

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



1761st  
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 23 September 1969,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> )	
Speech by Mr. Awadalla (Sudan) . . . . .	1
Speech by Mr. Salem (Lebanon) . . . . .	8
Speech by Mr. Riad (United Arab Republic) . . . . .	10
Statement by the representative of the Philippines . . . . .	14

*President:* Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. AWADALLA (Sudan): Madam President, it is with a feeling of deep satisfaction that I express my congratulations to you on your election to the presidency of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. You have represented your country at the United Nations for some years with competence and distinction. Now, Madam President, it is the whole of Africa and not only your country that has desired the honour and privilege of your election to this distinguished office. As an African, I am delighted to congratulate you most sincerely on this rare and well-deserved privilege.

2. However, Madam President, although the African Members of this Assembly may rejoice in your election, they have, looking outside this Assembly, little cause for satisfaction. They have to reflect most soberly and seriously that in this age of neo-colonialism Africans continue to suffer the frustration of their efforts to achieve ultimate liberation.

3. We in the Sudan, like the peoples of many other countries in Africa and Asia, regained our independence when colonialism was beginning to recede as a result of the determined efforts of the peoples of these two continents to be free of foreign domination. The fourteen years of our independence since 1956 have been years of great experience. Like so many other countries of the African continent, we emerged as a sovereign nation after the disruption and exploitation of the colonial era, in the confidence that we would be able to achieve our aims through the representative institutions of liberal democracy. We had hoped to co-operate with all nations on friendly and equal terms.

4. We were soon to learn, however, that independence was without meaning or value if it were not complete in every way, in the economic as well as in the political spheres. It did not take us long to discover that the forms of Western

democracy, imposed on tribal and under-developed institutions, could only lead to the consolidation of the forces of reaction. We also learnt that a system of free and uncontrolled economic enterprise, in conditions of general under-development, would inevitably result in exploitation and injustice. We came ultimately to realize that in order to safeguard our sovereignty and national unity we had to be constantly watchful and vigilant against the forces of neo-colonialism that continued to support and encourage divisiveness and dissension. This realization did not come easily to us, nor did it come without sacrifice.

5. My Government has pledged itself to a policy that takes into account all the lessons that we learnt during those fourteen years of trials and tribulations, the fourteen years of our independence. We declared in one of the first edicts of our revolutionary Government that our policy would be directed primarily towards the betterment of our forgotten people, the peasants and the workers to whom independence had meant little more than a change of masters. One of the first acts of this revolutionary Government was to define the goals of our economic policy—rejecting all forms of exploitation within the country and foreign domination from without.

6. We refused economic aid that would seek to impose on us conditions on how the funds were to be invested or modify the socialist orientation of our economic planning; we declared our irrevocable commitment to the attainment of socialism as the most humane and just system for our society.

7. The concept of non-alignment in international relations is to us, as an Arab country, conscious of the historic unity and destiny of the Arab people, endowed with a positive element. We do not stand in the middle of the road, maintaining a position of neutrality between the imperialist camp and the socialist countries. There can be no such neutrality for us.

8. We, therefore, stand united with the progressive and revolutionary forces, not only in the Arab world, but also in the world at large, acting in full awareness of the role that these forces can play in working for the happiness and prosperity of mankind. Among such forces we count the Palestine revolutionary movement whose struggle we are pledged to support by every means at our disposal, mobilizing our resources and our people for the cause of the liberation of Palestine.

9. It follows from this commitment that our relations with other States have been redefined in accordance with their attitude towards that issue. Thus we have recognized and applauded the courageous stand of the German Democratic Republic, which has given full recognition and support to

the Palestine liberation movement. Thus we have recognized and applauded the support of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has declared its solidarity with the people of Palestine in their struggle for national liberation.

10. The revolutionary Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan has accorded full diplomatic recognition to those Governments and maintains with them the closest and most cordial relations, ever conscious of the fact that the unity of the progressive forces of the world will eventually triumph over the forces of darkness and reaction.

11. Thus we come to the United Nations, to this Assembly, as one of its smaller Members, perhaps less endowed than many others in terms of economic development, but confident in our belief that it is by our own effort and sacrifice that we can achieve the goals that we have set for ourselves. We come to the United Nations in hope but without illusions, since we, like many others of our continent of Africa and of the Arab world, have experienced too many setbacks and disappointments to harbour any illusions. We have witnessed, only too often, the failure of the United Nations to uphold the values and principles of its Charter. We have observed with dismay the progressive stultification of United Nations endeavours in the maintenance and preservation of peace and the frustration of its efforts for multilateral economic co-operation.

12. However, the reasons for the failure of this Organization to be an effective instrument for peace and progress are not far to seek. We have no doubt that the failure of this Organization is due to a large extent to the tendency of the imperialist Powers to use the United Nations as an instrument of their policies. This abuse has inevitably led to the decline in the prestige of the Organization and to a severe limitation of its capabilities and resources and has engendered a lack of confidence in its effectiveness.

13. The failure of the Organization to solve the situation in the Middle East is not of recent origin; and it will continue to plague this Organization so long as it persists in ignoring the essential nature of the question of Palestine. The struggle that the Palestinians and the Arabs have been engaged in is a struggle of the indigenous population against alien domination.

14. Zionist propaganda often relates its title to the land of Palestine to a legendary domicile, going back to biblical times. It is an incontestable historical fact, however, that for 3,000 years—prior to 1948—Palestine had not been once under Jewish administration. There have always been Jews in Palestine, but they represented only 9 per cent of the population by 1918.

15. During the time of the partition, when Israel acquired by force of arms an area two-thirds in excess of the area assigned to the Jewish State by the partition resolution, there were still more Arabs than Jews in Palestine. This clearly represented an intolerable situation for the Zionists, who coveted the land of the Arabs in order to establish the Zionist State—rooted in the concept of racial exclusiveness and intolerance. The people of Palestine were evacuated through campaigns of unmitigated terror and atrocity, and the homes and lands of the Palestinians were usurped by immigrants from Europe who had no better claim to the

land than a worshipper in the Kowloon Mosque of Hong Kong could have to Mecca.

16. Thus it was estimated, as late as 1954, that 350 out of 400 Jewish settlements were established on lands that had belonged to Palestinians who subsequently became refugees—those refugees that the United Nations has reaffirmed, year after year for over two decades, should be repatriated or adequately compensated. Those are the people who have the undeniable right to the land of Palestine. Those are the people that the United Nations has abandoned to the Zionist aggressors.

17. The Foreign Minister of Israel is certainly not serious in trying to base a claim to Arab land on historical considerations going back 3,000 years—that is, to 1,000 B.C. He is certainly not so naive as to try to reshape the map of the world into the form it had in 1,000 B.C. If he really thinks that that is a basis for his claim; if he considers that any people that have been where they are for less than 3,000 years can be dislodged with impunity, then surely the Foreign Minister of Israel would not only lose the rostrum from which he has been displaying his eloquence, but he would be looking in vain in this part of the world for the limitless military, monetary and moral support by which a people of only 2 million have been encouraged to defy a nation of 100 million.

18. The question, therefore, is essentially related to the continued existence of the Palestinians as a people and their right to struggle by every means in order to maintain their national identity and uphold their inherent right to stay in their homeland. No State, no international organization, can deny them that right or ask them to disperse, or for ever live on the charity of others, as refugees.

19. The Zionist leaders have often suggested that the Arabs were belligerent because they challenged the right of Israel to exist within secure and recognized boundaries; as if the existence of Israel was not based on the dispersal of the Palestinians; as if the boundaries of Israel were not extended through aggression and forceful occupation.

20. The Foreign Minister of Israel has often derided the Declaration of the Arab Summit Conference held at Khartoum from 29 August to 1 September 1967 as signifying bad faith and intransigence on the part of the Arabs because it set forth the determination of the Arab nation not to recognize or negotiate with Israel or surrender the rights of the people of Palestine to their homeland.

