere in the affairs of another country on any pretext whatsoever.

68. This problem of non-intervention leads the Cambodian delegation to denounce once again the invasion of South Viet-Nam by United States armed forces and the war, unprecedented in history, that is being waged against the Viet-Nameese people. The representative of the United States has stood on this platform [*1677th meeting*] and proclaimed his country's peaceful intentions. But that was only words; the reality, in all its horror and brutality, is the destruction of a country and the genocide of a people by a foreign army.

69. There is no justification for American aggression against South Viet-Nam. There is no justification for the so-called limited bombings of North Viet-Nam by the American Air Force. There is no justification for the so-called reciprocal de-escalation measures demanded from

the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam by the American Government. And we would add that it is quite wrong that United States representatives should claim the right to speak for the Viet-Nameese people.

70. The American argument that North Viet-Nam is the aggressor against South Viet-Nam is not only mistaken, it is contrary to real facts. It must be remembered that the origin of the Viet-Nam war was the legitimate revolt of the South Viet-Nameese people against the dictatorship of Ngo Dinh Diem and the illegal intervention by the American armed forces in that domestic dispute. It is the United States that deliberately transformed the civil war in South Viet-Nam into a war of independence by the Viet-Nameese people against a foreign invader. The representatives of the United States assure us that they have no colonial ambitions and that their only aim is the welfare of Viet-Nam and the Viet-Nameese. Unfortunately, these fine sentiments are reflected in the wholesale murder of the civilian population, in untold sufferings inflicted on a people, and in the methodical destruction of a country under the pretence of helping it.

71. Cambodia lends its total moral, political and diplomatic support to the national Viet-Nameese resistance represented by the National Front for the Liberation of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. For us, this is a question of principle and of respect for the United Nations Charter, which recognizes that all countries, without distinction as to political régime, possess the sacred right to independence. It is for the Viet-Nameese, and the Viet-Nameese only, to settle their domestic affairs as they choose, and any foreign intervention in those affairs is and must be condemned.

72. The only solution to the Viet-Nam war is the withdrawal of American troops and bases from the southern part of the country and, of course, the cessation of the bombings and other acts of war against the North. We consider that the political programme of the National Liberation Front and the four points of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam constitute the only basis on which it will be possible to put an end to the conflict. It must be added that the Viet-Nameese position is the same as any country in the world would adopt in similar circumstances.

73. The opening of the American-Viet-Nameese negotiations in Paris raised hopes in every kind of people and in every kind of country. Unfortunately, it is becoming clear that no agreement is in sight and that none will come in sight so long as the United States continues to demand reciprocal concessions in exchange for halting its aggression and a limitation of South Viet-Nam's independence.

74. The United States tries to justify its invasion of South Viet-Nam by maintaining that the so-called "Government" of Saigon requested its assistance. Now, every journalist and international observer, including the Americans, has seen for himself that that Government has no popular backing and no legitimacy, and that it exists only by the will of the United States and thanks to the protection of the American armed forces. The truth is that, if left to itself, the Saigon police régime would be blown away like a straw in the wind, as was every régime imposed on occupied Europe during the Second World War.

75. It is obvious that the United States must sooner or later acknowledge the fact that it is powerless against Viet-Nameese patriotism and that the fiction of the representative character of the Saigon Government must be abandoned. We are already hearing suggestions here and there that a coalition government should be imposed on South Viet-Nam in which the principal role would be played by men pledged to America. However, those suggestions are completely unrealistic, for the form and composition of the future South Viet-Nameese régime cannot be decided from outside. Under infinitely more favourable conditions, an international conference encouraged the three Laotian parties to set up a similar kind of fictitious coalition government, and even ratified their agreement. We know today what happened to it.

76. Let us repeat it once again: the domestic political solution to the Viet-Nameese affair is a matter for the Viet-Nameese people alone, who must be left free to settle their differences by negotiation or by force of arms. Lamentable as they may be, there have always been civil wars, and the Viet-Nameese have as much right to have a civil war in 1968 as the Americans had from 1861 to 1865. It must, however, be observed that civil wars are shorter and generally less bloody when foreign countries adopt a position of strict neutrality vis-à-vis the parties involved.

77. Indeed, the sole aspect of the Viet-Nam war that concerns the United Nations and other international organizations is the ill-considered interference of half a million American soldiers in South Viet-Nam. But the General Assembly, at its present session, could play a useful role if it required the United States, in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Charter, to terminate immediately its aggression and to negotiate with the National Liberation Front over arrangements for withdrawing its troops.

78. The United Nations should also devote some attention to the Korean question. Korea was divided up by the great Powers just like Viet-Nam, not because it was a conquered country being punished for having taken part in the Second World War on the side of the dictators, but because it was a victim of the spirit of Yalta.

79. Cambodia is asking the Assembly to reflect on the injustice caused by the artificially maintained division of the Korean nation—with the agreement of the United Nations. Now, the United Nations has no political jurisdiction whatsoever in this matter, which is the responsibility of the Korean people, and the Commission which claims to be dealing with it, but has no legal basis, should be dissolved at once. Today the only obstacle to Korean unification is the presence of the army of occupation and American military bases in the southern part of the country. It is not for us to say how this reunification would be achieved, but we have good reason to believe that it would be by essentially peaceful means.

80. To perpetuate the division of Korea by the American occupation of South Korea is a clear violation of the national rights of the Korean people. If the United Nations is truly faithful to its ideals, it must straight away ask the United States to end this prolonged occupation and allow this free country to decide as it wishes.

81. A further important question is the restoration to the People's Republic of China of its seat in the United Nations, and in all United Nations bodies. It is incongruous and even scandalous—as every delegate here will agree—that the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek should be held to be the authentic representatives of 800 million Chinese. We believe it is time to put an end to that farce, which has gone on far too long.

82. Once again this year, the United States and its dependents are bringing out their usual arguments to oppose China's presence in the United Nations. Powers and countries, which use their armed might to impose a political and economic domination on others, set up military bases everywhere and send their navies into the seven seas, now accuse China of threatening world peace. Yet we know that there is not a single Chinese soldier and not a single Chinese military base outside China. Is it not the height of absurdity to maintain that China is a warmonger and that the United States is pacifist?

83. American imperialism, increasingly arrogant and brutal, is the only danger at the present time. Everyone knows that the United States has the hypocrisy to invoke freedom and democracy to justify its foreign aggressions, its interventions, its interferences. China spreads its revolutionary ideas, but no foreign country is forced to accept them and every country can reject them, as Cambodia does, without being subjected to military or other pressures. It would be entirely normal, therefore, that our General Assembly should judge these matters more equitably, according to the real facts.

84. The truth—and we trust it is a truth that will finally prevail—is that the People's Republic of China, a nation of 800 million people, are being kept out of the United Nations in flagrant violation of the principles upon which the United Nations was founded. We must ponder a fact often quoted by the Cambodian Head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, that “the United Nations needs China far more than China needs a seat in the United Nations”. The United States must, however, restore to China without delay the Chinese province of Taiwan which they are occupying in violation of every right, in collusion with the Chiang Kai-shek administration.

85. The Cambodian delegation wishes to express its deep concern at the increasing difficulties encountered by the developing countries. We are grieved to note that the abyss that divides the third world from the highly developed countries grows wider every year. There is no point in quoting figures and statistics; everyone is familiar with them.

86. Of course, political and ideological antagonisms justifiably give rise to concern for the maintenance of world peace. But the increasingly sharp division between over-developed and under-developed countries is infinitely more tragic, since, at the present rate, by the end of the century we shall have a world of six thousand million inhabitants, 80 per cent of them under-developed, underfed, even starving, and 20 per cent living in extraordinary affluence. Obviously, any peaceful coexistence between those two groups will be impossible.

87. For its part, Cambodia enjoys an enviable position; it is free from and will continue free from famine or poverty, and keeps progressing in excellent conditions. In addition, our Buddhist society has the wisdom not to aspire to material wealth beyond its reach. But as a third-world country, we must draw the attention of the United Nations to the heart-rending problems of under-development, for as our Head of State pointed out, "the peace of the world and the future of mankind depend on how those problems are solved".

