



CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

	<i>Page</i>
Speech by Mr. Malik (Indonesia)	1
Speech by Mr. Ramphal (Guyana)	4
Speech by Mr. Muller (South Africa)	11
Statement by the representative of Guatemala	14
Statement by the representative of Somalia	14
Statement by the representative of the United Kingdom	15

President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Tarabanov (Bulgaria),
Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. MALIK (Indonesia): I should like to begin by expressing, on behalf of my delegation, our appreciation and admiration of Mr. Corneliu Manescu, who so ably discharged the duties and responsibilities of the Presidency of the General Assembly during the twenty-second session.

2. To the new President, I should like to extend the warmest wishes of the Government and people of the Republic of Indonesia, as well as my own, on his election to the Presidency. This Organization has already benefited greatly from his wisdom. I am convinced, therefore, that under his Presidency, the twenty-third session of the General Assembly will be guided to a prominent place in the records of the United Nations.

3. Another year in the life of the United Nations is unfolding before us. A new country, Swaziland, has attained its freedom and taken its place in this world body. It is my earnest hope that the independence of Swaziland will bring the great African continent, specifically the southern part, a step closer to the ideal of complete freedom.

4. Once again we are convened to give an accounting before this world forum of whether we have lived up to the principles and purposes of the Charter. If we pause briefly to review the year behind us, we must admit sadly that the world is not yet ready to realize the ideals that we have so solemnly proclaimed we would pursue.

5. Apparently mankind still refuses to learn from the mistakes made by this generation and the previous one in the art of living together. Far from finding solutions to world problems in a spirit of amity and mutual under-

standing, we seem to have reversed our direction. As the Secretary-General points out in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, "there has been a serious decline in the standards of international ethics and morality, with States relying increasingly on force and violence as a means of resolving their international differences" [A/7201/Add.1, para. 174]. Indeed, the level of violence that rages through Europe, Asia, the Middle East and southern Africa seems to compete about the degree to which fundamental human rights and dignity are to be destroyed before the world comes to its senses.

6. With regard to the situation in Czechoslovakia, the Indonesian Government deplores the use of force as a means of settling international differences, contrary both to the principles of international law and to the Charter of the United Nations. As we affirmed in a statement on 24 August 1968, "the sovereignty of the Czechoslovakian people . . . should be respected".¹ It is the inalienable right of the people of that country, as of any independent country, to determine its own future free from foreign intervention or pressure.

7. The developments in Czechoslovakia have no doubt heightened international tensions, which could have serious adverse effects on international relations. These consequences, foreseen by the Secretary-General, could very well become a reality. I share his hope that the two big Powers of NATO and the Warsaw Pact will refrain from using Czechoslovakia as an excuse for a military build-up which would make the ominous state of the world even more frightening. Therefore, we must redouble our efforts to relax international tension and to reach for just solutions in our search for peace.

8. It is clearly in the interests of the major Powers, as well as of the smaller Powers, strictly to observe the provisions of the Charter at securing a more peaceful world order and to use the United Nations as an instrument in strengthening peace.

9. In our region of the world, the war in Viet-Nam continues unabated. If not soon arrested, this situation, which already obstructs the attainment of peace in South-East Asia, may well jeopardize the security of the international community. As long as the national interests of the Viet-Nameese people are considered as secondary to the interplay of outside forces and pressures, the problem of Viet-Nam will remain unsolved. My Government has always maintained that it is the Viet-Nameese people themselves who are best able to decide the kind of peace and stability which they need. It is not for others to prescribe those conditions for them.

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Supplement for July, August and September 1968, document S/8798.

10. Peace will not come as long as the road towards it is infested with instruments of death and destruction. Only after these instruments have been withdrawn can conditions be created which will lead to the kind of peaceful settlement that has for so long escaped the Viet-Nameese people. Conciliation and mutual understanding will bear the fruits of peace; coercion and force merely produce more violence.

11. The developments in the Middle East have not relieved the tension that pervades that region. Admittedly, the present situation is a partial respite from the massive clash of forces that we saw last year; but the continued uneasiness of the situation is still pregnant with the seeds of greater conflict, unless the United Nations succeeds in healing the wounds caused by the invasion by Israeli troops. My Government will continue its efforts to search for a solution that guarantees the national interests and the territorial integrity of the Arab countries.

12. In this connexion, my Government maintains that the withdrawal of Israeli troops to their positions of prior to 5 June 1967 is the necessary first step for a comprehensive solution of the Middle East crisis. Under no circumstances can the Indonesian Government condone the territorial acquisitions so flagrantly inflicted by Israel upon Arab soil.

13. The plight of the refugees and the victims of war is a sad aftermath of the war which demands the urgent and immediate attention of the United Nations. This Organization would fail in its duty to humanity if these victims were left to fend for themselves with no prospect of relief. My Government, therefore, reiterates that the machinery of the United Nations should be marshalled to solve this tragic aspect of the Middle East crisis.

14. Such is the discouraging picture that portrays the situation in the world today. It is a painful reminder of that historic day in San Francisco in June almost a quarter of a century ago, when the original signatories to the Charter pledged the determination of their peoples "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

15. They also pledged to promote "higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development". Thus it is clear that, while the current preoccupation of this Assembly is the prevention of war, the architects of the United Nations intended to emphasize the cultivation of the fruits of peace—peace not merely as the absence of war but rather as the presence of political stability, economic prosperity and social justice.

16. To achieve this, we solemnly launched the United Nations Development Decade almost ten years ago. We were inspired in this lofty enterprise, and I quote resolution 1710 (XVI), by the consideration:

"... that the economic and social development of the economically less developed countries is not only of primary importance to those countries but is also basic to the attainment of international peace and security and to a faster and mutually beneficial increase in world prosperity".