21. Let me proclaim from this rostrum that this remains the Arab position. It has not changed; nor will the twenty years of the Israeli usurpation of Palestine or subsequent Israeli conquests endow Israel with any rights whatsoever. The Arab States were right—and within their rights—to declare at Khartoum on 1 September 1967 that their basic commitment and conviction entailed non-recognition of Israel, no negotiation with Israel and no surrender of the rights of the people of Palestine.

22. The Israeli leaders have since indicated that they intend to retain Arab territory occupied since June 1967. As recently as June last, Moshe Dayan proclaimed:

“This is our homeland and if I say homeland I mean also Nablus and Jericho.... We consider the Golan

Heights part of Israel. . . . We must treat the Palestinians living on the West Bank as a government treats its citizens. They will be our citizens for a very long time.”

The Foreign Minister of Israel, who maintained in his address to this Assembly on 19 September [1757th meeting] that there was nothing which was not negotiable, expressed a different and contradictory position to the Knesset when he said, in reply to a parliamentary question on 12 May 1969:

“Three demands which Israel will not waive are a permanent presence at Sharm El Sheik, a unified Jerusalem . . . and a Golan Heights for ever out of Syrian hands.”

It appears, therefore, that Mr. Eban has a different mantle for every occasion, since his position in the Knesset excludes Sharm El Sheik, Jerusalem and the Golan Heights in no uncertain terms from even the possibility of negotiation.

23. In the face of his strong affirmation regarding the need for negotiations between the Arabs and the Israelis, one might indeed ask the Foreign Minister of Israel whether he does or does not consider himself or his State bound by the resolutions of his party congress regarding the permanent retention by Israel of the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip and a considerable part of the eastern and southern Sinai Peninsula. If he does consider himself bound by these resolutions, how is it possible for him to maintain that there is nothing that is not negotiable between Israel and the Arabs? How does he want us to believe that he or his State can wriggle out of the resolutions in the drafting of which he himself took a major part?

24. The Palestinians have demonstrated that they do not wish to be colonized by Israel, and they have a right, like every colonial people, to wage a war of liberation against colonial domination by Israel. They aspire to live as a free people in a free Palestine.

25. The people of Palestine envision a country unlike present-day Israel, which is a colony of aliens supported by world Zionism and nurtured by the United States of America and its imperialist satellites. The Palestinians entertain no claim of racial exclusiveness. They do not envisage a State based on any single religion or faith. The Palestinians see the Palestine of the future as a State the citizens of which are equal, without regard to race or religion; a State in which the Jewish community would be given the right to live as equal citizens, as they had always lived amongst the Arabs, free from that abominable state of persecution to which they had been subjected in Europe throughout the ages.

26. If this position is construed as being incompatible with the existence of the state of Israel, the fault lies with the State of Israel, which was established by an act of illegality fostered through aggression and unlawful occupation, a State in which the Arabs are treated as second-class citizens who are made to pay for sins that they never committed.

27. The Palestinian struggle is directed towards the achievement of a free and democratic State that does not exclude the Jews of Palestine. This surely is an endeavour that is worthy of support, not only by the Arabs but by the

United Nations itself. It is a sad reflection on this Organization that it has not seen fit to view this dispute in its proper perspective, in order to be able to discharge its primary responsibility in bringing about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

28. The President of the United States of America declared on 27 January 1969 that he considered the Middle East “a powder-keg” that needed to be defused. He stated that he was “open to any suggestion that may cool it off and reduce the possibility of another explosion”. Yet, we have witnessed during the last few months that the Government of the United States has bent every effort to support the Israeli position of continued occupation and provocation, even to the extent of supporting its defiance of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

29. In major declarations of policy on the Middle East issue, four successive Presidents of the United States have pledged that their country would defend the right of every State in the area to peace and security and the maintenance of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

30. The United States has not fulfilled that pledge. Its commitment has been one of unreserved support for Israeli aggression. Its commitment has been just one-sided. At the beginning of the present administration, it was proclaimed that a more even-handed policy would be followed by the Government of the United States on this issue, but in actual fact, this has been the period when Israel was enabled by the United States to maintain and even extend its aggression. The territorial integrity of all States that the United States Presidents have pledged to uphold is being violated, with the active help of the Government of the United States, in the Israeli occupation of the Arab lands.

31. In this connexion, it is interesting to consider that over the past twenty years the volume of economic aid, both private and public, that has flowed from the United States into the Israeli coffers exceeded a total of \$4,000 million, or about \$1,200 for every one of the citizens of Israel.

32. Further, in the conditions that prevail in the United States of America, where the Zionists wield such an inordinate influence in business and government circles, the attempt at the adoption of an even-handed policy towards both the Zionist State and the Arabs was bound to come to grief.

33. Mr. David Nes of the State Department, in an address delivered on 18 April 1969 at the Conference on World Affairs of the University of Colorado, entitled “Our Middle East Involvement”, revealed the extent of this influence. He stated that 20 per cent of key positions in the State Department were held by Jews, most of them presumably sympathetic to the Israeli position.

34. Professor Willard Oxtoby of the University of Yale described the genesis and conditions of the commitment of the Government of the United States to Israeli policies in the following terms:

“In this country, any question of Israel’s right to exist, or of her actions today in any field, is immediately

targeted as anti-Semitism... anything short of total commitment to the rightness of Israel's cause is interpreted as anti-Semitism... In our country, this a characterization which I would say, certainly in government, is considered far worse than being a communist."

35. In these conditions it is idle to suppose that the Arab cause, no matter how just, would receive the support of the United States Government. This has been demonstrated time and again, during the last two decades.

36. We heard the President of the United States proclaim from this rostrum last Thursday, 18 September, that the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 "charts the way to that settlement" [1755th meeting, para. 64]. Our understanding of that resolution differs from that of the President of the United States. We consider a resolution of the Security Council not as a working paper but as a solemn decision that requires implementation, especially in conditions where the threat to the peace is so palpable. We expect the United States of America, which is a major Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, to bring its prestige and influence to bear so that the dangerous situation in the Middle East does not develop into what President Nixon, in his statement of January 1969, feared would be "a major explosion" that could very well involve "a confrontation between the nuclear Powers".

37. The President of the United States in his speech before this Assembly on 18 September 1969 [1755th meeting] stated that in case of failure to reach agreement on a settlement in the Middle East the great Powers should endeavour to contain the conflict by limiting the supply of arms to the belligerents. Yet the United States, through its delivery of the Phantom jets and other weapons of aggression to Israel, has helped to spur rather than deter the armaments race in the area. The seriousness of that action will be fully realized when we consider that Israel has nuclear capability based on nuclear reactors such as that at Dimona, which is capable of producing enough plutonium for the manufacture of several nuclear weapons. It is an open secret that Israel possesses this capability as well as the means of delivery.

38. We have no doubt the ultimate purpose of Israel's nuclear capability, nor do the Israelis themselves leave any room for doubt in the matter, since they have rejected the application of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system and have not accepted the agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

39. The suggestion by the President of the United States for arms limitation, if Security Council resolution 242 (1967) providing for the withdrawal of Israel is not implemented, amounts to an endorsement of the Israeli position and a sanction of its continued occupation of the Arab land in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and specific resolutions of the Security Council. It did not come as a surprise to us that that should be the position of the United States on this issue, since it is part of the declared policy of the United States that Israel should maintain a clear superiority in armaments over the Arabs. The suggestion that there should now be some arms limitation convinces us that the United States is now assured that it has provided Israel with the means of maintaining that superiority.

40. Let me say here that we reject that suggestion that seeks to impose on the Arabs a permanent position of inferiority and subservience.