88. We do not intend to propose any solutions, but merely to note that the development revolution has yet to come. That revolution will come with or in spite of the great developed Powers, which we must refer to as imperialists so long as they regard the third world as a source of wealth for themselves and for themselves alone, or so long as they isolate themselves within a selfish indifference. Those Powers must have the wisdom to realize that a world divided into rich always growing richer and poor always growing poorer is doomed to annihilation.

89. The failure of the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was due to political disputes and even more to the desire of the highly developed countries to evade the essential questions such as third-world industrialization, stabilization or re-evaluation of the prices of tropical produce, ocean freight rates, and so on. It is revealing, too, that on that occasion the great Powers confirmed the reduction in their assistance to developing countries.

90. Cambodia, which has chosen to help itself and rely on its own strength, has no illusions about so-called disinterested foreign assistance, and little belief in international solidarity for progress. It is content to emphasize the illogical and immoral character of the gigantic efforts expended by some on the conquest of outer space or the establishment of nuclear arsenals, while hundreds of millions of men lack the minimum required to sustain life or are suffering from endemic diseases that should be a thing of the past.

91. A general and complete disarmament would free vast resources for development. But that disarmament is further away than ever, despite the endless palaver and declarations of intent that no one believes.

92. Being fully alive to the facts of a world in which a very precarious peace is maintained only by the balance of the forces of destruction, the Cambodian delegation has submitted to this session a limited proposal [A/7183 and Add.1] the adoption of which would offer a gleam of hope for the future. It asks, briefly, that every country in the world should set aside for peace the amount of one day's expenditure on war or preparations for war. The funds thus released could be administered by the United Nations and devoted to emergency relief in countries suffering from the scourge of war, famine, epidemics, and so on. We earnestly hope that this modest proposal will attract the support of all delegations since that would show that the United Nations retains the hope of realizing the ideals it proclaims. In present circumstances, a gesture of international solidarity would have a special significance and would restore to the United Nations some of the confidence once reposed in it.

93. In conclusion, may I say that we welcome the election to the Presidency of the General Assembly of His Excellency Mr. Arenales. The Cambodian delegation extends to him its congratulations and expresses its best wishes for the success of the work of the present session.

94. Mr. UQBA (Southern Yemen):<sup>5</sup> Sir, I greet the President, Mr. Arenales, in the name of the people and the Government of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen, and congratulate him on his unanimous election to the office of President of the General Assembly at its twenty-third session. I wish him complete success in his work and hope that this session will allow him and the General Assembly to attain positive results for the benefit of mankind all over the world.

95. I greet also, with appreciation, his predecessor, His Excellency Corneliu Manescu, the President of the General Assembly at its twenty-second session which witnessed the establishment of our Republic and its accession to membership in the family of nations.

96. I wish also to express our appreciation and support for the sincere efforts which are being exerted by the Secretary-General in the cause of humanity, despite the challenges and difficulties that face him.

97. I take pleasure in welcoming, in the name of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen, the membership in the United Nations of the newly independent State of Swaziland, as well as the independence of Equatorial Guinea, following the termination of foreign rule in those two countries and the liberation of two parts of the heroic African continent. We wish them every progress and prosperity. We look forward, as a nation which itself achieved its independence less than a year ago, and after a long armed struggle, to the membership of other nations remaining under the yoke of colonialism and racist minority rule as they liberate their territories and assume an honourable place in the sun. For we believe that the world we live in will not enjoy peace, stability or progress as long as there are oppressed and exploited nations and colonialist and imperialist States which still hold absolute power over the destinies of nations and the fate of peoples.

98. I feel honoured in extending appreciation and gratitude, on behalf of the people and Government of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen, to all friendly Member States which welcomed us to the United Nations as a new Member and I pay special tribute to the President of the Republic of Chad for welcoming our membership in his speech delivered before the General Assembly on 7 October 1968 [1684th meeting].

99. I also feel pleased and honoured to be entrusted by my Government with the task of heading my country's delegation to the twenty-third session to participate in its work and for the first time to take part in the name of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen in the general debate of this Assembly. May I therefore, Mr. President, give a brief survey of conditions in the People's Republic of Southern Yemen since independence. I shall not speak of

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Uqba spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

the pre-independence period for I am confident that you are all aware of the various stages of the heroic struggle of our people, which culminated in the outbreak of armed popular revolution on 14 October 1963, under the leadership of the National Liberation Front.

100. The armed revolution came after our people had exhausted all peaceful ways and means in unsuccessful attempts to persuade the British colonialists to accede to the will of our people and to accept our right to self-determination and to the shaping of our own future. After a bitter struggle, during which the revolution spread out from the countryside until it swept the towns, our people achieved their great victory. They wrested their liberty, in whose cause thousands of martyrs were sacrificed, rid their land of the military and political vestiges of colonialism and liquidated the gigantic British military base in Aden, which had continuously threatened the independence and security of neighbouring Arab and African countries.

101. Our people also put an end to the reactionary puppet régimes of the Sultans, with which the British colonialists had worked with obstinate determination during the past ten years in order to bequeath them authority on departure. The British had intended to give the Territory a false independence which would guarantee the continuation of British influence and safeguard foreign economic and commercial interests in the country.

102. Our nation, small in population, rich in revolutionary spirit, firm in its belief in its legitimate right to a free and dignified life amongst the other countries of the world, realized its independence and established its Republic on 30 November 1967. At the beginning of last week, our nation celebrated the fifth anniversary of the 14th of October Revolution, for the first time as master of its own country and destiny, after having unified the country which had been torn and divided by the imperialists during their dark rule of 129 years, in which they sowed dissension, intensified ignorance and backwardness, spread deprivation and inflicted humiliation and indignity on our people.

103. The birth of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen coincided with rapidly deteriorating and tense international circumstances. It came at a time when the Arab nation was passing through one of the darkest phases of its long and eventful history, following the execution by Israel, the base of imperialism in the Middle East, of the criminal expansionist scheme which it had been planning over the past twenty years and in particular since its participation in the tripartite aggression on Suez in 1956.

104. Our country has been suffering from the consequences of that aggression since independence, and particularly from the grievous economic losses caused by the fact that our economy depends to a large extent on the international port of Aden. We received no aid to compensate us for those great losses. Despite this, the victory of the revolution of Southern Yemen should be a clear proof of the morale of the Arabs. It confirms their ability to defeat their oppressors, put an end to aggression, liberate their land and restore their dignity. The victory of our revolution came also as a ray of light dispersing part of the darkness

which had been clouding the horizon of humanity, proving to the world that the forces of good, freedom and peace cannot be suppressed, no matter how long the imperialist reactionary and racist shadows fall.

105. On their departure from our territory the British left us a heavy and onerous heritage—poor economic conditions, a tottering treasury, an excessively large and inefficient administrative structure in Aden as well as an administrative, cultural and health services vacuum in the countryside where the vast majority of the population of the Republic live.

106. The British colonialists left us a country divided into minute principalities, sultanates and sheikhdoms, with no means of communication except for a road or two, built for military purposes, and actually used in their drive to crush the revolution. They left an under-developed society, suffering from misery, deprivation, ignorance and disease. They left us no productive agricultural or industrial projects on which the economy of the independent republic could be based. We inherited an economy of which more than 80 per cent depended on services. It was only natural that such an artificial economy was adversely affected by the closure of the Suez Canal as a result of last year's Israeli aggression and the liquidation of the huge British military base and the services related to it. In addition, we inherited all the ill-effects of the destruction wrought by the British forces in urban and rural areas. During the four-year war of liberation they destroyed a number of villages in several areas including Radfan and Ihala where thousands of people were rendered homeless.