17. This Decade has nearly passed into the pages of history. It is, therefore, regrettable to note that most of

these pages are void of productive contents or are inscribed with reports of regression in the economic level of the developing countries. A cause for even more serious concern is the growing schism in the socio-economic level between the developing and the more advanced countries which these pages reveal. Here I draw the attention of this Assembly to the discouraging findings of the UNCTAD secretariat that, in the period 1955-1960, 33 per cent of the entire population of the developing world lived in countries whose national output *per capita* grew at a yearly average of less than 1.5 per cent and, in the period 1960-1965, the proportion of the population living in countries with such low growth rates had risen to 66 per cent.

18. This alarming trend still continues despite the tremendous efforts of the developing nations to improve their life. The over-all picture that emerged from the second session of UNCTAD in New Delhi recently only reaffirms this concern. Admittedly, there have been a few positive results in certain sections of trade and development. However, the actual needs of the developing countries are far greater than the results yet accomplished.

19. The plight of the developing countries was aptly reflected in the words of the Secretary-General at the 1531st meeting of the Economic and Social Council at the opening meeting of its forty-fifth session, on 8 July 1968:

"... the poor are increasingly aware of the gap that separates them from the rich, increasingly impatient at the denial of adequate help for them to bridge the gap. Failure to act is an invitation to violence."

20. Failure to act will leave us open to the accusation that we have failed in our duty to secure for posterity a world free from poverty, disease, hunger and ignorance: the very elements that continue to corrode the foundations of world peace.

21. We stand at the very gates of the next Development Decade. We must not enter these gates as ill-prepared as we did the first. Thus, in the short time that is available, we must carefully prepare the foundations and build on them a better structure than the old one.

22. My delegation believes that a specific framework of international development strategy for concerted international action is required—one that focuses on certain basic issues that demand our special attention. Identifying these issues would help us in selecting specific goals and targets as well as the most efficient way in which they can be carried out in the coming Decade.

23. The realization of these objectives depends on the availability of public and private means to finance them. We can conceive extensive plans, but they will not serve developing countries without the required financing. This lack could be overcome if we could approach trade and aid pragmatically and objectively. More liberal trade policies on the part of the developed countries would guarantee a better opportunity for increased export earnings for the developing countries. The amount and nature of aid from the advanced countries and from the international financial institutions will no doubt have a great bearing upon the pace of economic growth in developing countries. These plans would, moreover, be successfully implemented if

appropriate and continuing machinery could be devised to supervise and review constantly the operations of such plans.

24. The task that thus confronts us is gigantic. Let us, therefore, be realistic in our attitude and re-deploy our forces more efficiently to set a more fruitful course for the coming Decade. Only in that way can we mobilize public opinion in the developed and developing countries to contribute to the success of the socio-economic development of the world.

25. In that connexion, I should like to state that my delegation feels that several new items are worthy of our attention. The proposal with regard to teaching the ideals of the United Nations, with particular reference to human rights, to young people should be explored carefully. Similarly, the item entitled "One day of war for peace" merits our serious consideration, as does the proposal to launch a study of the human environment.

26. The United Nations has often reaffirmed that the welfare of the developing countries is as much the concern of the developed nations as of the developing. At the same time, we in Indonesia fully realize that no nation can become truly great merely through the generosity of others. The achievement of the social and economic well-being of a nation is first and foremost the responsibility of its own people.

27. Fully recognizing this, my Government has formulated a new five-year development plan for the period 1969-1973. This plan, drawn up on a priority basis, accords the highest priority to the immediate needs of our people. We do not deny, however, that external assistance is needed in a developing country such as ours to speed up the successful realization of our five-year plan. The Indonesian Government has, therefore, provided incentives to attract foreign capital and technological investment to help utilize our available natural and human resources for the benefit of our people.

28. The aim of being of service to the world has inspired Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Indonesia to initiate the Association of South-East Asian Nations, or ASEAN for short. The goals of this Association are mainly economic and social, in order that we may first meet the pressing needs of our peoples. As President Suharto of Indonesia so aptly remarked at the opening of the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting held in Djakarta in August of this year:

"We [the peoples of the Association of South-East Asian Nations] are struggling to give fulfilment to our independence through our national aims and are aspiring to elevate the welfare of our peoples in a manner that accords with our respective identities."

This demonstrates how the peoples of ASEAN are striving, in their own way, to contribute to both regional and world prosperity.

29. We recognize that no organization springs forth full grown. We do not expect ASEAN to do so. But, by the very process of meeting and working together in a spirit of mutual respect, goodwill and conciliation, we hope to

overcome many obstacles. We are confident that this spirit of conciliation will prevail in the question of Sabah, thereby strengthening the development of peace in our region and contributing to world stability as well.

30. Material wealth will not help the millions of our fellow men if so many are still kept in spiritual and physical bondage. On the African continent, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal have conspired in an "unholy alliance" to exercise unwarranted superiority of status over the indigenous people whom they keep in human subjugation.

31. In the whole of southern Africa, we still witness the most blatant violations of freedom and human rights. Resolutions of the United Nations have been defied repeatedly. The general situation is daily becoming more serious. Still, my Government, as a member of the Council for Namibia, will do its utmost to relieve the situation. It is indeed an unholy aspect of human relations when racial discrimination is practised upon a people which is already kept in unjustified captivity. Indeed, this is in complete disregard of the letter and spirit of resolution 1514 (XV), which this Assembly adopted to promote the welfare of humanity. To make matters worse, these colonial Powers not only enjoy the tacit consent but even the active support of their allies. The latter, having their own material gain at heart and holding vested interests in the continuation of these deplorable conditions, prefer not to hear the cries of anguish from the oppressed peoples of Africa.

32. If previously the question of colonialism was merely a matter of releasing the colonized from the grasp of the colonizer, now a new element has further complicated the issue. This is the presence of a silent partner, pretending innocence in complicity, but holding vested interests in the continuation of the existing shameful conditions.

33. These new problems, among others, have not been dealt with adequately in the resolution on decolonization. It is necessary, therefore, for us to make changes and adjustments in this area to correspond to the new problems.