41. We, as a part of the Arab nation, are convinced that our struggle against the colonial occupation of Palestine by the Zionists will be long and arduous. The United States, in supporting injustice and upholding usurpation has irrevocably identified itself with the immorality of the Israeli occupation. Ultimately, it will be the loser since the Arabs are inexorably moving towards the full attainment of their inalienable right to live in freedom in the Arab homeland; and while the United States supports the cause of foreign domination and reaction, the Arabs have come to realize that their destiny lies in the solidarity of the progressive forces in the Arab nation supported by all the peace-loving countries of the world.

42. Let it be clear to the Government and people of the United States of America that the policy pursued by the United States Government in the Middle East can lead to nothing but the alienation of the Arab people. The United States Government has maintained some traditional friendships with certain ruling circles in the Arab world in the mistaken belief that such a course of action is sufficient to give it that grip over affairs that is necessary for the protection of American interests in the Middle East.

43. Let there be no misapprehension about the fact that such a course of action is pregnant with considerable dangers to those very interests that the United States Government seeks to safeguard. The Arab peoples everywhere do not have any illusions about this. It is for the United States to choose between amity with a nation of 100 million in an area of great strategic importance and animosity to that nation. It is for the United States to choose between a foreign policy dictated purely by domestic considerations and one pursued in conformity with the exigencies of foreign realities.

44. Finally, we reject the implication in the policy declaration of the President of the United States before this Assembly when he said: "We are convinced that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of substantial alterations in the map of the Middle East" [1755th meeting, para. 65]. Let us sound the warning here that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of any alterations in the map of the Middle East; to maintain a position that contradicts this is to contravene the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which calls for the complete withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied areas. To maintain a position that Israel should extend its territory in the Arab lands that it now occupies is to support the contention that armed conquest is capable of supporting rights or concessions. It is regrettable that the President of the United States should hold the position that the map of the Middle East has to be modified in order to appease Israeli ambitions. It is lamentable that he saw fit to declare this before the Assembly.

45. For some years now the United States has been fighting a brutal war in Viet-Nam. The United States has committed more of its armed forces to that war than it did in Korea, more in fact than it has done in any other war, except the two world wars. The number of United States



troops and their allies, before the recent token withdrawal, represented a numerical superiority of men under arms of the order of seven to one. The allied forces of aggression in South Viet-Nam have had, in addition to overwhelming numerical superiority, a superiority in fire-power, excluding the B-52 operations, amounting to about one hundred to one. It has been reliably estimated that the superiority of the allies over the Viet-Nameese patriots in helicopter-transport facilities, in communications and electronics, has amounted to about one thousand to one.

46. It becomes obvious, therefore, that in this context the recent withdrawals of United States troops dwindle to insignificance and do not in themselves warrant any response from the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam or the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam. American troop reduction does not represent a reduction of military activity or an abatement in the bombing and destruction that the heroic people of Viet-Nam have endured all these long years.

47. The President of the United States declared before this Assembly on 18 September 1969 that what the United States wanted for Viet-Nam was not important—what was important was what the Viet-Nameese themselves wanted. He declared that the South Viet-Nameese had “the basic right to determine their... future” without “outside” intervention [1755th meeting, para. 54].

48. Coming from the President of the major Power that is intervening now in South Viet-Nam that is indeed an amazingly ironic statement. One fails to comprehend the logic that permits the Americans to accept that the activities of the South Viet-Nameese Liberation Front, even if aided by the North Viet-Nameese, can be considered as unjustifiable foreign intervention, while the American military machine, aided by Australian, South Korean, New Zealand, Thai and Filipino forces, can legitimately and justifiably bring death and destruction to the poor people of Viet-Nam. If we are to exclude foreign interference we must recognize that it is the interference of the United States that must come to an end. It is the interference of the United States which is hindering the Viet-Nameese from determining their own future.

49. The President of the United States tells us that: “the people of Viet-Nam, North and South alike, have demonstrated heroism enough to last a century” [ibid., para. 61]. Let me say that they have demonstrated that heroism mostly in their relentless struggle against American domination. They certainly now deserve to live in peace. Let the United States unconditionally withdraw its troops so that the Viet-Nameese may live in peace. The land is theirs and they ought to be masters of their own destiny.

50. It is ironic that the President of the United States should state without qualification that his country has not turned away from the world. Some of us cannot help but wish that it had. Some of us cannot but feel that the world would be a better place if it were free of American orbiting spies in the sky, free of their intelligence ships, free of their military bases, their loaded aid, and the pervasive machinations of the Central Intelligence Agency—free, in short, of all the devices and intrigues that United States imperialism has been employing to impose its will on the world in the

name of “freedom”. It is curious that the brand of freedom advocated by the United States is always espoused by leaders who are discredited in their own countries, and embraced by reactionaries and quislings—men who have had a history of dishonest collaboration with foreign Powers occupying their countries. That is certainly the case in South Viet-Nam and is true of the Chung Hee Park régime in South Korea; it is certainly the case in many other parts of the world.

51. In South Korea the United States has supported its presence by advancing the palpably false claim that its armed forces are there to deter aggression. It should be obvious that that is a bogus claim, since it is the very presence of foreign troops in South Korea that has been the major source of tension in the area. The incursions of the American spy-ships and airplanes into the territory of the Democratic Republic of Korea have sometimes been deliberately provoked in order to see, as one observer put it, how other side reacts. The case of the spy-ship *Pueblo* is too recent and too well known to need any comment. Major-General Gilbert H. Woodward even signed a written confession on behalf of the United States Government on 23 December 1968, admitting guilt for that inexcusable infringement of the sovereignty of another State.

52. It is, however, a matter of great concern that the United States presence in South Korea is justified in the name of the United Nations; it is regrettable that the United Nations should tolerate this abuse of its name.

53. Yet one is heartened and encouraged to see that in Viet-Nam and in Korea, as well as in the Middle East, the tide is turning and the era of imperialist domination is constantly receding. One would wish that the United Nations had played an active role in bringing to an end this unhappy state of affairs. The United Nations, having grown out of the pain and turmoil of the Second World War, out of the fight against fascism, should have continued to be an Organization that united all the forces that had fought against oppression and injustice. Yet this was not to be, in spite of the awareness that in order to be able “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”, “... we are expected”—in the words of the late Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld—“to succeed where our predecessors failed”.

54. We in the Sudan believe that the United Nations is capable of such achievement. We also believe that in the world of today, which is characterized by fundamental and rapid changes in the relationships of nations and peoples having different cultures and social systems, our efforts should be geared towards transforming the United Nations into a universal organ capable of drawing together the multifarious interests of humanity in general, and not towards allowing it to deteriorate into an instrument of policy for those who already wield too much power and exert unlimited influence.

55. It is our conviction that only the achievement of true universality can save this Organization from falling victim to its own shortcomings. We cannot conceive of the realization of that universality without the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. The case of the restoration of the lawful

rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is based on considerations of historical fact, of legal right, and of a correct appraisal of the political realities of our present world.

56. The Government that succeeded to the treaty obligations of the Charter of the United Nations after the establishment of the Organization was the Government of the People's Republic of China, and not the Government of Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan. The Government that ought to assume the privileged position and obligations of a great Power is the Government that is now in effective control of almost 4 million square miles of the land mass of Asia, inhabited by one fourth of the total of the world population. It is therefore not only in furtherance of the dignity and prestige of this Organization that the People's Republic of China should assume its lawful rights of membership, but also in the interests of humanity. This is now especially true since the People's Republic of China is one of the five nuclear Powers of the world.