107. Britain aims at maintaining its old economic interests, while renouncing all its obligations and commitments declared before independence. It refuses to compensate the people of Southern Yemen for the aforementioned destruction and for its exploitation and exclusive utilization of the territory of the republic, its ports, air space and economic resources during its long period of occupation. Its refusal to pay compensation to our people, made during the last talks between its delegation and the Southern Yemen delegation, is aimed at stifling the free will of our people and toppling a progressive régime by precipitating the financial crisis which faces our people today. Thus Britain wrecked the financial talks of April and May of this year. The People's Republic of Southern Yemen still holds Britain responsible for the economic under-development and deprivation of our country. We do not accept Britain's argument that its declared prior commitment to pay 60 million pounds sterling over a period of three years after independence had been made only to the ousted puppet régime erected by Britain prior to independence. We maintain that Britain's responsibility and commitments are to the people of the territory. The people should be at least partially compensated for all that Britain has long inflicted upon that country, so as to enable the present Government to tackle the extremely difficult economic and financial situation brought about by Britain's financial and economic policy during the time of occupation—a situation which has been further aggravated by the reduction of local financial resources and by the increasing expenditures of the newly independent State. We therefore continue to demand that Britain should honour its obligations and respect its commitments to our people.

108. The historical phase through which the Southern Yemen revolution is passing places before the Government the following tasks:

(1) Defending and consolidating the revolution and the present progressive régime and their achievements;

(2) Maintaining political and military independence and achieving economic independence. Although we achieved political and military freedom by ending foreign rule, we are still in the process of ending the present dependent state of our economy, which is a remnant of economic colonialism;

(3) Crystallizing the true content of the revolution by making real and safeguarding the interests of the masses, to whom the revolution belongs;

(4) Building the country and achieving progress for our people, who have for too long suffered from misery and deprivation. This is to be done through the execution of the plans, projects and tasks in all fields laid down in the Ministerial Programme issued by the Government four months ago.

109. The popular revolution which, under the leadership of the National Front, had achieved complete political and military independence and established a revolutionary and progressive régime, will forge ahead to accomplish the aims of the people. It will continue its struggle by carrying arms in defence of the revolution and its achievements while further liquidating the evil vestiges of the previous dark régime, and will build an independent national economy.

110. Colonialism, world imperialism and reaction, which were defeated by our people during the fight for freedom, have not accepted defeat. They are resorting to conspiracies and drawing up plans and adopting new methods in order to bring about a new confrontation with the people and against the territory of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen. They are even forming a new alliance of anti-revolutionary elements with the object of toppling the revolutionary régime by the following means: First, infiltration of counter-revolutionary elements from outside the Republic, in complicity with the old feudal rulers and ex-puppet ministers and reactionaries, backed by colonialism and world imperialism, motivated by their vested interests, to organize acts of subversion inside the Republic; secondly, endeavouring to implement the policy of engulfing the revolution by undermining the solidarity of the revolution and by accentuating minor divisions of opinion to the extreme, the object being to cause marginal conflicts within the revolution to divert its attention from facing the fundamental contradictions and the real enemies; hence to enable the reactionary and opportunistic elements to seize power and ally themselves with neo-colonialism; thirdly, by exerting economic pressures to prevent the revolutionary régime from acquiring real control of the national economy, freeing it from foreign domination and enabling it to enhance the welfare of the people.

111. The people, its political organization and Government of the Republic have been subjected to the above-mentioned neo-colonialist manoeuvres, old and new, since the first day of independence. Three months ago, our

Republic was the target of an armed attempt, financed by imperialist and reactionary forces, to restore the pre-independence state of affairs. That attempt, however, was thwarted by our people and it was not allowed to be intensified or to exhaust our limited resources, which the enemies of the people do not want us to utilize for the welfare of our people.

112. I should like at this juncture to point to an ominous phenomenon of which the United Nations and, in particular, the peace-loving and progressive countries, should take careful note and towards which they should adopt a positive stand. This phenomenon is a natural result of the prevailing international situation and, more specifically in our area, the outcome of the unjust state of affairs in the Middle East, resulting from the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries. What has taken place and is still taking place in the Arab world is not simply a victory achieved by world imperialism and its base of aggression, Israel; it also achieved favorable and suitable conditions for the reactionary forces in the area, as well as in other parts of the world, to move from defensive to offensive positions against the progressive régimes. This, no doubt, presents a threat against the forces of progress and peace in the entire world. The United Nations and its peace-loving and progressive Members should take firm positions to support the progressive régimes in the Arab world and elsewhere in Asia, Africa and Latin America against this imperialistic and reactionary move. If that is not done, the next few months will witness a further deterioration in conditions which will endanger the peace and security of the world.

113. Despite the difficult conditions through which our Republic is now passing and the conspiracies it faces, we believe that our people are capable of withstanding all challenges in a revolutionary spirit. It will overcome the present crisis with courage, relying on itself, its capabilities and resources, as well as on unconditional aid from friendly countries and the United Nations.

114. The policy of my Government with regard to foreign affairs can be summarized as follows:

(1) Adherence to the United Nations Charter and to international laws and conventions;

(2) Establishment of our relations with those countries with which we exchange diplomatic recognition and relations in accordance with the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, non-aggression, equality and mutual interest, and peaceful coexistence, as embodied in United Nations resolutions. And pursuant to these principles we harbor no ill-will, nor do we intend to cause any harm to anybody, and we expect to be treated likewise. We are not prepared to accept any attempts from any quarter infringing on our freedom and sovereignty;

(3) Adoption of the policy of non-alignment. We wish to emphasize at the same time, however, that we necessarily align ourselves with the forces of freedom against imperialism and colonialism;

(4) Support at all levels of liberation movements by nations struggling to rid themselves of the yoke of

imperialism. We reject the policy of aggression and the application and expansion of spheres of influence being adopted by imperialist and colonialist forces;

(5) Opposition to the policy of racial discrimination everywhere in the world, and to the racist minority rule being practised against some African nations;

(6) Strengthening and prompting of positive relations with progressive and socialist countries and countries of the third world in all fields of common interest.

115. In the light of the broad lines of my Government's foreign policy which I have described, I should like to deal with the major problems in the world and give my country's point of view on matters that threaten the security and peace of the world and of humanity, and that turn our world community into a battleground torn by suspicion and swept by the lust of the world's expansionist-imperialists. The non-progressive and non-peace-loving countries endeavour to cast our world community into a sea of intensive conflicts which, in the main, adversely affect the small nations striving to achieve self-sufficiency, justice and progress for their peoples, whose interests are usually jeopardized in such an extremely tense environment and the ever-impending risks of war that prevail in many regions of the world.

116. It is regrettable and painful indeed that the Middle East crisis created by Israeli aggression against three Arab countries, Members of the United Nations, more than sixteen months ago remains without any successful action by the United Nations to end the Israeli occupation of the west bank of the Jordan and Arab Jerusalem; Gaza and Sinai of the United Arab Republic; and the Golan Heights of the Syrian Arab Republic. What is more serious and bitter is that, despite the dangerous and precarious existing situation, the General Assembly and the Security Council are still unable to solve the problem of the people of Palestine whose land the Zionist Israeli forces occupy and who were expelled from their homes more than twenty years ago.

117. It is indeed ironical that Israel, the aggressor backed by international imperialism headed by the United States of America and World Zionism, brags about peace when it has expelled hundreds of thousands of the Palestinian Arabs and continues to this day to carry out acts of murder against the Arabs of occupied Palestine and the occupied Arab territories. It destroys village after village, expelling their inhabitants to the east bank of the Jordan, or what has remained of Jordan, before the eyes and ears of the world. Israel, the aggressor, challenges international public opinion and tramples on the resolutions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the world Organization and continues in its expansionist policy of annexing Arab territories which it occupied in its aggressive war of June 1967. Their representative comes, time and again, to stand before the representatives of the people of the world to cry for peace and to proclaim the desire of Israel to establish peace. At the same time, it continues in all its actions to destroy every international effort to achieve peace, and persists in putting obstacles in the way of Ambassador Jarring, whose sincere efforts and rare devotion deserve our appreciation.

118. It is no longer a secret that up to this moment Israel refuses to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967), and what was stated by its Foreign Minister proves this without the shadow of a doubt. For Israel, as stated by its Foreign Minister, accepts the call of the Security Council for promoting agreement to establish peace, but accords that resolution its own special interpretation which nullifies the basis of the resolution. And no doubt Members have noticed the Israeli Minister mentioned the word peace more than seventy times, while his speech did not once mention the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories which formed the cornerstone of the Security Council resolution.