34. The first United Nations decade for development as well as for decolonization will soon belong to history. For both, a new decade looms on the horizon. Thus, we must begin to make the necessary preparations for entering a new era of development and decolonization. It would not be amiss, therefore, if we were to start exploring measures that could co-ordinate the aims of these two decades. When we plan for development we must consider not only ways to improve the condition of those already able to walk, although perhaps at a slow pace, but also ways to assist those who will soon learn to stand on their own feet.

35. Membership of the United Nations signifies that the peoples here represented are fully committed to the cause of world peace. Is it thus not inconsistent with our precious commitment to obstruct the very concept intended to bring peace if its foundations appear to be cracked? I am referring to the peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations system. Two world wars have already brought tragedy to mankind. The world in which we now live has been described as a "twilight" world, neither completely at peace nor fully at war. Such a condition of life makes it

imperative that the United Nations be equipped with mandatory powers to make arrangements to modify passions, perhaps resulting from an unintended error of judgement, before they are aggravated into more serious conflict.

36. Peace-keeping operations instituted by the United Nations have, when the occasion permitted, lighted the road to peace where twilight had obscured vision. My delegation is accordingly convinced that even more satisfactory results could be achieved if such operations were to receive the greater attention and wider support they deserve. But my delegation also realizes that the question of peace-keeping operations has become bogged down in the quagmire of legalities, constitutionality and, above all, power politics.

37. The Indonesian delegation could understand it if we rejected measures that had proved ineffective or harmful in operation. It would, however, be beyond comprehension to impeach the workings of arrangements that had already demonstrated their validity in preserving world peace.

38. Indeed, the world has changed tremendously since the original signatories fashioned the Charter, and it must continue to change if it is not to become stagnant. We must therefore not keep our eyes fixed on the letter of the Charter and say that because it does not provide for a certain objective its attainment is not possible. On the contrary, this merely enhances our responsibility to find the necessary correctives where the Charter appears wanting, or where world conditions urgently demand arrangements not provided for in this historic document.

39. As Members of the United Nations, we have committed ourselves to resolving our differences peacefully, using its machinery and faithfully observing its principles. The great Powers especially have the solemn responsibility and obligation, as permanent members of the Security Council, to maintain peace and security within the framework of the Charter.

40. Peace, however, is not a matter of legal formulae or constitutional procedures. Much less is it the exclusive property of those who wield the sceptre of power. Peace is the common property of all mankind. It should not be allowed to run the gauntlet of political wrangling and power politics. Whenever peace is threatened, the survival of mankind is in jeopardy.

41. To revert to unilateral action would reverse the whole trend of history and lead us back into chaos. Therefore, we have no alternative but to proceed in the direction to which the Charter leads, by ensuring that this Organization fulfils the role which mankind expects of it.

42. It is said that service is the rent we pay for inhabiting this earth. On behalf of the Government and people of Indonesia I have the privilege to reaffirm our resolve to work in the service of peace and freedom for mankind.

43. Mr. RAMPHAL (Guyana): It is with a very real sense of regional pride that I congratulate the President on his election to preside over the General Assembly at its twenty-third session. As a distinguished son of Guatemala, as an

experienced diplomat and minister of the Latin American region and, perhaps above all, as a devoted internationalist, his election represents a source of great satisfaction to the Government and to the people of Guyana. To us, coming as we do from the same part of the world and linked as we are by the comradeship of small and developing nations, it is a special pleasure to assure him of Guyana's support during his term of office. In so doing, I am happy to pledge the co-operation not merely of the Guyana delegation but also of our Permanent Representative who will be serving with the President during the life of this Assembly as one of the Vice-Presidents. We in Guyana are particularly gratified that this early opportunity which has been afforded to us of contributing to the organizational work of the Assembly comes at a time when so close a regional colleague occupies the President's chair.

44. I hope—and may the future prove this to be no excess of optimism—that the months which lie ahead of us will bear witness to a world less convulsed by national and international tragedy than have the months through which we have passed since the beginning of the twenty-second session of the Assembly. For all of that troubled time this Assembly was led with assurance, with humanity and with a sensitive care for the peace of the world by the President's distinguished predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Corneliu Manescu, Foreign Minister of Romania. My delegation wishes to pay tribute to him for the outstanding service he rendered to the General Assembly and to the United Nations.

45. As this new session begins, we need to reassess our progress towards an ordered international society and to renew our commitments to its pursuit. The President, in his inaugural statement, set before us with understanding and realism the problems which lie ahead. In the closing passages of that statement he gave expression to sentiments which many Governments must share, perhaps more particularly the Governments of smaller States, and they are sentiments which express what I believe the peoples of the world everywhere recognize as the basic necessity of our time. He said:

“What is needed is not a new organization; what is needed is simply a return to the spirit of the Charter, a return to those principles of human coexistence which at both the international and national levels, should set the standard for a humanist political philosophy.” [1674th meeting, para. 62.]

If we could make those thoughts the theme of this general debate; if we could make those thoughts the creed of this twenty-third Assembly; if, above all, we could make those thoughts the basis of international action during the life of this ensuing session, then perhaps we might begin to restore the faith of the peoples of the world in the United Nations and in its pursuits.

46. If the general debate is to achieve anything, it must proceed on a commitment to recapturing the belief of the world in our seriousness of purpose, and to rebuilding the faith of men and women everywhere in the value of our endeavours and of this great institution through which we must pursue them.

47. Conscious of these considerations, Guyana's contribution to this debate will not be an attempt to range

through the broad spectrum of international affairs; instead, it will be an effort to focus attention upon matters which seem to my Government of transcending importance and about which we feel qualified to speak with the authenticity of experience.

48. The first of these relates to the special problems of the small States in a world from which avarice, expansionism and vaulting ambition have not yet been banished. My country is a small State. We are one of the States which this Organization helped to bring to freedom. We are a community of three-quarters of a million people, and our land covers an area of 83,000 square miles. We are a racially various people whose forebears were moved mainly from Africa and Asia in the cause of enriching the treasury of metropolitan power and the prestige that once attached to empire. That time has passed. Today, as in so many of the new countries, a national identity now transcends these ethnic differences, and with the self-respect that comes with self-determination we are working to build a just, stable, democratic multiracial society.