57. The United Nations can continue to ignore China only at its own risk and peril. Furthermore, the admission of China to the United Nations will not only be a source of strength to the Organization but will also herald the admission of other countries that have an effective impact on world affairs but that still remain outside the United Nations. No country is too unimportant to make a contribution to the work of this Organization. To attempt to exclude certain countries can be motivated only by factors that have nothing to do with the good of mankind or the effectiveness of the United Nations. The Secretary-General has recently reiterated the thesis first put forward in the introduction to his annual report last year<sup>1</sup> in support of true universality and emphasizing the need for the divided countries to take part in the work of the United Nations. The case of the German Democratic Republic, with its great industrial potential and capability of assisting in the area of multilateral economic aid, may well be cited in illustration of this point. This Organization cannot continue to ignore the existence of the German Democratic Republic and the contribution that it is capable of making towards the enhancement of the effectiveness and prestige of this Organization.

58. We believe that the realization of prosperity on a wide scale and the attainment of peace and freedom for the people of the world everywhere are closely connected. We in the Sudan have realized that as Africans our freedom and independence will remain incomplete as long as parts of the African continent remain under colonial domination.

59. In the three African Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), Portugal continues its domination of the African inhabitants. Portugal has over 60,000 soldiers in Africa engaged in the brutal suppression of movements for national liberation of the African inhabitants. The war waged by Portugal against the people in those three African Territories is a conflict that constitutes a real threat to peace and security in the area.

60. It will be recalled that frequently in recent months the military forces of Portugal have crossed the borders of

independent African States, on the assumption that they have a right of pursuit. They have thus infringed upon and violated the sovereignty of those countries, whose response has often been quick and immediate. Yet the incursions continue.

61. Portugal stands condemned before the United Nations family and before world public opinion for its defiance of the United Nations resolutions and for its refusal to accept the universal principle of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence—a principle enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. The continued defiance of this principle and the persistence in ignoring resolutions of the United Nations should alert this Organization to the need for more resolute action in support of the real forces that will bring the downfall of Portuguese colonialism in Africa. I refer to the forces of the African liberation movements in those Territories.

62. The tragedy of Rhodesia continues to unfold in a manner similar to the Palestine tragedy. Like the Zionists, the white minority in Southern Rhodesia are appropriating the land and depriving the indigenous people of Zimbabwe of their birthright to their homeland. As a result of the hesitant policy of the United Kingdom, the United Nations has been forced to resort to measures which have continued to be inappropriate and inadequate to deal with the situation.

63. Before the unilateral declaration of independence, the United Kingdom had challenged the competence of the United Nations to deal with the situation in Rhodesia, but once the unilateral declaration of independence was announced Britain sought the help of the United Nations. The United Kingdom did not heed the appeals of the Afro-Asians to act promptly and to deal effectively with the rebellion through the use of force. The United Kingdom resisted even the idea of using force and embarked on a series of abortive negotiations with the rebels before resorting to the ineffective application of economic sanctions.

64. While economic sanctions have failed to topple the Smith régime, the fascist Rhodesian front is proceeding with the enforcement of a system of *apartheid* more repugnant than the South African system, having severed all links with Britain and declaring that the country would become a republic with a proposed racist constitution depriving the African population of their fundamental human rights and conferring title to half the land upon 5 per cent of the population—that is, the white minority.

65. We consider that the only effective solution of the Rhodesian question short of the immediate use of force to end the rebellion is the imposition of mandatory sanctions on the whole of southern Africa. However, Britain has made it quite clear that it is not ready to use force nor ready to agree to a total embargo for political, legal and economic reasons, and insists, together with its Western allies, that the United Nations should pursue the present course of action of denying recognition and maintaining sanctions against the illegal régime. To us, the present course is unacceptable because it is deceitful and ineffective.

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 1A.

66. It did not come as a surprise to us that while the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom as recently as yesterday [1759th meeting], was warning the Members of this Assembly against unrealistic proposals and precipitous action concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia, there was jubilation in the white racist circles in Salisbury on the return of the United States Consul-General to his post, which is interpreted, according to *The New York Times* of yesterday, 22 September 1969, "as a small token of American approval". The action taken by the United States and the interpretation of that action in Salisbury is more important and more significant than the pious hopes expressed by the United Kingdom.

67. Again, it is left to the people of Zimbabwe to intensify its struggle for freedom; and again, the United Nations will have a clear obligation, in accordance with its Charter resolutions, to give that people all possible assistance. We in the Sudan are pledged to give the peoples of Zimbabwe all the assistance necessary to enable it to attain its right of self-determination and independence.

68. The African population in South Africa continues to live under the inhuman system of *apartheid* instituted by the minority racist régime of Pretoria, which stands condemned by all the world for the pursuance of policies that are contrary to all standards of decency and justice. The General Assembly, the specialized agencies and the Security Council have repeatedly condemned the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa. Yet all our pleas and exhortations have fallen on deaf ears. Indeed, there has been an intensification of these policies and an extension of their application to other territories. Both Namibia and Southern Rhodesia are now in the grip of this repugnant system.

69. The situation in Namibia remains unchanged; the Government of South Africa illegally continues to administer the territory and consolidate its control further by implementing measures leading to the integration of the territory into the system of *apartheid*, in contravention of United Nations resolutions. The authorities of Pretoria are enacting legislation leading to the dismemberment of the territory by the creation of sixteen Bantustans, leaving the rich and more developed part of Namibia under the control of the white minority while the indigenous population lives in transit camps and native reserves. Over eighty-one resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the territory have been met with total disregard by the South African Government. The South African authorities' refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions rendered the United Nations Council for Namibia powerless. The Government of South Africa is carrying out a war of genocide and repression against the Namibians. Its inhuman treatment of the captured Namibians, who had been resisting the illegal South African authorities, is contrary to all accepted standards applicable to prisoners.

70. The United Nations has declared the presence of South Africa in Namibia illegal, has condemned South Africa for not complying with United Nations resolutions and has affirmed the territorial integrity of the territory. But since condemnation has been without result, the United Nations must now proceed to adopt appropriate steps to deal with the South African refusal to comply with the provisions of its resolutions.

71. It is our unshakable belief that the traditional notion "let him who desires peace prepare for war" is inconceivable in the era of nuclear weapons. The total destruction of mankind that may be caused by nuclear war makes such a war differ from a conventional conflict not only in kind but also and most seriously in scale. It is now well established in amply documented evidence that even those who survived the immediate destruction of a nuclear war would be exposed to radio-active contamination, while the future generations would suffer different and grave disabilities.

72. It is discouraging to note that while the progress in disarmament has been very slow, nuclear technology has proceeded at a formidable pace and is now within the reach of a growing number of countries.

73. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII)] has been a significant landmark on the path towards achieving complete disarmament. We sincerely hope that this Treaty will open a new chapter in disarmament negotiations and will inspire members of the enlarged Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to direct their efforts towards achieving concrete and effective measures for arms control.

74. My Government fully endorses the resolutions and the Declaration of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States,<sup>2</sup> dealing with questions of universal peace—in particular, the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, cessation of the nuclear arms race, general and complete disarmament and the exploration of the means of harnessing nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. That is an area in which the United Nations can achieve a great measure of success. Let us hope that it will not be deterred from pursuing that end. Let us hope that in the area of peaceful reconstruction and development the United Nations will be able to fulfil the promise of its early years.

75. The oppressed people of the world will not be completely free unless they shake off the stranglehold of neo-colonialism—the major oppressive force of our day. Direct colonial rule has now all but disappeared from the face of the earth. Since 1945 over sixty countries of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean, inhabited by over one third of mankind—have become independent. This has been the era of the great dawn of freedom all over the world.

76. But the imperialist Powers were not willing to allow freedom to see the light of day. They resorted to all available means to suppress it. In many cases they drew up the constitutions of the newly independent countries and built up the leaders to whom they were to hand over the reins of power. They instituted regional organizations through which they exercised great influence in order to safeguard their interests, and they made absolutely certain of the dependence of the economies of the newly independent countries on their own. That has been the insidious and dangerous work of neo-colonialism since the end of the last war.