119. I do not think I need go into the details of the barbaric deeds practised by Israel against the Palestinian people and the Arabs in the occupied lands of the three Arab countries, for to my knowledge the Assembly is fully aware of it and of the extent of the Israeli expansionist policy which constitutes a threat to the security and peace of the Middle East and of the whole world. I shall therefore only point out fundamental points of extreme danger which we must all realize and must not allow any outside influences to cause us to ignore.

120. The tragedy of Palestine, more than twenty years ago, imposed upon the Arab world a foreign and alien presence which came into being as a result of the concerted efforts of certain world Powers as well as a combination of outside political factors not related in any way to the Middle East. The Palestine calamity struck at a time when the Arab countries were under the foreign domination of Western colonial Powers. The establishment of Israel in the Arab world came about as a result of a criminal war of annihilation against the Arab population of Palestine and the expulsion of about 2 million Palestinian Arabs from their homeland. That was done to honour a promise made by a British politician early in the century to cut out and give part of the Arab lands as a present to the Jews. Since then the Middle East has been living under threats from Israel to the security and stability of its peoples. Israel had been created as a base of aggression against the Arab peoples, who began after the last World War to end the nightmare of foreign occupation and to develop their countries so as to enable their people to catch up with the march of progress and civilization which the Arabs had once led but in recent centuries lagged behind. The Arab countries have been compelled to set aside huge portions of their budgets, which they can ill afford, to defend themselves against Israeli aggression and the expansion which the very nature of the existence of Israel makes inevitable. As a consequence, their efforts to achieve prosperity and progress have been hampered.

121. The June aggression of last year was not the first Israeli aggression against the Arab nation, but it was the worst since the usurpation of Arab Palestine. Israel's acts of aggression have continued throughout the past twenty years and a notable example was its participation in the aggression against Suez in 1956. It has become evident to anyone who seeks the truth and upholds justice that the Arab countries from the forties until the present have been the victims of aggression and that it is their territories which have been subjected to occupation.

122. The failure of the world Organization to impose its resolutions, which reflect international will on Israel since 1948 casts dark shadows on the future of this world Organization. The Arab peoples had and still have great confidence in the United Nations, not the least demonstration of which is the fact that the Palestinian people, who have suffered misery, humiliation and deprivation in the refugee camps for over twenty years, still look to the world Organization—which took part in the creation of Israel—for help to regain their usurped rights, especially their legitimate right of return to their homeland. The Palestinians do not wish a continuation of their present condition, which constitutes an outrageous violation of human rights and an unmitigated disgrace to humanity. The Palestinian people want to return to their usurped homeland and to achieve this they have every right to use whatever means they deem fit. The Palestinian resistance movement against Israeli imperialism must go on and must grow to become a nation-wide war of liberation aiming at the restoration of the rights to their legitimate owners. All peoples of the world who love peace, freedom and progress should regard the struggle of the Palestinian people in the same way as they view all other honourable liberation movements in the entire world. They should accord it support and help. And the United Nations should support it, as it supports other national liberation movements.

123. As we attempt to deal with the dangerous situation created by the continued occupation by Israel of the Arab territories after its war of aggression in June last year, we must not forget that the basic issue is that of the Palestinian people, most of whom have now become refugees. Any settlement or other measure which offers only a partial solution and ignores the question of the Palestinian people cannot achieve permanent peace and security in the Middle East. And I want to stress here that any solution to the Palestinian problem must be determined by the Palestinian people alone. No other party has that right.

124. The Security Council resolution 242 (1967) cannot be regarded as the proper formula guaranteeing the restoration of Arab Palestinian rights, which have been usurped since 1948. At best it constitutes the very minimum of what the world Organization should undertake to rebuff the Israeli aggression. Despite these considerations the resolution has been accepted by the Arab countries concerned because of their belief in peace. In spite of all these facts Israel still refuses to comply and displays, time and again, its evil intentions to keep the present explosive situation in the Middle East unchanged, taking no heed of the consequences of its arrogant and extremely dangerous policy.

125. The Government of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen, like all other peace-loving, free and progressive countries, denounces and condemns Israel's continued aggression and its insistence on reaping the fruits of aggression at the expense of the Palestinian peoples and the peoples of the three Arab countries, parts of whose lands it continues to occupy. I believe that this session offers the United Nations an opportunity which may not occur again, to preserve the principles of the Charter which we uphold, but which are trampled upon by some countries, including Israel as well as the big Powers which stand behind Israel.

126. We consider that the absolute and unequivocal support, including financial and military assistance, given Israel by the United States constitutes a hostile policy against our peoples, who struggle to preserve their freedom and sovereignty over their territories. There can be no more obvious proof of the deliberate obstruction and frustration of the work of the world Organization, and the work of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Middle East, than the impossible situations which the United States constantly creates. The most recent example is its intention to supply Phantom jet fighters to Israel to use in destroying peaceful Arab towns and villages and to help her persist in her defiance of international public opinion and in trampling underfoot the principles which we all uphold and safeguard as members in this international Organization.

127. This last American action can only be interpreted as encouragement and incitement to further aggression. Despite these circumstances, the Secretary of State of the United States spoke before this Assembly of the great misery and tragedy which the Middle East has suffered in this generation, and announced his country's desire to establish peace in the Middle East. Yet we know, as does the whole world, that without the support of the United States and that of certain other countries, together with world Zionism, Israel would not have dared launch the 5th of June war of aggression, nor would it have risked the continuation of aggression. What is more, Israel would not have continued its preparations for further onslaughts to conquer and occupy additional Arab territory with which to create a Zionist, racist empire as the counterpart in the Middle East of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia in Africa.

128. One of the tragedies which continues to beset our generation is the subjection of the destinies and national interests of smaller nations to those of the larger ones, and in some cases the fate of smaller nations has to await the outcome of purely domestic matters pertaining to a great Power. As an example I refer to the views currently expressed in some diplomatic circles at the United Nations to the effect that all efforts to establish peace in the Middle East cannot achieve any positive results until after the American elections, notwithstanding the fact that the results of the elections will not change the substance of American foreign policy so long as Zionist economic interests and influence continue to affect America's economic and political institutions. One sometimes wonders whether the solution to international problems should be sought at the United Nations or in the State Department. I would not be overstating the facts if I say that the United Nations is facing in this session, more so than at any time in the past, a test of its viability and ability to play the role for which it was created. The question for the United Nations is very clear by now, namely, "to be or not to be". The kind of being I envisage for the United Nations is not a mere nominal existence, devoid of any substance and effectiveness, which benefits only some States intent on exploiting the existing worsening international situation and wishing to see the United Nations weak. Rather, I would like it to be the positive, creative and noble institution that the peoples of our planet would want it to be.

129. The current session provides another historic opportunity for all members of the world community to resist economic and political pressures exercised by some of the great Powers, which are aimed at frustrating the United Nations from carrying out its noble objectives. We should all work together, inspired by the spirit of international co-operation to strengthen the United Nations, not on the bases desired by non-peace-loving countries that oppose freedom and progress, but on the new bases dictated by the fundamental changes in the structure, composition and functions of the United Nations that have been taking place since its inception.

130. To conclude my statement about the crises of humanity in the Middle East, I should like to summarize the position of my Government with regard to this vital matter. The People's Republic of Southern Yemen:

(1) Affirms the position of its sister Arab States in their demand and insistence on the immediate withdrawal, complete and unconditional, of the Israeli forces from all the territories under its occupation. Not one inch of Arab territory should remain occupied;

(2) Considers illegal any administrative or other measures taken or that might be taken by Israel with regard to Arab Jerusalem or any other occupied Arab territories;

(3) Reaffirms the indisputable and inalienable right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homeland, as has been repeatedly confirmed by the United Nations during the last twenty years;

(4) Condemns all aggressive acts committed and still being committed by Israel against the Arab States and in particular the repeated, barbaric raids against Jordan;

(5) Condemns all aggressive acts being conducted by Israeli authorities in Gaza and Sinai in the United Arab Republic, the western bank in Jordan and the Golan Heights of Syria. We uphold the right of the Palestinian peoples to resist the Israeli aggression and occupation, and to restore their usurped homeland;

(6) Condemns all Israeli measures to expel the Arab peoples from their homeland;

(7) Rejects Israel's demand for direct negotiations and adheres to the principles of the Arab Summit Conference held at Khartoum from 29 August to 1 September 1967.