49. Our experience may therefore hold lessons for world society and our special problems may have import for many States—certainly for all those like ourselves, who may be small in size and in population; who may be weak in a world in which strength still continues to be measured in units of missiles; who may be poor from centuries of neglected and retarded development; but who are rich in devotion to country and in their resolve to create a better life for their peoples and for those of the region whose destiny they share.

50. For us, these first years of independence have been rich and varied and stimulating. And just as they have been informed by the harsh realities of international existence, so they have been warmed by many acts of friendship and help. But that experience has been overshadowed by a neighbour's hostility and aggression. It is an experience that has shocked our people even as it has steeled their determination to ensure that the freedom so recently won from an imperialist Power across the seas is not overborne by a new imperialism from across our borders.

51. In my address in the general debate a year ago [*1581st meeting*] I alluded to the Venezuelan threat to my country's territorial integrity with deliberate restraint, in the belief that the traditions of a Hemisphere that has fought so valiantly against a colonial imposition must deter a new colonialism from within it, and in the belief also that with dialogue and diplomacy a sense of justice and of international morality founded upon a respect for treaties, and above all for boundary treaties, must in the end prevail.

52. The experience of the past year has led my Government to a reappraisal of all these assumptions as they relate to the policy of the Government of Venezuela. The sole response to our restraint at the international level has been the blatantly provocative occupation of a part of our border territory, an intensive pattern of clandestine interference in the internal affairs of our country, a studied campaign of economic aggression, of pressure and of intimidation directed at our development, and, most recently, one of the most flagrant acts of contempt for international law that the Hemisphere has seen. This

aggression, this interference, this intimidation make it vital to my country that I speak more plainly now before this Assembly of nations.

53. As I do so, I invite other delegations to consider the import of our experience. The continuing dangers which confront the people of my country and the future of my State imperil the interest of all small countries and the future of all small States; they imperil the survival of all States which place their faith in an international legal order, and they place in jeopardy settled boundaries the world over. I invite other delegations to mark the lessons of our experience as a commentary on the President's plea for a return to the spirit of the Charter.

54. Guyana's boundaries with Venezuela were settled nearly seventy years ago, even as the nineteenth century was drawing to its close. It was settled with due formality by an international Arbitral Tribunal established under the Treaty of Arbitration² which the Government of Venezuela had freely signed. Indeed, it may be of more than historical interest that the United States, on behalf of Venezuela, had actually threatened to go to war with Britain if Britain failed to sign that treaty. It was a treaty to settle for all time the boundary between Venezuela and what was then Britain's colony of British Guiana; and each side—Venezuela and Britain—undertook in solemn terms:

“...to consider the result of the proceeds of the Tribunal of Arbitration as a full, perfect, and final settlement of all the questions referred to the Arbitrators”.

55. The Tribunal went into the most elaborate examination of the history of the occupation of the territory; the verbatim records of hearings occupy fifty-four printed volumes, with cases and counter-cases along with additional documents, correspondence and evidence. The Government of Venezuela was represented by a plethora of justices led by an ex-President of the United States, General Harrison. On 3 October 1899, exactly sixty-nine years to this very day, the international Arbitral Tribunal presented its award. The boundary was demarcated on the ground pursuant to the Treaty and the award, and an official boundary map was drawn and promulgated. Venezuela, satisfied with its achievements, proceeded towards the fulfilment of its great destiny on the basis of the vast mineral wealth which its land yielded.

56. Through those years—through most of the first half of the present century—Venezuela found no quarrel with the award; and when finally it chose to open the question of the boundary—a question which had been closed at its instance nearly fifty years earlier—it conducted its dialogue with Britain with restraint and circumspection in the manner of equals constrained to argue but resolved never to force the issue to a trial of strength.

57. But time was on the side of those in Venezuela for whom by now eastward expansion had become an imperial crusade. The ground was well prepared. At the first sign of Guyana's movement to independence, Venezuela initiated a boundary controversy on the most tenuous grounds. The

² See *British and Foreign State Papers, 1896-1897* (London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1901), p. 57.

singular source of these grounds was, and remains to this day, a memorandum written by an American lawyer, Severo Mallet-Prevost, who was one of the junior counsel for Venezuela during the Hearing of the Tribunal.

58. Mr. Mallet-Prevost's memorandum,³ written in 1945 just after he had received from the Government of Venezuela the Order of Liberator for his services to the Republic, was, under his strict injunction to that effect, published only after his death in 1949—at a time when every other participant in the arbitration proceedings was long since dead. The posthumous memorandum contended that the Award of 1899, which decided the frontier between Guyana and Venezuela, was the result of a political deal between Britain and Russia carried into effect by collusion between the British judges and the Russian President of the Tribunal and agreed to in the interest of unanimity by the two American judges. The British judges on the Tribunal were the Lord Chief Justice of England and a judge of the High Court. The American judges were the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States chosen by the President of Venezuela and another Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The Russian President of the Tribunal was the distinguished international lawyer, Professor Frederick de Martens.

59. It was on this flimsiest pretext of an old and disappointed man's posthumous memoirs, set down some forty-five years after the events they sought to relate—it was on these shreds and patches embroidered with speculations, ambiguities and allusions to new but undisclosed evidence—that Venezuela mounted its campaign of international propaganda against Guyana as we approached independence. From then on, as Guyana's independence drew nearer, Venezuela's agitation grew fiercer threatening in veiled and indirect ways the advance to independence itself. It was out of this circumstance that, on 17 February 1966, three months before Guyana's independence, the Geneva Agreement⁴ was concluded between Venezuela and the United Kingdom; to that Agreement, Guyana, on attaining independence, became an additional party. The Agreement established a Commission of Guyanese and Venezuelan representatives charged with the task of—and I quote from the Agreement:

“seeking satisfactory solutions for the practical settlement of the controversy . . . which has arisen as a result of the Venezuelan contention that the Arbitral Award of 1899 . . . is null and void”.⁵