77. The economies of many independent countries have been infiltrated by the agencies of capitalist exploitation in

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, agenda item 96, document A/7277 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 17.



such a way that it has become difficult for those countries to envisage a future where they can achieve any measure of self-sufficiency.

78. The fallacy that the developed countries should concentrate on the manufacture of industrial goods while the developing or under-developed countries should devote their labour to extractive industries and raw materials seems to have taken hold to such an extent that it has become an accepted tenet of national economic planning in some countries.

79. The machinery of capitalist foreign aid has been used extensively to further these neo-colonialist aims and to foster a state of future dependence for a number of years to come. In this connexion one must mention the unprincipled use of economic aid as one of the weapons of Zionist infiltration into Africa.

80. It is true that on the political level many of the leaders reared by the colonial Powers who failed to live up to the aspirations of their people were overthrown and replaced by others who were more responsive to the needs of their countries and the national aspirations of their people. Yet, wherever the people were not vigilant, the agents of neo-colonialism have been active in the other direction, foisting decadent and corrupt leadership upon the people and engineering the overthrow of progressive governments in order to install régimes sympathetic to the neo-colonialist aims.

81. The methods which these agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, follow in the realization of their despicable aims include all kinds of subterfuge, such as incitement to riot, strikes and assassinations. To strengthen its hold over such countries, neo-colonialism has directed its attention mainly to the sources of information and instituted broadcasting stations, libraries and scholarships wherever its agents have had the chance to do so.

82. On the strategic level, the forces of neo-colonialism have military bases and aggressive alliances that encircle the globe in the name of collective security. This is the extent of the danger that the emergent countries of the third world have had to face.

83. Yet there is hope—hope that people everywhere will awaken to this danger and combat the rapacity of the imperialists and their new weapons of oppression. There is hope that the inherent weakness of neo-colonialism will lead to its final end as the inherent weaknesses of capitalism bring about its downfall. This hope will be realized when the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean recognize that the interests of their peoples are best served by their marching together, alongside the democratic forces all over the world, towards freeing themselves from the shackles of neo-colonialism; when they realize that the only way to attain real independence and true freedom for their people is through being united.

84. Only in their unity is there hope.

85. Mr. SALEM (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): Madam President, on behalf of the delegation of Lebanon and on my own behalf, I should like to offer you our

sincere congratulations on your election to the presidency of this twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and to express our hope that this Assembly will work for peace among the peoples, in accordance with the principles of its Charter.

86. I also desire to pay a tribute to the memory of His Excellency Mr. Emilio Arenales, who presided so ably over the twenty-third session of the General Assembly.

87. Madam President and fellow representatives, I address you on behalf of a country which knows that its existence, its independence and the freedoms to which it is passionately devoted can be safeguarded only under the rule of an international morality under which law is respected, aggression is outlawed as a means of pressure, States reject armed force as an argument in the settlement of their disputes, international relations are based on justice, mutual respect, the spirit of co-operation and an absolute regard for peace, under which, in short, nations live in conformity with humane and civilized principles.

88. During the journey which brought me here, my thoughts more than once went back to the year 1945 when, in San Francisco, I participated with the Lebanese delegation, together with the delegations of fifty other countries, in the drafting of the Charter of the United Nations. That was a time of great hopes. In less than thirty years the spirit of domination and racism had plunged the world into two wars, one more devastating and murderous than the other. The victorious coalition wished to open up a new era in history, an era in which nations, whether powerful or small, would live in peace and with equal rights, when men would at last be free from the anguish of war, from the fear of losing their birthplaces, their ancestral tombs and their homelands, of being enslaved or persecuted because of their race, religion or thinking.

89. Such were our hopes and our ideal when drafting the Charter and establishing the organs of the United Nations. The General Assembly and the Security Council represented for us the highest courts of justice and the uncompromising guardians of the new international order.

90. All those who lived through those historic moments no doubt recall the climate of confidence and hope which prevailed throughout our labours. Would it be an exaggeration to say that today, after the many sufferings to which mankind has been incessantly exposed, there is unfortunately a danger that these sentiments may soon give way to disillusionment and disenchantment?

91. Although the United Nations has many happy achievements to its credit, the fundamental problems on which the future of peace, security, justice and human well-being depend still confront us in all their magnitude and in all their tragic scope. Among all these evils, may I touch more particularly upon the one that most directly concerns my own country, namely, the conflict in the Middle East?

92. As early as 1949, in order to fulfil the "messianic destiny of the people of Israel", more than a million Palestinians were expelled from their homes and land by terrorism, violence and fire. For more than twenty years these "refugees" have been living in poverty, bitterness and



nostalgia for their usurped fatherland. But today some profess to be shocked because these people have rebelled and because resistance to oppression is being organized and is becoming a key factor in the problem—a new factor which cannot and should not in any way be underestimated.

93. In 1967, the June war led to the occupation of the whole of Jerusalem and the West Bank of the Jordan, as well as Sinai and the Golan Heights. And on 21 August 1969 came the burning of the Al-Aqsa Mosque, which was deeply resented by both Christendom and Islam. Was not this burning, as was stated recently by the Algerian representative in the Security Council [1508th meeting], "the tragic accomplishment that must follow the complicity of the international community"?

94. It would take too long to cite the decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council which have remained dead letters for Israel. This contempt for the United Nations seems to be the policy of Israel. The peaceful statements of its leaders are intended solely to dull the vigilance of international opinion. Behind them is visible a desire for territorial expansion; an arrogant mystique of greatness and domination is inspiring Israel's policy of force and dictating its behaviour.

95. Among the Israeli leaders, General Dayan seems to be the one who best illustrates this policy by the statements he makes from time to time and which at least have the merit of being frank. From these statements one could compile a genuine and highly enlightening anthology. However, I shall quote only two which seem to me particularly significant. The first was published in the Israeli newspaper *Haolam Haze* of 8 July 1968. General Dayan stated the following:

"Our fathers got as far as the borders recognized in the partition plan of 1947. Our generation got as far as the borders of 1949. But the generation of the Six Days War was able to get as far as Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights. This is not the end, for beyond the present cease-fire lines, there will still be new lines beyond the Jordan, perhaps as far as Lebanon and perhaps also as far as central Syria."

96. General Dyan's statements have been transformed into deeds by the Israeli attacks which have been incessantly directed against our territory ever since the attack on Beirut international airport on 28 December 1968.

97. In this connexion, Israel has unilaterally denounced the General Armistice Agreement between Lebanon and Israel of 23 March 1949. However, contrary to the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel in the Assembly, Lebanon considers that Agreement to be still valid. Article VIII of the Agreement provides, in fact, that it will remain in force until a peaceful settlement has been reached and that it can be denounced only with the agreement of the two parties.

98. In another statement, quoted by the Israeli newspaper *Maariv* on 30 April 1968, the Israeli Defence Minister said:

"It may be possible to arrive at peace treaties between ourselves and the Arab countries, but the Arabs are asking

a very high price. I pray to heaven that that day will never come."

99. It is statements of that kind by Israeli officials which are responsible for the whole trend of domestic and foreign policy in the Near and Middle East. It is this policy of aggression and conquest, pursued by Israel with the arrogance of one confident of impunity, that is adding to the toll of victims, piling up acts of destruction and plunging the whole region into violence and insecurity. One must be blind, or else simply refuse to see, not to realize that this policy can lead only to a general conflagration which might destroy the world.

100. Nevertheless, there was recently an exceptional opportunity of reaching a peaceful and honourable settlement of the Middle East problems on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), dated 22 November 1967. The two Arab States most directly concerned in the conflict accepted this international instrument, which had been unanimously adopted by the Council, and co-operated loyally with the Secretary-General's Personal Representative in an endeavour to find ways and means of implementing it. The United Arab Republic and Jordan have given proof of their extreme good faith with regard to the Security Council's resolution; and Lebanon can only reaffirm its solidarity with these States and press for the full implementation of this text. By adopting a negative attitude, Israel is deliberately sabotaging all chances of peace; it continues unremittently to defy international law and the decisions of the Assembly. Furthermore, it dares to demand, as the fruit of its military victory, security for its boundaries, to the detriment of the security of the other States of the Middle East.