131. Also, in case Israel refuses to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories or in the event of new acts of aggression, the whole Arab nation, peoples and governments, would, in the view of my Government, confront the aggressor not only with a regular war but also by a popular war of liberation to restore the usurped Arab rights and territories.

132. And if Israel persistently refuses the implementation of the Security Council resolution 242 of 22 November 1967, the Security Council should then take more effective measures to implement this resolution and other United Nations resolutions dealing with Palestine and the Middle East.

133. I should now like to state the position of my Government on another serious problem, which has pre-occupied our world for many years. I am referring to the criminal war in Viet-Nam waged by the United States of America against the Democratic People's Republic of Viet-Nam. It is causing the extermination of the heroic Viet-Nameese people and the destruction of their crops and all that their people have built in their country. It has led to the perpetration of the worst kinds of crimes against humanity. All that is held sacred by the human soul has been trampled underfoot. Yet, it seems rather strange that this ugly and tragic war should receive no attention from the United Nations.

134. We condemn this aggressive war that is being waged by the strongest Power on earth, using hundreds of thousands of soldiers and the most deadly weapons in an attempt to crush the will of a small nation. The United States is also trying to impose internal changes in Viet-Nam by force under the very eyes of world public opinion. My Government demands that this aggressive war be terminated immediately and that the Viet-Nameese people be left alone to decide their own destiny and future. The heroic Viet-Nameese people, having proved their ability to resist aggression and work for the final victory, are best qualified to determine their own future.

135. We call also for the immediate cessation of the bombing of North Viet-Nam. This policy has proved its failure to undermine the will of the people. The billions of dollars that are being squandered on mass destruction could be better spent for the good of humanity, to provide food for the millions who are suffering from hunger and starvation, and to provide a dignified life for all. I declare here my Government's support for the heroic struggle of the Viet-Nameese people against American colonialism and intervention. My country associates itself with all those who believe that an end must be put immediately to this mass massacre.

136. This position of my Government is in line with its declared policy of support for all wars of liberation by peoples struggling against imperialism and neo-colonialism. We are only a small nation that has struggled for and suffered great sacrifices in life and property to realize this cause. We have suffered from foreign domination and experienced all its evils. Therefore, we cannot but give our wholehearted support to all peoples struggling to liberate their lands from colonialism, both old and new. Hence it is only natural that we should support the struggle of the Palestinian people to regain their usurped homeland. We also support the struggle of the peoples of Oman and Dhofar to put an end to the last vestiges of imperialism in the Arab homeland. We consider the continued presence of British forces of occupation on our eastern border in Muscat and Oman as a direct threat to our security and to the stability of the region.

137. We also support the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to rid themselves of foreign rule and to liquidate foreign military bases everywhere. As in previous sessions, the United Nations should continue to take positive steps towards decolonization and ensuring the right of self-determination to all peoples whose destinies are still in the hands of foreign Powers. In the second half of

the twentieth century no country should have such powers over any other country or be allowed to continue to subjugate other peoples. It is in the interest of the imperialist Powers themselves to realize before it is too late that force is no longer effective in the face of the determination of the people to achieve their just hopes and aspirations.

138. We also support the heroic Korean people and its right to the freedom and unity of its territory. All foreign troops in South Korea, serving under the disguise of the United Nations flag, should be withdrawn to enable the Korean people to exercise self-determination and achieve unity by their own free will and in complete freedom from any foreign interference and influence.

139. The anachronistic Portuguese imperialism in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) should come to an end. It is indeed an abnormal phenomenon that such a weak and small nation as Portugal should continue in revolutionary Africa to hold an empire that is out of all proportion to its size and resources. In this connexion we strongly deplore the support given by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to Portugal. We also condemn the South African racist minority rule in Namibia, or South West Africa, as it used to be called. Eighty resolutions have been passed by the United Nations since the question of the future status of South West Africa was first raised in 1946 [65 (I)]. We call for the implementation of those resolutions, in particular General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) of 1966 and 1967 respectively. The General Assembly should recommend that the Security Council immediately take effective measures to enable Namibia to achieve its independence. We regard the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa after June of this year as an act of aggression that constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

140. Among the worst evils of the decades of imperialism have been the establishment of racist minorities on the African continent as well as in the Middle East as represented by the case of Israel. I have just made it clear that the Government of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen opposes the policy of racial discrimination in all parts of the world, including that practised by the racist minority régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Therefore we strongly condemn the policy of *apartheid* practised by South Africa against the predominant African population. We also oppose and condemn the creation of separate tribal reservations, the so-called bantustans, for African and coloured peoples. We believe that the continued membership of South Africa in the United Nations gives a bad name to our Organization. We hereby warn this racist clique, whose actions discredit the human race, to desist from their foolish policies before the African giant loses patience and removes from his continent all trace of those who believe in racial segregation, which stands condemned by humanity as a governmental policy to oppress the rightful owners of the land.

141. In Southern Rhodesia—Zimbabwe as it should be called—the illegal Smith racist régime has been defying the Charter of the United Nations for almost three years. The Zimbabwe leaders are thrown into prisons, nationalists are murdered and a white settler minority forcibly imposes its

rule over the brave Zimbabwe people. Britain must realize that it continues to be responsible for the people of Zimbabwe. Although the policy of economic sanctions against the Smith régime has failed to make the slightest change in the situation, Britain, which is still the legal authority in Southern Rhodesia, refuses to use force to ensure respect for the basic human rights of the majority of the population of Zimbabwe.

142. There is no justification whatsoever for the continued subjugation of the rights and interests of the majority to those of the minority. We feel that the use of force by Britain to terminate the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia, if accompanied by the necessary practical steps, would prevent the massacres that are bound to occur if the present situation continues. It is true that such a circumstance would cause tremendous losses in life and property among the Africans but it would inevitably mean the end of the racist minority régime. Britain must live up to its moral responsibility. It should stop courting the illegal Salisbury régime. The situation may explode at any moment if it is left without a speedy and drastic solution. We do not want to see in Southern Rhodesia a repetition of the Palestine tragedy. Twenty years ago Britain abandoned its responsibilities in Palestine and allowed the Zionist-racist régime to secure its hold on an Arab land, to usurp that land and expel its people without any right or justice. Any solution that would not give Zimbabwe to its true African people would result in bloodshed in all of Central Africa. The imperialist countries should stop collaborating with the racist régimes in Africa and should not oppose the gallant African will, which should be supreme in its continent.

143. Allow me now to speak about a subject which has been discussed repeatedly for the past twenty years; one in which the United Nations has incapacitated itself by not permitting the People's Republic of China to secure its status and privileges in the Security Council and be on an equal footing with the other permanent Powers. It has been the honour of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen to sponsor, along with other progressive and peace-loving countries, a draft resolution<sup>6</sup> calling for the membership of the People's Republic of China. The family of nations will not be complete without the membership and active participation of the People's Republic of China in the affairs of the world community. We, for our part, have opened diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. Once again the United States will try to deprive the United Nations of the membership of the People's Republic of China by exercising its diplomatic and economic influence upon some of the Members of this Organization. This session gives another opportunity to the Members of the United Nations to free themselves from any foreign pressures by voting of their own free will. Then one could sincerely believe the often repeated statement from this rostrum that the United Nations is the reflection of the will of its Members.

144. Among the items under discussion at the last session, which were on the whole frustrating, one could say that partial success was achieved with regard to the non-proliferation Treaty. This Treaty should be a sincere step in the

<sup>6</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/L.549.

direction of world peace and human security against the dangers of nuclear weapons. The People's Republic of Southern Yemen has voted in favour of this Treaty along with the overwhelming majority in the United Nations. We voted in favour of the Treaty in spite of the fact that the security measures mentioned in the articles of the Treaty and in the subsequent Security Council resolution were inadequate. It is the opinion of my Government that the nuclear Powers should renounce the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States which have renounced their acquisition or production and have prohibited nuclear weapons in their territory. It is but fair that the nuclear Powers should reciprocate. The nuclear Powers should also renounce the use of nuclear weapons against each other. Serious discussions concerning the cessation of the arms race and total nuclear disarmament should soon be conducted. The non-nuclear-weapon States should not be deprived of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In order to reduce the gulf between the developed and developing nations, the latter nations must have every access to all technical developments with regard to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, without any discrimination and at minimum costs. My Government hopes that the final document [A/7277] of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States that took place in Geneva from 29 August to 28 September 1968 is worth considering at the present session of the General Assembly.