60. If the Commission fails to find such a solution to that controversy—and I emphasize that it is the controversy over Venezuela's allegation that the Award of the International Court of Arbitration is invalid that the Commission is concerned with—if the Commission fails to find a solution to that controversy, then Venezuela has undertaken under the Geneva Agreement that it shall resort to the procedures for peaceful settlement of disputes set out in Article 33 of the Charter and it will then be for the parties, through

those procedures, to pursue a solution to that controversy. Meanwhile, the Agreement enjoins that:

“No new claim, or enlargement of an existing claim, to territorial sovereignty in those territories shall be asserted while this Agreement is in force, nor shall any claim whatsoever be asserted otherwise than in the Mixed Commission while that Commission is in being”.⁶

61. The Agreement was signed in February 1966. My country became independent in May of that year. Barely six months had passed before Venezuela began a studied campaign of violating its provisions. In September 1966, even as the Commission was sitting in Guyana for its second meeting and in the very month of Guyana's admission to the United Nations, Venezuela brazenly occupied the Guyana half of the island of Ankoko, an island of strategic importance in one of the border rivers between our countries. The boundary demarcated pursuant to the 1899 Award had bisected that island and this was recorded both in the official boundary maps and by the survey on the ground. Indeed, so incontrovertible was this demarcation that less than a year before, in January 1966, the Venezuelan State of Bolivar which adjoins Guyana had formally promulgated its boundaries on the basis of the 1899 Award and had specifically acknowledged that the eastern half of the island belonged to Guyana. To compound the aggression, Venezuelan armed forces have established upon the island an airstrip capable of accommodating military aircraft and have turned the island itself into a military fortress.

62. And, even as this aggression continues, a range of new and devious measures have been adopted to promote a campaign of pressure and intimidation designed to shake our resolve.

63. In pursuit of its effort to overturn the boundary Treaty of 1899, Venezuela has secured the exclusion of Guyana from the Organization of American States. Guyana's experience with the Treaty of Tlatelolco—the Latin American de-nuclearization Treaty—is already well known to Member States. And to what other end than pressure has Venezuela pursued its efforts to prevent Guyana from becoming a signatory to that Treaty—a Treaty which can achieve its optimum results only when it embraces all the countries of the region?

64. I regret to say that the effort to preclude Guyana's signature of this Treaty has so far been successful in that, despite our repeated requests to the Depositary Government that a date be set for our signature in conformity with General Assembly resolution 2286 (XXII) and the express undertaking and understanding of many delegations which spoke during the debate on that resolution that the need for universality would be met, Guyana has not yet been permitted to sign the Treaty.

65. More recently, but less successfully, Venezuela attempted at the Vienna Conference on the Law of Treaties in April of this year to dilute the provisions of the International Law Commission's draft convention dealing with the sanctity of treaties—an attempt specifically directed

³ See *The American Journal of International Law*, vol. 43, No. 3, July 1949.

⁴ See *United Nations Treaty Series*, vol. 561 (1966), No. 8192, pp. 323-327.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 323.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 327.

towards providing a cloak of respectability for the abrogation of solemn treaty obligations.

66. But the violations of the Geneva Agreement have not always been overt. In 1966, Venezuelan diplomatic personnel in Guyana were engaged in clandestine attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of my country through the subversion of members of Guyana's indigenous Amerindian community. As a result, Guyana had no alternative but to expel a second secretary of the Venezuelan Embassy in Georgetown who was responsible for organizing and financing a secret meeting of Amerindian tribes in Guyana and attempting to induce them to express support for Venezuela's claim. The Government of Venezuela, this Government which has stirred the Hemisphere with its protest at the interference of other Governments in its internal political life and which has invoked the great tradition of non-intervention which has been one of the outstanding contributions of Latin American jurisprudence to the international legal system, this Government has been and continues to be deeply involved in activities which constitute a gross interference in the political life of Guyana.

67. This particular act of interference failed to achieve its goal of subversion. Venezuela's pursuit of that goal continues, and even now my Government faces a situation in which a massive effort is being made to subvert the loyalty of our indigenous Amerindian people. It is an effort which has no lack of financial resources; which functions through hand-picked and trained agents working under the direction of the Venezuelan authorities from bases situated on the Venezuelan side of the border; it is an effort which is now assuming the shape of a campaign of slander directed at estranging the indigenous peoples of Guyana from the rest of our society in the hope of advancing their affection for a Venezuelan suzerainty. A more flagrant premeditated course of interference in the internal political life of a neighbouring country directed from a governmental level it would be hard to find.

68. In recent months, these attempts to force my country into submission have reached new dimensions of ugliness when the Venezuelan Government embarked on an open crusade of economic aggression against those who, through investment, might contribute to Guyana's economic development. In April of this very year, timed to coincide with the visit of Guyana's Prime Minister to London and designed to undermine his efforts to attract investments for Guyana's development, the Venezuelan Government purchased advertising space in *The Times* of London of Saturday, 15 June and announced to the world its refusal to recognize any concessions granted by the Government of Guyana to companies operating in the area of Guyana to which Venezuela lays claim. To companies already operating within Venezuela the Venezuelan Government has announced its intention of applying sanctions should they contribute to the development of this region of Guyana.

69. When it is recalled that what Venezuela seeks is no minor border adjustment but an area of over 50,000 square miles—two-thirds of the total area of my country—the full magnitude of this policy of economic blackmail calculated to impede Guyana's development will be apparent to this Assembly. And this policy is undertaken during the United

Nations Development Decade by one of the richest and most developed countries of Latin America against another which is among the smallest and newest and poorest of the developing countries of the world.

70. And yet this was but a prelude to the most recent and sinister episode in this campaign of lawlessness and intimidation. On 9 July of this very year, the President of Venezuela issued a decree in which he purported to annex as part of the territory of Venezuela and to assert a right to exercise sovereignty over a nine-mile belt of sea extending to within three miles of the coast of Guyana and contiguous to Guyana's territorial waters. The decree is a manifest absurdity which my Government has repudiated for the nullity that it is. But, perhaps most significant of all for this Assembly, is the way in which it seeks to overthrow some of the fundamental principles underpinning the International Conventions on the Law of the Sea, which were the outcome of a major United Nations effort at defining and consolidating the principles of international law governing the territorial sea, the contiguous zone, the continental shelf, the régime of the high seas and fishery conservation.