101. In his address to the General Assembly [1755th meeting], the president of the United States spoke of secure and recognized boundaries. However, you are not unaware of the fact that boundaries secure from threats or acts of violence are no longer geographical and that no border today can resist the power of modern weapons. Secure boundaries are rather of a moral character; what ensures them is the spirit of peace, the desire for peace and respect for international law.

102. To preserve peace, to promote the development of every nation and of every human being, we must endeavour to overcome evil instincts so that love for peace and justice, tolerance and the sense of brotherhood may triumph among men.

103. This is Lebanon's moral code. Recently, for example, his Excellency, the President of the Republic of Lebanon, made the following statement:

"Lebanon's role in the Arab world and in the world at large is so important and so necessary that any aggression against our territory and against our national and our human mission is an aggression against those values without which there can be neither life nor progress for mankind as a whole.

"Any sign of indifference to our just cause on the part of any State, large or small, condemns that same State which is guilty of it. History will judge harshly those who

are indifferent or hostile, whoever they may be. And not only history but also the inexorable march of future events.”

104. Mr. RIAD (United Arab Republic):<sup>3</sup> Madam President, your election to this high international post is manifold in its significance. It is a recognition of your role in the defence of the United Nations Charter and the right of the peoples of Africa to independence and self-determination. It is also an added illustration that the values upheld by the African woman transcend African frontiers and cross wider universal horizons. We further share in rejoicing at your election because bonds of brotherhood and the common struggle for the liberty and progress of Africa bind our two countries and peoples. I have full confidence that you will lead the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly with the greatest skill and objectivity, which are characteristic of your conduct in all the posts we have known you to occupy.

105. I also wish to express here the deep sorrow of the United Arab Republic at the tragic death of Mr. Arenales, President of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. His untimely demise shocked those who knew him and it was, indeed, a great loss for the Government and the friendly people of Guatemala.

106. The conflict which engulfs the Middle East today is between aggression manifested in Israel's occupation of Arab territories aimed at expansion in these territories and the will to achieve peace based on the United Nations Charter, which condemns aggression and expansion and ensures the territorial integrity and the political independence of all States.

107. Israel's policy of continued occupation of Arab territories to realize its expansionist aims by usurping more Arab lands and expelling more Arab citizens, is only comparable in modern history to Nazi aggression based on the fiction of racial supremacy as a justification for aggression against other peoples and the usurpation of their rights and homeland.

108. The crime of the arson of the Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem stands in repulsive contrast to man's progress towards the unity of his civilization and faith. The guilt of this crime weighs heavily upon racist Zionism, which occupies Jerusalem by the force of arms, destroying the houses of God as well as the houses of the Palestinians and undeterred in fulfilling its dreams of expansion and domination by any law, be it of God or man. The crime of the arson of Al Aqsa Mosque is not the first crime by Zionism on the land of Palestine or other Arab lands, nor will it be its last, so long as it believes that the international community is incapable of standing up to enforce on it the rule of the Charter.

109. Every day that passes without the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories is, in itself, a new aggression. It is an aggression whose dangerous and criminal character is constantly aggravated with every raid Israel commits against the Arab countries and every attack it commits against Arab civilians, civilian targets and Arab economic achievements.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Riad spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

110. The crimes which Israel commits daily against the Arab citizens in the occupied Arab territories reach, in the case of Israel, the same level of criminality practised by Nazi Germany against the peoples of occupied Europe. Israel deludes itself in believing that by throwing thousands of Arab citizens into the camps of torture, by expelling more Arab citizens, by the destruction of Arab villages and houses, and all other measures of police terror against the people of the occupied territories, it can ultimately achieve its aim of forcing Arab citizens to submit to occupation and to give up their legitimate resistance. But Israel is as hopelessly blind as were all other occupiers to a fundamental fact—that the struggle of all peoples against occupation and aggression is ultimately more powerful than all the armies of occupation, and that the faith and the will of liberation inevitably overcome forces of usurpation and aggression.

111. This is the fourth time that the General Assembly has convened under the shadow of Israel's occupation of the territories of three States Members of the United Nations since Israel committed its aggression on 5 June 1967.

112. The General Assembly first met in an emergency special session, especially called in June 1967, to consider the situation arising from Israel's aggression against the Arab countries. Despite the diversions of views which characterized the deliberations at that session, there nevertheless existed one fundamental point: the absolute necessity of withdrawing Israeli forces from all the territories they have occupied. Every Member State of this Organization voted for this principle in the General Assembly, whether they supported the non-aligned draft resolution<sup>4</sup> or the Latin American draft.<sup>5</sup> There was not a single proposal submitted to the emergency special session which failed to provide for Israel's withdrawal from all of the occupied territories. At its emergency special session, the General Assembly also adopted, by an overwhelming majority, resolutions stating the illegitimacy of the Israeli measures for the annexation of Jerusalem [*resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)*]. This continued to be the United Nations position in many resolutions which it has persistently adopted and which Israel, with equal persistence, continued in arrogance and defiance to reject; the last of these was adopted by the Security Council on the 15th of this very month [*resolution 271 (1969)*].

113. With regard to the citizens of the occupied territories, who have been forced to leave their homes as a result of Israeli aggression, the General Assembly has adopted unanimous resolutions which provide for their return to their homes in the occupied territories. Israel expresses its continuous rejection and defiance of these resolutions in terms and in a language heretofore unheard in the international society.

114. In the autumn of 1967 intensive consultations were held among the members of the Security Council, in which the permanent members of the Security Council played a principal role. These consultations resulted in the adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which provides for a peaceful settlement in the

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5, document A/L.522/Rev.3.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

Middle East. In accordance with this resolution, the Secretary-General appointed a Special Representative for the implementation of the resolution.

115. Since his first visit to Cairo in December 1967, the United Arab Republic has informed Ambassador Jarring of its acceptance of the Security Council resolution and of its readiness to implement all its obligations arising from this resolution. We also proposed to him, in the course of our contacts, that he should set up a time-table for the implementation of the resolution.

116. Furthermore, we have informed the Special Representative that we consider it necessary that the Security Council should undertake the supervision of, and guarantee the implementation of, the resolution of 22 November [242 (1967)]. This necessity stems from Israel's record of aggression and unilateral denunciation of the international agreements it has signed with the Arab States.

117. Israel has rejected the Security Council resolution. Israeli spokesmen in the United Nations have desperately attempted to conceal this fact, through semantics and deceptive abuse of words. The official statements which Israeli leaders have been issuing, in competition with one another, have served in revealing, beyond any doubt, Israel's plans for territorial expansion, as well as its policy of defiance and rejection of the Security Council resolution.

118. There is not a single principle in that resolution which has escaped Israel's rejection, either by deed or by word. It has already taken measures to annex Arab territories, and its leaders have reiterated their insistence on territorial aggrandizement in the occupied territories. Thus, Israel rejects and challenges: the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war; the principle of the sovereignty of States over their territories; the principle of territorial integrity and political independence of the States in the region. Furthermore, Israel, by its continued occupation of Arab territories, is obstructing the termination of the state of belligerency.

119. Throughout 1968 and in the first few months of 1969, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General pursued his contacts; these were destined to come to a standstill, however, as a result of the collision between Israel's policy of expansion and the provisions of the Security Council resolution. It was impossible for Israel, no matter how clever its spokesmen were in the abuse of words, to conceal this one fundamental contradiction. This has resulted in the fact that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General was forced, early this year, to suspend his contacts.