145. Undoubtedly, the United Nations and its specialized agencies could play a larger role in the social, cultural and economic fields leading to the betterment of the developing countries and this world of ours. With regard to this point, I would like to mention that the United Nations and its agencies should offer help to those countries that need it most and not those that are better off. Administrative and other essential elements concerning projects should be simplified and limited to the absolute minimum requirements. The aim to obtain complete and thorough research studies should not be the paramount goal, as much as to help the recently independent and small nations.

146. Many of the Member States have declared that the first United Nations Development Decade was not as successful as it was hoped to be. The experience gained from it, however, should be utilized to improve the effectiveness of the second development decade. In the first place, the prices of raw materials produced in the developing countries have remained steady during the first Development Decade, and in some cases have even fallen. On the other hand, the prices of manufactured products have increased, in some cases almost five times, during the same period. This, evidently, will serve the interests of the technologically advanced countries at the expense of the developing countries. This anomaly must be changed in the second development decade by taking into greater consideration the interests of the developing countries. Secondly, the advanced countries must show their sincerity in participating in the development of the emerging countries by relaxing their strict tariff and custom policies on imports from developing countries. Thirdly, the industrialized countries should try to reach the objective of contributing one per cent of their gross national product into a development fund to expedite development in the emerging countries. It should be realized by all that the small percentage

mentioned is an obligation on the part of the industrialized countries rather than a gift. The sincere contributions offered by Sweden are worthy of our respect and should be an example to others.

147. As the industrialized countries are making their own economic cartels to further their economic interests, more assistance to developing countries should also be offered. The developing nations should increase their co-operation and co-ordination and establish strong ties based on the varied interests among themselves. They should also impose and follow a sound, well-studied system of economic planning in order to obtain the best results for their efforts.

148. This year, the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, has been designated by the General Assembly as the International Year for Human Rights. We celebrate this occasion and also the historic Teheran Conference held from 22 April to 13 May 1968 which was the culmination of efforts, against all forms of racial discrimination, to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions relating to occupied territories in case of war. After having considered, earlier in my statement, the problems confronting our world today, one may conclude that there is still a long way ahead before we reach the fulfilment of human rights. Hence, we consider it the duty of all Member States to be more concerned and to make more sincere efforts to achieve this noble objective and avoid what would otherwise disgrace humanity.

149. In the light of the Teheran Conference resolutions, it deserves to be noted here that Israel has refused the recommendation to accept a representative of the Secretary-General to investigate the racial discrimination against the Arab peoples in the territories under occupation after the aggression by Israel on 5 June 1967. These Arabs are now tortured and humiliated by the occupying Israeli forces. Once again, Israel gives further evidence of disrespect for and disregard of fundamental human rights.

150. In conclusion, in spite of the limited success of the United Nations in peace-making, and its failure to adhere to the true principles of the Charter for the last twenty-two years, the United Nations still remains the last hope of millions all round the world. All Member States must respect the principles of the Charter, strictly adhere to them and determine to make this world Organization a reflection of peace and brotherhood. Then, and only then, could we hope to banish disease, hunger, ignorance and war from our planet. Succeeding generations could live in peace and prosperity, and look back on us with respect and admiration for our courageous efforts and noble purpose to achieve peace and prosperity, not for a single country but for humanity at large.

151. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Afghanistan, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

152. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan): On 16 October the representative of Pakistan, for the fourth time in the course of this general debate, spoke on the problem of Pakhtunistan, and my delegation stated that we would set the record straight on facts and points that had been distorted by him.

153. First, I should like to refer to certain remarks at the beginning of the statement of the representative of Pakistan. He said that the position taken by my delegation “implies a challenge to the territorial integrity of Pakistan” [1698th meeting, para. 196]. Afghanistan respects the territorial integrity of all countries, including that of Pakistan. The support of Afghanistan for the legitimate established right of the people of Pakhtunistan should not be and can not be considered a challenge to the territorial integrity of Pakistan.

154. Pakhtunistan has never been accepted by its people, and therefore by Afghanistan, as an integral part of Pakistan. Nothing in any circumstances can change that fact. Only the will of the people of Pakhtunistan can determine their fate, through their exercise of the right to self-determination, without any outside influence or interference.

155. On 30 September 1947, on the occasion of Pakistan’s admission to the United Nations, the chairman of the delegation of Afghanistan at that time stated the following:

“Afghanistan heartily shares in the rejoicing of the peoples of Pakistan in their freedom. We have profound respect for Pakistan. May Pakistan prosper.” [92nd meeting, p. 313.]

He added:

“The Afghanistan delegation does not wish to oppose the membership of Pakistan in this great Organization, but it is with the deepest regret that we are unable at this time to vote for Pakistan. This unhappy circumstance is due to the fact that we cannot recognize the North-West Frontier as part of Pakistan so long as the people of the North-West Frontier have not been given an opportunity, free from any kind of influence—and I repeat, free from any kind of influence—to determine for themselves whether they wish to be independent or to become a part of Pakistan.” [Ibid., pp. 313 and 314.]

156. I quoted that only to show that the problem of Pakhtunistan is not a new issue before the General Assembly and therefore the representative of Pakistan was not right in saying that this problem “has no place in this Assembly”.

157. So much for the remarks in the opening paragraph of his statement. In the paragraph following that, the representative of Pakistan said that the representative of Afghanistan “relied mainly on the name and utterances of a single individual”. He is right; we did so. We did so for the reason that the representative of Pakistan brought up the name of that leader of Pakhtunistan in his second statement of reply, whom he refers to in his last statement as a “single individual”, intentionally avoiding his name for reasons of his own.

158. The second and the third paragraphs in that statement are references to the same individual, Khan Abdul Ghafar Khan. I, as representative of Afghanistan, am not here to defend the Khan. He has his own means of doing so. I am sure he will. Perhaps he has already done so. But I want to state clearly that the representative of Pakistan is absolutely wrong in saying that I sought to rest my case on him. Since that statement calls for it, I shall offer a few

quotations now. In doing so I shall not quote, at this stage, from any sources in Afghanistan or, as the representative of Pakistan did, from India.

159. Before doing so, I would point out that it should not be ignored that the problem of Pakhtunistan came into existence with the advent of British colonialism in central Asia. It is not a new issue. It existed before the inception of Pakistan. It was then a dispute between the Afghans and the British from the time when the territories outside Afghanistan inhabited by Pakhtuns were severed from it by military force.

160. W. R. H. Merck describes the situation in the *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, June 1911:

“Only 13,000 square miles, however, are under British Law and administration, and 25,000 square miles are occupied by political control but maintain their internal and municipal independence . . . the remainder of the space as far as the Durand Line . . . separating the British and Afghan spheres of influence is occupied by the Independent Tribes.”

161. Sir William Barton, in his book on the North-West Frontier, where he lived for two decades, throws more light on this point:

“ . . . there can be no doubt that the Pathan of the administered areas is not prepared to throw in his lot with India except on terms that would preserve the identity of his people as a nation apart from the people of India.”<sup>7</sup>

162. In another place, Sir William Barton adds:

“Tribal territory . . . or the country of the independent tribes, as it is often termed, between the British administrative border and the Durand line, is in political theory a British Protectorate. It has not been annexed; the tribes have not accepted our rule.”<sup>8</sup>

163. Lord Reading, Viceroy of India, admits another fact:

“The North-West Frontier is a very special province. You cannot apply general laws as you would to other provinces.”

164. The French writer, Alfred Foucher, states the following:

“What complicates the question is the fact that there is not one but two frontiers. The first, and the real one, marks the limit of British jurisdiction and stops on the outskirts of Hazara, Peshawar, Kohat; the other, a purely theoretical one to the north, is none other than the line agreed upon the Anglo-Russian Pamir Commission, and the line imposed by Sir Mortimer Durand on the Amir of Afghanistan.”