71. Foremost among these principles is that which asserts that while the maximum freedom of mankind to exploit the resources of the sea is the goal of organized international effort, special rights of varying kinds attach to the coastal State, and to the coastal State alone, over the waters that are adjacent to its shores. It is not my intention to elaborate at this stage on the many respects in which this decree violates the rules of international law.

72. Matters are only made worse when it is recalled that Venezuela has signed and ratified the Conventions on the Law of the Sea without entering reservations which bear upon the present issue. Thus, by a single act Venezuela has flouted the Geneva Agreement; has abandoned its obligations under the International Conventions on the Law of the Sea and has compounded these treaty violations to buttress the abrogation of its solemn undertakings under the Treaty of 1897.

73. What this decree proclaims to the world—and there should be no doubt about its implication in the challenge it throws down to all maritime nations and to international society in general—is not merely the absurdity of a belt of Venezuelan territorial waters interposed between Guyana's territorial sea and the high seas and superimposed upon Guyana's contiguous zone and above Guyana's continental shelf, but the abandonment by the Government of Venezuela of all semblance of regard for international obligations, least in so far as those obligations seem to stand in the way of its usurpation of my country's territory.

74. Nor is this a matter that we can treat with complacency as an empty gesture leaving the defiance of international law to be required at the hands of international society generally. My Government has been obliged to take note that this decree has specifically charged the armed forces of Venezuela with its implementation. Guyana has unquestioned and unimpeachable authority under international law to exercise its rights as the coastal State over the contiguous zone, to use the waters of the zone as high seas and to carry out within

them and beyond acts ancillary to exploitation for the benefit of our people of the natural resources of the continental shelf beneath them. Any attempt by the Government of Venezuela to hinder or otherwise interfere with the exercise of those rights by the Government or people of Guyana or by anyone acting under the authority of the Government of Guyana will constitute an act of aggression against our State.

75. Yet we must assume as a Government that the Government of Venezuela will be no more deterred by obligations under the Charter of the United Nations than it has been so far by its obligations under a miscellany of treaties. We must be prepared, therefore, for aggression from across our borders and we must let the world know of the peril which confronts us and of the danger to the peace of the Hemisphere which now exists. Within past months we have taken what steps we could to alert the international community. Copies of my Government's notes of protest at the Venezuelan decree were forwarded to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is the custodian of the Geneva Agreement, with a request that they be brought to the notice of all Member States. Beyond this we must remain ready to invoke the procedures of the Charter to secure the integrity and safety of our State and to take all such other steps consistent with the Charter which may be open to us.

76. Let me repeat that what Venezuela seeks in this attempt to break a treaty of seventy years standing is no minor border adjustment, but the absorption of over two-thirds of my country and one-sixth of our people—people who represent all the several racial strains of our multiracial society who differ in origin, culture and tradition from the people of Venezuela, a people newly freed from a century and a half of a colonial imposition and who will not submit to a new colonialism in whatever guise it comes.

77. This has been the experience of Guyana's first years of independence. It is not a heartening commentary on the emergence of an ethos of international legality and it is a depressing reflection on how readily some of the most important traditions by which countries have lived, including in this case principles of national self-determination and resistance to imperial domination, can become tarnished by power and a frenzied ambition.

78. But it is an experience which could be the experience of any small State anywhere in the world. Indeed, it could be the experience of any State at the hands of some powerful neighbour, once boundary settlements lose their sanctity and become forever arbitrable in response to the dictates of power. My Government invites this Assembly to consider the chaos and confusion into which most of the world's frontiers would be thrown if all that one party to a boundary settlement need to do to secure that boundary's revision is to constitute itself a judge in its own cause; to assert that the settlement is not valid; to proclaim a new boundary consonant with its own ideas and to assume the right, once it has the strength and power, to extend its frontiers into the territory of a neighbouring State. It is preposterous and unthinkable that such a situation can be tolerable twenty-three years after the signing of the Charter, and yet this is the course upon which the Government of Venezuela has embarked.

79. What are small nations to do faced with threats of this kind? It is Guyana today, but who knows who may be the victim of expansionist ambition tomorrow? There is one direct and immediate answer. Meet aggression with force, be ready whatever the cost, whatever the sacrifice, to defend the State against those who violate its territorial integrity. Yet, is this the answer that the collective voice of the international community is to give to the smaller States of the world at this stage of organized international effort? At a time when that society, as a whole, acknowledges the universal importance of advancing as rapidly as possible the economic development of the less developed countries, is that same world society powerless to create conditions in which the small, the developing countries, may be freed of the burden of bearing arms in defence of their right to survive as sovereign States? Must it be the case that they can never be secure in devoting all their slender resources, both human and material, to the essential tasks of change and development to which they are committed, and in the success of which all nations have a deep and continuing interest?

80. Every million dollars that a developing nation spends on defence, whether it be on aircraft or on ships or on a standing army, or on any of their several adjuncts, represents a million dollars diverted from development. Indeed, in some cases, it may represent a much greater diversion, dependent on the terms of bilateral or multilateral assistance available to the State for projects of development. At its most conservative, however, and I use units of cost that are relevant to my country, every million dollars spent on arms would provide school places for 50,000 children, would settle 1,000 families in developing areas, would build fifty miles of secondary road into new areas of land development, would provide ten medical clinics for the men, women and children on whom the burden of development must really fall. A single military aircraft at conservative cost of \$5 million could build schools for a quarter of a million children; twenty such could provide the hydroelectric power needed to bring the economy to the take-off stage in industry and agriculture, with all that this means to an entire generation.

81. And this is to say nothing of the diversions of human resources, of expertise, of manpower, of energies from the urgent tasks of social and economic change to which they ought to be applied. These diversions of resources, both human and financial, are the real effects of aggression, of intimidation, of pressure, directed at a developing State. Those who embark upon them bear a heavy responsibility to all mankind.