120. In the early spring, France took the initiative to hold talks among the four permanent members of the Security Council with a view to implementing the 22 November 1967 Security Council resolution, and to assist the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the pursuit of his mission.

121. On our part, we have welcomed the initiative of France, whose Middle Eastern policy has been consistently motivated by a consciousness of its responsibilities and its

commitments arising from the Charter—a stand which has been greatly appreciated by the Arab peoples. We have also welcomed the talks by the four Powers arising out of their special responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security, and the fact that these consultations have taken place within the framework of the Security Council resolution and its implementation. Once again, Israel stood against this step and declared its opposition to this new attempt aimed at the implementation of the Security Council resolution.

122. Today the entire world is witness to Israel's plan of expansion, as revealed by its actions in the occupied territories and the declarations of its leaders.

123. First, there is the West Bank of the Jordan. The Prime Minister of Israel stated in February 1969 that "the Jordan River must become a security border for Israel with all that that implies" and that the Israeli army was to be stationed "on the strip along that border".

124. Secondly, there is Jerusalem. Israeli spokesmen here and outside the United Nations have wasted no opportunity of asserting that the process of annexation is irreversible and unnegotiable.

125. Thirdly, the Golan Heights: Israeli leaders have emphasized, time and again, that Israel will retain the Syrian Golan Heights.

126. Fourthly, the Gaza Strip: Israeli leaders have also declared that they will continue to retain the Gaza Strip.

127. Fifthly, the Sinai Peninsula: Israel has declared that it will continue the occupation of the eastern and southern parts of Sinai.

128. Mr. Yigal Allon, Deputy Prime Minister of Israel, declared in August 1969 that a part of Sinai, which stretches 64 kilometres from Rafah to El Arish on the Mediterranean coast down to southern Sinai, has been added to "municipal Israeli administration" by annexing it to a newly-formed municipal region, namely, the "Eshkol region in the Negev desert". In the celebration of this event, the Deputy Prime Minister of Israel made the following announcement: "It benefits Eshkol's memory that this should be the first regional council to include an area beyond the former demarcation lines".

129. That is Israel's plan for expansion in the occupied Arab territories. It operates on the basis of two complementary components: annexing Arab territories and expelling Arab citizens. This is the same policy which turned 1.5 million Palestinians into refugees who have lived in camps for the past twenty years and caused the displacement of another half million people as a result of Israel's latest aggression.

130. By persisting in its policy of expansion against the Arab States, Israel not only commits a crime against the Charter, but it also undermines the peaceful settlement adopted by the Security Council and threatens world peace.

131. It is the duty of every Member State of this Organization to stand up to Israel's aggression against the



Charter and the decisions of the United Nations. The obligation of every State positively to oppose Israel's aggression is rooted in each and every principle upon which international order, as laid down in the Charter, has been built. Forcing Israel to withdraw its aggressive forces from the occupied Arab territories and to abandon its policy of expansion, in conformity with the norms of the Charter, is not only a sacred national duty, responsibility for which falls on the countries victim of aggression, but is, at the same time, a collective duty to which all Members must subscribe, if we are to preserve the integrity and, indeed, the very existence of the United Nations order.

132. I wish here to refer to the just stand taken by the Assembly of Heads of African States and Governments at its sixth session held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 9 September 1969, concerning Israel's acts of aggression. They have adopted the following resolution [AHG/Res. 56 (VI)]:

"We, the Heads of State and Government, meeting in Addis Ababa this day, 9 September 1969,

"*Deeply moved* by reports that a further aggression has been perpetrated today by Israeli forces against another part of the national territory of the United Arab Republic,

"1. *Condemn* this act of aggression, like all other acts of aggression directed against a sister country;

"2. *Desire to reaffirm*, in these circumstances, our unwavering solidarity with the United Arab Republic;

"3. *Demand* the immediate withdrawal of the foreign occupation forces;

"4. *Appeal* to the conscience of mankind to do everything possible in order to spare our continent, which has suffered all too often from invasion by foreign forces, from becoming afresh the scene of tension and conflict, with unforeseeable consequences for Africa and the rest of the world."

133. The Heads of African States and Governments also issued another resolution [AHG/Res. 57 (VI)] in which they declared their solidarity and support to the United Arab Republic and called for "the withdrawal of foreign troops from all Arab territories occupied since 5 June 1967, in accordance with the resolution taken by the Security Council on 22 November 1967". They also appealed to all Member States of the Organization of African Unity to "use their influence to ensure a strict implementation of this resolution".

134. There can be no question that the implementation of the decisions and resolutions adopted by this world Organization, in matters of direct bearing on international peace and security and the safeguarding of territorial integrity and political independence for all States, is the most imperative among all collective duties shouldered by all Member States. The permanent members of the Security Council bear a special responsibility within the framework of this collective obligation.

135. In this connexion, I wish to refer specifically to the position of the United States, which continues to supply

Israel with war planes and other weapons while Israel continues its occupation and declares its expansionist plans. The Skyhawk and Phantom planes which Israel receives from the United States are the same planes which every day raid the Arab peoples, kill Arab citizens and follow the Palestinian refugees in their tents and camps with napalm bombs and other instruments of death and destruction.

136. The United States policy of support to Israel in the military, political and financial spheres, while Israel occupies Arab territories, is a policy which could at least be described as a violation of the provisions of the Charter and a denial of peace in the Middle East.

137. The United States support to Israel, and its share of responsibility in the present state of aggression and denial of peace in the Middle East, acquires a more serious character when we recall that this support runs contrary to the commitments which the United States had previously undertaken upon itself. The United States has continuously affirmed the absolute necessity of respecting the Armistice Agreements, its support for the territorial integrity and the political independence of all States in the Middle East, and its firm opposition to aggression in the area.

138. Today, we are entitled to ask the United States whether it does not see in Israel's occupation of the territories of Arab States a violation of the territorial integrity and the political independence of these States; and whether its supply of warplanes and other weapons to Israel, while Israel occupies the territories of Arab States, does indeed constitute an opposition to aggression, or whether it is rather a support of aggression.

139. I wish further to refer to the United States position with regard to the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)]. That is a resolution which the United States voted for and declared it would support. We are entitled today to ask the United States how it can reconcile its support for that resolution with its supplying of Skyhawks and Phantoms to Israel at a time when Israel has already declared its annexation of Arab territories, in full violation of the Security Council resolution, as well as its unqualified rejection of the United Nations resolutions on the Palestinian refugees.

140. It is within our right to ask the United States to follow in the Middle East a policy of justice compatible with the Charter and with its own commitments, and to proceed from the principle that the right of an Arab man to peace, to his land and to his home should not be sacrificed to satisfy Israel's dreams of territorial expansion.

141. We also believe that the United States is capable of casting its weight behind peace and the implementation of the peaceful settlement proposed in the resolution adopted by the Security Council. We believe that when the United States proceeds along that road, prospects for making peace in the Middle East will be greatly improved.

142. The Israeli leaders want the world to believe that the Palestinian people, who have lived in Palestine for thousands of years, never existed. The Prime Minister of Israel declared this to the world in the course of an interview

published by the *Sunday Times* of London on 15 June 1969. She stated:

“It was not as though there was a Palestinian people in Palestine considering themselves a Palestinian people, and we came and threw them out and took their country away from them. They did not exist.”

This statement reveals the extent of Israel's attempt to suppress the truth. The Prime Minister of Israel imagines that by such a statement she will be able to conceal the crimes which Zionism has committed against the people of Palestine in Palestine.

143. The struggle that the Palestinian people are waging today, in conditions which no other people have ever faced, is a struggle for their right to exist, to return to their homes, and to exercise their right to self-determination. By virtue of this fact, the Palestinian people's struggle incontestably attains the highest degree of legitimacy and deserves the support of all forces that have faith in the right of every man, regardless of his race, colour or religion, to live on his land, to defend his existence and to determine his future.