165. Now let me say a few words about the situation on the eve of the inception of Pakistan. I will quote from Caspani, an Italian scholar and author. He has also lived for many years in that part of the world and was present at that time. He writes:

<sup>7</sup> Sir William Barton, *India's North-West Frontier* (London, J. Murray, 1939), p. 13.

<sup>8</sup> Op.cit., p. 19.

“When in 1947 the English favoured the partition of British India into a Pakistan and an India, a strong movement was formed among the Pathans against their inclusion in Pakistan and in favour of the formation of a State of their own, Pakhtunistan . . . England remained firm for division into the States only . . .”<sup>9</sup>

He is referring to India and Pakistan. He goes on:

“Agitation was on the increase and in 1949 the tribal jirgahs—the jirgahs are the assemblies—declared that their goal was to establish a Pakhtun State as soon as possible. Afghanistan . . . racially and historically bound with the Pakhtuns . . . supported their rights.”<sup>10</sup>

166. Now I shall quote a British diplomat, author and historian, Sir Kerr Fraser-Tytler:

“The British did not solve the problem of the tribes, and when in August 1947 they handed over the control of India’s North-Western defences to the untried Government of Pakistan, they handed over likewise a fluid, difficult situation, fraught with much danger . . .”<sup>11</sup>

167. *Current History* of June 1950 records the following:

“ . . . despite the apparent one-sidedness of the voting . . . the Afghans pointed out that the plebiscite offered the alternatives of union with either a Hindu or a Moslem country . . . and that the voting had been held in the settled . . . districts . . .

“ . . .  
“ . . . A meeting was held at Tirah Bagh, the summer homeland of the powerful Afridi Pathans. Here, representatives of the seven Afridi subtribes gathered, and, after deliberation, announced the creation of a new and independent nation, Pushtoonistan, the land of the Pushtoons . . . A flag was also adopted. . . .”<sup>12</sup>

168. Arnold Fletcher, of the University of California, an American historian, who also has lived in that area, states the following:

“Plans for a plebiscite contain no mention of Afghan”—and he puts the word “Pathan” between brackets—“interest but offered a choice of union with India or with Pakistan. The Afghan Government protested twice in July 1947 but received no satisfaction.”

169. The representative of Pakistan said he was saddened that we had said that the Pakhtuns had nothing in common with the people of Pakistan except religion. Since I have to state the facts, I am afraid I cannot make him happy. I reiterate this statement and here I should like to begin by quoting from the memoranda of Clan Chiefs to the Royal Statutory Commission of British India. These are the Chiefs of Clans and they report to a British Commission:

“The contiguity of the Province with independent territory and Afghanistan, the intercourse between the

people on both sides of the borderline, the similarity of their ideas, customs and mode of life, and especially their descent from the common stock, strongly distinguish the people of our province from those of the rest of India.”

170. Sir William Barton on this point says:

“The British failed to realize that the Afghan borderland had no affinities with India. . . . From every point of view, ethnic, linguistic, geographical as well as in traditions and history, it differs widely. . . .”

171. The representative of Pakistan said:

“It is nothing short of tragic that he”—meaning the representative of Afghanistan—“should have turned his back on both history and geography. . . .” [*1698th meeting, para. 200.*]

172. I could not afford to turn my back on history and geography even if I had to. With the background of his nation, it is inconceivable for any Afghan to turn his back on history. It is interesting to hear the representative of Pakistan permit himself the boldness of making such an irresponsible statement. I hope the representative of Pakistan will realize that Pakistan is not in such a happy position geographically. He referred to certain invaders, against all of whom Afghanistan has fought. But I should like to correct what he said: “. . . and out of this historical process have emerged the Pakhtuns as well as the other people of Pakistan” [*ibid.*]. I will not make any reference to the people of Pakistan even in a historical context—that is their business—but in connexion with the Pakhtuns that statement is absolutely absurd. The Pakhtuns are the original inhabitants of Ariana, the historical name for Afghanistan, described by the father of historians, Herodotus, as “warlike Aryan people inhabiting valleys west of the Indus”. Their land being Pakhtia has been mentioned in the great and ancient document, the Avesta. Geographically speaking, the river Indus, the natural and historical frontier of the Indian sub-continent in central Asia, that is to say, Afghanistan, is geographically referred to as “the heart of Asia”. It is from the word “Indus” that the name “India” is derived—a historical and geographical fact. So much for the reference to history and geography at this stage—although of course much more could be said.

173. The representative of Pakistan said:

“If the representatives of Afghanistan deny the common roots and the unifying bonds of the people of Pakistan, they also deny the nexus that holds the people of Afghanistan itself together.” [*ibid.*]

174. Afghanistan is a multiracial country united in a nationhood based on its total essential concepts, under the single name “Afghan”. The words “Pakhtun” and “Afghan” are synonymous, as anyone with the least knowledge of anything in that part of the world knows as an undeniable fact. If there could be anything to compare the two countries from this point of view or any conviction in these principles, the creation of Pakistan would not have been based solely on religious consideration. Hundreds of millions of Moslems share with each other the religion of Islam all over the world, but none of them have based their nationhood solely on religious considerations.

<sup>9</sup> E. Caspani and E. Cagnacci, *Afghanistan, Crocevia del l'Asia* (Milan, Antonio Vallardi, 1951), p. 148.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> W. K. Fraser-Tytler, *Afghanistan* (London, Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 270.

<sup>12</sup> Arnold Fletcher, “Afghanistan: Highway of Conquest”, *Current History* (Philadelphia, vol. 18, No. 106, June 1950), pp. 338 and 339.

175. In the paragraph following that paragraph in his statement, the representative of Pakistan paid tribute to the Pakhtun people by saying: "... let us not forget some basic facts about the valiant Pakhtun people, who have refused to bend the knee to any world conqueror" [1698th meeting, para. 201]. It is good to remember this and it is good to call it a basic fact.

176. The representative of Pakistan, in the same paragraph, referred to the number of Pakhtuns inside and outside Afghanistan. It was his contention that there are actually more Pakhtuns living outside Afghanistan than in Afghanistan itself. This is not true. Even if this contention could be validated, this abnormal repartition certainly did not take place in conformity with the wishes of the Pakhtun people; it took place with the use of military force by a colonial Power. The number of Pakhtuns outside Afghanistan—in various parts of Pakistan, as the representative of Pakistan mentioned; in India, which he did not mention; in other Asian countries, which he did not mention; in Australia, which he did not mention; in the United States of America, which he did not mention, or elsewhere—is not at issue. At issue are the Pakhtuns who live in Pakhtunistan. The representative of Pakistan by such fantastic submissions cannot, I am sure, introduce an element of confusion in the debate into the mind of any sovereign State here or elsewhere.

177. Then the representative of Pakistan, in order to sidetrack the real issue, resorted to outmoded tactics and put forward the idea of holding a referendum for all Pakhtuns within and outside Afghanistan. That is a highly irresponsible statement. No international gathering is more aware than is this Assembly that the right of self-determination should be invoked only in the case of disputes concerning peoples and territories emerging from colonial status or from any foreign domination. The self-determination of the people of a sovereign country is certainly not at issue. If this could be so—and here I appeal to all Members of this Organization to listen to me carefully—if this could be so, it would apply not only to Afghanistan but to all sovereign States, and particularly to those that support the right of peoples under alien domination to self-determination.

178. To conclude, I should add that the representative of Pakistan, in the following paragraph in his last statement, spoke of his respect for Afghanistan and said: "our people have shown their esteem for the present ruling dynasty" [ibid., para. 20] and then he quoted a passage from a book by His Excellency Field-Marshal Ayub Khan, the President of Pakistan.<sup>13</sup> We, in turn, respect the people of Pakistan. May I, with due respect, draw the attention of the Ambassador of Pakistan to the first statement of a representative of the same delegation of Pakistan which appears in the verbatim record of the plenary meeting, on 10 October 1968, where he referred to Pakhtunistan—and I quote his words—as "a figment of the imagination of a small coterie of the ruling clique of Afghanistan" [1699th meeting, para. 171]. When I exercised my right of reply immediately after his statement on that day, I intentionally did not make any reference to this discourteous remark because it is in fact of no importance or significance.