82. If this world Organization is serious in its commitment to the economic growth of the developing countries, can it fail to recognize that this growth must be forever stultified if a larger and larger share of the national product of the developing countries must go to the purchase of arms—inevitably from the developed countries—merely to ensure their survival as States? If that commitment is both serious and sincere, is it not time that all nations acknowledge that international guarantees of territorial security must be the handmaiden of an international effort for development; and is it not already a blemish on that international effort that this wasteful diversion of men and money away from the essential tasks of development could be substantially, if

indeed not entirely, prevented by a collective action which may cost little more than a collective resolution?

83. It is not so long ago that a distinguished representative of the Republic of Brazil, opening the general debate of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly, advanced bold and imaginative ideas on the peace-keeping role of the United Nations and called for a new chapter on peace-keeping operations to be written into the Charter. He acknowledged then the difficulties so far encountered in adapting the Charter to the new requirements of the world, and I am mindful now, as he was then, of the problems to be surmounted if these ideas are ever to be implemented.

84. But these ideas are particularly relevant to the need for preventive action to which my Government calls attention. For what Brazil was advancing was a new and vigorous concept of peace-keeping operations altogether different from the enforcement measures contemplated in Chapter VII of the Charter—a concept of an international effort, in no sense dominated by the larger Powers, whose objective would be to preserve peaceful conditions, in contrast to operations of a coercive character undertaken against transgressors of international order.

85. The course of international events since 1964 has only served to strengthen the arguments advanced on that occasion; we have seen all too clearly the limits upon coercive action; the world's aggressors have learnt all too effectively how to exploit the gap in the system of international security which results from the absence of established arrangements for peace-keeping operations of a preventive character. Guyana lends its voice to the plea for this gap to be closed—at least in relation to the developing countries—and will lend its support to every reasonable proposal to this end.

86. At this moment of deep disillusionment with the results of the Development Decade an international guarantee of the frontiers of the less developed nations would contribute materially to offsetting the acknowledged failure to generate either a flow of increased aid from the developed to the developing countries or even to maintain the real levels of existing aid, for it would increase the capacity of developing nations to contribute to their own development. It would in effect amount to a new and important accession of aid and the value of the resulting release from the uncertainties and instabilities which attend the threat of aggression would be incalculable. It would represent a significant step towards a return to the spirit of the Charter and a major advance in international co-operation and coexistence.

87. Bound as we now are by the need to divert our resources to the protection of our frontiers, we share in addition the bitter problems which all developing countries face in the loss of their skilled men and women to the lucrative employment markets of the developed countries. But this too is a problem which this Organization can help to relieve. My Government recognizes that the seriousness of the brain-drain has become a focus of international attention and concern and we are particularly pleased that the agenda of this session contains under item 47 a consideration of the “outflow of trained professional and technical personnel at all levels from the developing to the

developed countries, its causes, its consequences and practical remedies for the problems resulting from it”. My Government regards this matter as both grave and urgent, and my delegation will have more to say on it when item 47 is being considered.

88. But my Government also believes that this Organization, which has at its disposal a significant corps of expertise, should not evade its own role of leadership in this field. We believe that national experts who serve under the flag of the United Nations should be permitted to serve in technical capacities in their countries of birth. By making this possible under its Development Programme the United Nations would contribute materially to our development, for all of our development plans will come to nothing if we cannot afford the skills to implement them—and more especially the skills of those who understand the environment in which those plans must be executed. It is our hope that this session of the General Assembly will accept and endorse as a general principle that, wherever it may be appropriate, technical assistance to a developing country should permit the employment of the nationals of that country who can contribute to its development programmes in expert, executive and advisory positions. This imaginative beginning could lead to the adoption of similar arrangements by the developed countries in their own programmes of bilateral aid.

Mr. Emilio Arenales (Guatemala) took the Chair.

89. We shall also, in the appropriate Committee, draw attention to the urgent need for greater realism on the part of aid-donor countries in such matters as interest rates, project priorities and the tying of aid to their own goods and services if we are to maximize the development value of aid—a result which must surely be the common aim of developed and developing countries.

90. Meanwhile, we in the Caribbean sub-region of Latin America have not stood still. Guyana has sought to play its part along with Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and the West Indian Associated States in establishing a Caribbean Free Trade Area, which we envisage as a first step towards integrating production and consumption patterns throughout the area. The Free Trade Area which came into operation on 1 May of this year, which now comprises eleven States and is still growing, is a great step forward for this sub-region of Latin America. We are currently involved in negotiations for the establishment of a regional development bank in which friendly donor countries such as the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Canada—themselves old and distinguished Members of this Organization—have expressed a desire to participate. The region is subscribing no less than 60 per cent of the all too modest equity of the bank in an endeavour to pull itself out of the economic doldrums in which centuries of colonial rule have left us. I am glad to say that organs of this world body, in particular the United Nations Development Programme, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, are playing a leading role in these exciting developments.

91. In the view of my Government, these are some of the ways in which this Organization might advance the develop-

ment of the small and weak countries of the world; but we know too well the lessons of interdependence to deceive ourselves into believing that we can achieve our objectives of development irrespective of the tensions which persist in the international community.

92. We cannot ignore, for example, that, amidst the tensions of the Middle East, the fundamental precept of the Charter that territory shall not be acquired by force continues to be in jeopardy. We cannot ignore that the experience of Czechoslovakia might be that of many a small State if the abandonment of the spirit of the Charter, which lies at the base of recent events in that unhappy country, were to become pervasive in international society.

93. Nor can we ignore that the principles of self-determination and non-intervention which have been breached in Czechoslovakia are no less threatened by the continuing tragedy of the conflict in Viet-Nam. We urge on all who have it in their power to contribute to a successful conclusion to the negotiations now proceeding in Paris the very deep concern we feel for a swift end to this wasteful conflict on a basis which ensures a just respect for the rights of all the people of that troubled land.