144. The United Nations was brought into existence for the very purpose of never allowing a situation similar to that existing today in the Middle East to exist. That situation cannot possibly continue without assuming that the international order on which this Organization is founded has finally collapsed, and that the principles of the Charter have been completely shattered with Israel's aggression on 5 June 1967.

145. For our part, we refuse to submit to aggression. History is a witness to the fact that the will of peace, in mobility and in action, is far stronger than the will of war and aggression. In this our faith has no limits. We thus refuse to believe that the international community can possibly allow Israel to continue a policy that is destined to undermine and ruin the rule of the Charter.

146. In the history of this Organization there is no example, apart from Israel's aggression, more indicative of the serious hazards to international peace and security resulting from the refusal of one Member State to abide by the decisions of the Security Council and other resolutions of the United Nations.

147. In this connexion, I wish to express our appreciation of the positive initiative taken by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to include in the agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly a new item on strengthening international security. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union presented to us [*1756th meeting*], in his important address here some days ago, various constructive ideas, amongst which is the need for the implementation by Member States of the Security Council decisions and for respect for the provisions of the Charter.

148. My delegation, together with other delegations, looks forward to the deliberations that will take place on this item. We are confident that those deliberations will lead to positive results for the future effectiveness of the United Nations system.

149. In the Middle East, faithful implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, under the supervision and guarantees of the Council, is the road to peace. Israel's call for direct negotiations with Arab States while it occupies their territories is a call for capitulation by those States. At the time Israel calls for direct negotiations with Arab countries, it continues to occupy their territories and attack Arab cities. At the same time that it calls for those direct negotiations, Israeli leaders insist that the annexation of Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights is non-negotiable.

150. In this connexion, I wish to refer to the annual report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the work of the Organization, submitted to the twenty-third session, in which he states that his Personal Representative on Jerusalem stated

“... that Israel leaders had made clear to him beyond any doubt that Israel was taking every step to place under its sovereignty those parts of the city not controlled before June 1967”.<sup>6</sup>

151. In an interview published by *Newsweek* magazine in its issue of 17 February 1969, the Prime Minister of Israel stated: “As for the Golan Heights, we will, quite simply, never give them up. The same goes for Jerusalem. Here there is no flexibility at all.” In the same interview, the Israeli Prime Minister referred to Jerusalem in the following words: “There is no possible way to compromise on Jerusalem.”

152. No matter how much Israel's representatives in the United Nations resort to the use of semantics and the deceptive abuse of words, they will inevitably collide with the truth. The truth here is that Israel's call for direct negotiations from the position of its occupation of Arab territories aims at imposing its policy of expansion and fait accompli upon the Arab countries. This has been clearly affirmed by Israeli words as well as Israeli deeds. These are the same negotiations that Nazi Germany sought to impose upon the occupied countries of Europe. These negotiations are inherently in contradiction to peace. Indeed, they would be but the continuation of aggression and the instrument for consolidating the results of aggression, in complete denial of all the values of the Charter and in an attempt to return to an era when international society was subject to the law of the jungle.

153. The only alternative to the present state of aggression and war prevailing in the Middle East is the faithful implementation of all the provisions of the peaceful settlement proposed in the resolution adopted by the Security Council of 22 November 1967 [*242 (1967)*]. The implementation of that resolution requires the fulfilment of the following three points: first, the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all the territories they have occupied as a result of the aggression of 5 June 1967. That withdrawal would be the practical implementation of terminating the state of belligerency in the Middle East. Secondly, the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people must be recognized and the United Nations resolutions affirming the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes or to receive compensation must be implemented. Those resolu-

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 1, p. 13.

tions constitute the formula which the international community has adopted for the achievement of justice for the people of Palestine. Thirdly, the Security Council must undertake adequate guarantees for peace and security in the Middle East, and for the implementation of all provisions of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

154. The struggle of our people falls within the framework of the universal struggle to establish just international relations which will ultimately flow into the current of man's progress and advancement. The people of the United Arab Republic have been carrying out the movement for industrialization and an increase in their arable land. They have already begun to use the electric power provided by the Aswan High Dam, which is destined for completion in the course of next year. It will be erected on the Nile as a monumental example of the creative co-operation with the friendly people of the Soviet Union, to whom I wish to express here the deep appreciation of the people of the United Arab Republic for their firm stand against Israeli aggression, for their efforts to establish peace based on justice and the rule of the Charter and for the support given to the peoples of Asia and Africa in their just struggle against colonialism and foreign domination.

155. The United Arab Republic refused to allow the conditions of aggression to disrupt its pursuit of the realization of the principles of peaceful coexistence and international co-operation. We have joined our efforts with those of all the other non-aligned countries in a new stage of the development of the principles of non-alignment. The last consultative meeting of the representatives of the Governments of non-aligned countries, held from 8-12 July 1969 in Belgrade, was a new landmark on the road of non-alignment adopted by many countries and peoples of the third world.

156. Meanwhile, the United Arab Republic continued, together with its sister African States, to work within the Organization of African Unity for the complete liberation of the African continent from colonialism and racism and to provide the African personality with new opportunities for creativeness and for effecting progress on the land of Africa.

157. We have been constantly subscribing to the international efforts aimed at establishing just economic international relations necessary for a more accelerated rate of development, and at the realization of a better life for the peoples of the developing countries.

158. The attainment of peace in Viet-Nam continues to require a complete and immediate end to all military operations against the people of Viet-Nam, and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of Viet-Nam, so that the Viet-Nameese people will be able to determine their own future and to build on Viet-Nameese land as heroically as they have fought for it.

159. The United Arab Republic has continued its policy of working in the various international forums for general and complete disarmament and for ensuring the peaceful character of the new spheres conquered by man. We believe

that further efforts must be exerted towards the realization of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. Indeed, several important steps await the nuclear Powers' agreements in the field of disarmament which would strengthen international security and make available more human and material resources for the benefit of all mankind.

160. It is my duty to convey to you the state of mind prevailing among the people of the United Arab Republic concerning the aggression on their territory. Our faith is absolute in the inevitable freeing of every inch of Arab territories occupied as a result of Israel's aggression on 5 June 1967. Failure is the ultimate destiny of Israel's invasion.

161. This faith is part and parcel of every beat of life in the heart of every man, woman and child in the land of Egypt. No matter how much military assistance the occupying Israeli forces receive, never will they overcome the will and the determination of the people of Egypt to recover the occupied territory, nor will they ever be able to impose any capitulation on the people of Egypt, or any other Arab peoples.

162. Our refusal to submit to the *diktat* of aggression and our faith in its inevitable failure not only give expression to our national commitment, but also carry the conviction of and give honour to all human sacrifices made throughout history to establish an international society capable of maintaining peace and bringing justice.

163. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Philippines to speak in the exercise of his right of reply.

164. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): My delegation notes with deep regret that the representative of Malaysia, Mr. Ramani, in his statement yesterday, saw fit to reply in somewhat flippant terms to the friendly, restrained and reasonable reference to the Philippine claim to Sabah, made by H. E. the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines in his policy statement before this Assembly.

165. With all due respect, I should like to say to the representative of Malaysia that the Philippine claim cannot be dismissed unilaterally, nor can it be wished nor laughed out of court. The justice of a cause is not gauged by the quantity of verbiage used but by the firmness and dignity with which it is pursued.

166. I should like to assure the Assembly that this just and legitimate claim will be maintained in the same firm, friendly and peaceful way for as long as may be necessary to obtain a just and orderly settlement. Our confidence in this case is based on the simple conviction that our cause is just and that time and history will vindicate it.

167. The PRESIDENT: I take this opportunity of thanking the representatives of the Sudan, the United Arab Republic and Lebanon for the compliments they paid the Chair.

*The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.*