<sup>13</sup> Mohammad Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1967).

However, I appreciate the correction by the Ambassador of Pakistan of this point now. We in Afghanistan traditionally respect the heads of all States and do not use discourteous words.

179. As far as the so-called figment of the imagination is concerned, let us hear the words of a well-known American author and war correspondent, Christopher Rand, who was visiting one part of unoccupied Pakhtunistan. I quote from his report:

"I asked what the guiding idea of the Fakir's movement was"—Haji Mirza Ali, the Fakir of Ipi, was a leader of Pakhtunistan—"and was told it was freedom; his people had not been conquered by Genghis Khan or by anyone since—a proud boast in those much-fought-over mountains, and I think a true one. They certainly had not been conquered by the British, and they did not mean to be conquered by the Pakistanis. . . . He repeated that freedom was the principle."

...

"Coming away from a remote place like the Fakir's mountains, one always has to contend with the law of diminishing reality. One finds that people who are real and vivid in their hinterland are treated more like abstractions—or paper dolls—the farther one gets from them on the road back to so-called civilization. In Karachi, there was a tendency to look upon the Fakir's men that way. So I here report that they are not paper dolls."

180. In the following paragraph, the representative of Pakistan said that it was a matter of sorrow to him that "... at this particular moment the delegation of Afghanistan does not seem to reciprocate our fraternal sentiments or to show sufficient regard for the need for a steady improvement of our bilateral relations to our mutual benefit" [1698th meeting, para. 203]. In this connexion, I should like to state that we are willing to reciprocate and we have reciprocated everybody's friendly sentiments, including those of Pakistan. In this case I reciprocate with the friendliest feelings. But in the same paragraph the representative of Pakistan said: "Such a problem would threaten the statehood of Afghanistan itself" [ibid.]. Now, anywhere else I might have to explain this, but here, to you, my fellow representatives, there is no need to make any explanation. This is a threat. I will answer this threat in the exact words of the representative of Pakistan in his statement on 10 October 1968: "No force or threat of force can establish any other situation, come what may" [1690th meeting, para. 170]. Can I reciprocate more?

181. After some general statements the representative of Pakistan concluded his statement by saying:

"It is unfortunate that the circumspection of my words, which evidently refer to the humanitarian issue of the Muslims in India, led the representative of Afghanistan to say that I had offered a weak argument. What I had hoped was that the delegation of Afghanistan would share a humanitarian approach to the question that we had raised about the Muslims in India. . . ." [1698th meeting, para. 206.]

182. The stand of Afghanistan on humanitarian issues is well known. We have full sympathy with all human beings

everywhere without distinction of any kind. It was not my place to say anything about a matter strictly between India and Pakistan. I had the right only to refer to the rights of the people of Pakhtunistan. But I think it is rather odd that the representative of Pakistan should not allow me to express our support and sympathy for our own people on our own border, and at the same time expect me to support him in what he says about the citizens of another country.

183. I apologize to the President and the members of the Assembly for having taken so much of their time. The rest of the statement of the representative of Pakistan again refers to India-Pakistan relations. Since the question of Pakhtunistan is not yet on the agenda of the General Assembly I shall not go into details at this stage. However, I reserve the right of my delegation to exercise its right of reply if necessary.

184. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Thailand, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

185. Mr. VISESSURAKARN (Thailand): Owing to the late hour I shall be very brief. Allow me on behalf of the delegation of Thailand to address myself, in exercise of the right of reply, to the critical remarks which the representative of Cambodia made a few moments ago about my country. Too many times in the past the representative of Cambodia has abused the time of the General Assembly by initiating an unfounded attack on the policies of the Government of Thailand. This afternoon the Cambodian representative again demonstrated his extreme obsession with an imaginary problem. Suffice it for me to say that the charges that he made against Thailand in the course of his intervention today are a travesty of truth and cannot in any way be substantiated; they are old and stale accusations.

186. My delegation has in the past several years consistently revealed the false nature of those charges and has always answered them point by point. The records of the past sessions of the General Assembly are there for everyone to see. My delegation therefore is not disposed to use the valuable time of the General Assembly in giving a detailed reply. All my delegation desires to do now is to put the record of this meeting in the right perspective, that is merely to say that the statement of the Cambodian representative in regard to Thailand's policies and actions is a plain and simple set of lies.

187. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

188. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): It is with great regret that I feel compelled once again to reply from this rostrum to the representative of Afghanistan. We did not speak on any problem of Pakhtunistan; we merely answered the points made by the Afghan delegation earlier. To ask that a part of my country which has internationally recognized boundaries should exercise its right of self-determination is nothing but a challenge to its territorial integrity. Only today the Foreign Minister of Mali warned us of the dangers of encouraging centrifugal forces which threaten the unity and independence of States in all regions [*1700th meet-*

*ing*]. When my delegation replied to the remarks of the Afghan delegation earlier, we did so not because we recognized the validity of the position taken by the Afghan delegation but out of courtesy to that delegation.

189. Having listened to the statement of the representative of Afghanistan I feel that there are no new points which call for a reply from me. Of course he cited a string of quotations from different writers and scholars. I can also do so. We have done sufficient historical research about the social, ethnic and historical origins of our people. There are not lacking authorities of equal if not greater reputation who take a different view from that quoted by the representative of Afghanistan. But we are concerned here with questions as practical statesmen and as diplomats, and not as savants or scholars of history.

190. This is not the forum for my delegation to go into the question of the origins of the peoples which constitute the population of Pakistan and the neighbouring territories. Who is to say that since the time of Herodotus, who referred to the peoples inhabiting the particular region in question, there has been no fusion of peoples and that for 2,500 years after Herodotus the ethnic composition of the people has remained unchanged in spite of the influx of peoples after peoples from Central Asia? Is it not also true that the Aryan peoples marched from Central Asia in many directions—Europe, Iran, Pakistan and India? However this is not the place; let scholars settle this matter. I do not think that the dim past is so clearly revealed to us that we can speak dogmatically on such questions.

191. But let me again repeat that we are concerned here as representatives of Governments who have to deal with difficult problems confronting newly emerging States, newly independent States, and trying to establish peace and stability in our region on the basis of respect for one another and on the basis of good neighbourly relations.

192. We should like to reiterate that the Pakhtun people in Pakistan have already exercised their right of self-determination. Let me assure the representative of Afghanistan that we regret this futile controversy. We on our side will not strain our bilateral relations. As our President has said, our policy towards Afghanistan is one of patience and good neighbourliness. Let me add that we wish our neighbour, Afghanistan, well, and we hope that all its people, including the Pakhtuns, will live in progress and prosperity.

193. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Cambodia, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

194. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): In view of the lateness of the hour, I do not wish to tax the patience of representatives by replying at length to the representative of Thailand, who has attempted to confuse the issue. The statement I made a very short while ago was quite clear and unambiguous. If, as the representative of Thailand claims, his Government had no expansionist aims with regard to Cambodia, we would simply ask him to explain to us why his Government refuses to sign the joint statement undertaking to respect the present frontier between Cambodia and Thailand, a statement that

had been proposed several years ago by the Royal Government of Cambodia and that still, I would emphasize, remains valid. Cambodia is prepared to extend its hand to Thailand and to re-establish normal relations, if Thailand first agrees to sign this joint statement on respect for the existing frontier.

195. For the information of the General Assembly, may I point out that the present frontier between Cambodia and Thailand was delimited and fixed by the international treaties of 1904, 1907 and 1937, and the Agreement of 17 November 1946. With regard to Cambodia's sovereignty over Préah Vihéar, that was confirmed by a judgment, adopted by a very substantial majority, of the principal

judicial body of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, in 1962.<sup>14</sup>

196. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of Thailand, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

197. Mr. VISESSURAKARN (Thailand): I regret to ask for the floor again. The remarks of the representative of Cambodia have offered no new points which call for my reply. Therefore, my delegation reserves the right of reply.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*

<sup>14</sup> Case concerning the Temple of Préah Vihéar (Cambodia v. Thailand), Merits, Judgment of 15 June 1962: I.C.J. Reports, 1962, p. 6.