94. We have watched, as a brother watches, with anguish and agony, the tragic struggle among the peoples of Nigeria and the loss of life which the resolute efforts of so many have failed to prevent. We have noted the resolution passed by the Organization of African Unity on 16 September which was subscribed to by an overwhelming majority of African States. We hope that this call from the substantial voice of Africa will not go unheeded. It has been a long night for Nigeria; we pray for its end and that with the dawn the leaders of that great nation may be guided through the no less critical problems of peace by those same principles of respect for human dignity which were the foundations of the united national movement to self-determination.

95. Earlier in this statement, I said that I would attempt to speak out of the experience of my own country. I said that we are a racially various people, with our origins mainly in Africa and in Asia. As such a people, we are deeply involved in what must surely now be acknowledged as the racial crisis which confronts the world.

96. As long ago as 1964, the Group of Experts established in pursuance of the Security Council resolution of 4 December 1963, under the chairmanship of Sweden's Mrs. Myrdal, to examine methods of resolving the present situation in South Africa drew the attention to this world body to the gravity of the problems and the fact that

“... a race conflict starting in South Africa must affect race relations elsewhere in the world, and also, in its international repercussions, create a world danger of first magnitude”.⁷

Those repercussions are being felt, and that danger is with us. The racial rumblings which echo around the world with such frightening regularity and the several racial tremors which in so many societies are silent messengers of social

upheaval are, after all, part of our contemporary experience.

97. The situation in southern Africa is grave indeed. How can men anywhere, how can Governments, remain unmoved by the injustices, the indignities, the violence, the oppression meted out to the non-white people of South Africa, of Namibia, of Rhodesia, of Mozambique and of Angola? In the face of such colossal lapses from the ideals of the Universal Declaration on the part of the régimes responsible for these atrocities against human dignity, and the lamentable restraint which continues to condition the reaction of some Governments to them, it is perhaps not surprising that a mood of cynicism should have settled on the international effort for the advancement of human rights, more especially in the area of race relations. However, if this effort is to succeed, if the world racial crisis is to be resolved in favour of racial justice, this is no time for cynicism. Despite the formidable impediments to total success that the remaining fortresses of racial bigotry and oppression represent, the siege upon them must continue and, in the nature of things, it must be a siege from without—from organized international opinion conditioning both national and international action.

98. Nowhere has this effort to end racial bigotry and oppression been attended by greater frustration than in Namibia—a ward of the international community. By persisting in its illegal control over Namibia and by extending its intolerable policy of *apartheid* to the region, South Africa not only has continued to affront the sensibility of all mankind but has also demonstrated its moral incapacity to continue in the membership of this Organization. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Guyana shares with special acuteness the frustration and moral outrage which the intransigence of the South African régime generates. My country will, nevertheless, continue to participate with even greater determination in the work of that Council in the hope that Members of this Organization and, above all, the Security Council will be stimulated to a greater awareness of their responsibilities to the people of Namibia.

99. This is the International Year for Human Rights—a Year, I am happy to recall, initiated on a proposal by a fellow Caribbean State, Jamaica—and I cannot leave this area of my remarks without placing on record the admiration of my Government for the efforts of this Organization and of the many non-governmental organizations associated with it in the area of human rights. We believe that the dedicated work that has been done in advancing the cause of human rights throughout the world has already served to awaken the consciences of millions to the injustices which exist, to the urgency of the need for change and, perhaps most important of all, to the righteousness and the legitimacy of change.

100. Yet much remains to be done; in particular, much more is required of the Governments of Member States than pious declarations of their acceptance of the imperative of human dignity. If the world racial crisis is to be resolved, that imperative must be obeyed by all States and must be obeyed over a much wider area of action than has hitherto been acknowledged. The effort that is required is an effort for all mankind, and its urgency is such that it

⁷ Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1964, document S/5658, annex, para. 31.

cannot be allowed to falter. Among the several endeavours of this world Organization in the year ahead the pursuit of racial justice must remain a matter of paramount importance, for failure here must make it impossible for us to meet the need for a return to the spirit of the Charter and to the principles of human coexistence.

101. Mr. MULLER (South Africa): Mr. President, on behalf of the South African delegation, I wish to extend to you our congratulations on your election to the presidency of this Assembly. We are indeed fortunate to be guided in our deliberations by a person of your ability and experience.

102. Since I have not had an earlier opportunity to do so, I now wish to welcome one of our closest neighbours, the Kingdom of Swaziland, as a Member of this Organization. A short while ago I had the honour to represent South Africa at Swaziland's independence celebrations.

103. Relations between South Africa and Swaziland have always been close and cordial over several generations, going back to long before the era which ended on 6 September 1968. Thus it was in fact a resumption of direct relations which proved mutually fruitful in the past and which we are sure will be the same in the future. We welcome Swaziland to the community of nations, and more particularly to the growing circle of independent States in southern Africa living in harmony in the spirit of sovereign equality, mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of others—a genuine system of peaceful coexistence, with fruitful co-operation in the many fields of mutual concern, which is proving a living reality.

104. In the course of my remarks to the Assembly last year I uttered a plea for respect and tolerance in our relations with one another. This, I maintained, would make it easier for us all to avoid sterile ideological debate and free us to concentrate more on the basic needs of mankind—securing freedom from want, encouraging economic development and providing for education, improved health conditions and living standards—some of the most important tasks enjoined upon us by the Charter.

105. Unfortunately, during the past year, there have been no signs of greater tolerance or respect between nations and peoples. All over the world, since last we met, there have been confrontations, clashes, even open violence between nations or population groups. Indeed, we cannot but view the events of the past year with great sadness. Fresh in our minds is the callous use of brute military force by the Soviet Union against a small neighbouring country. This came, ironically, within months after the Soviet Union solemnly undertook special responsibilities as a nuclear-weapon State and as a permanent member of the Security Council. In the United Nations itself there have been numerous instances of malice and intolerance. The machinery of the Secretariat has, for example, been subverted to further a vendetta against my country, in violation of the Charter and in defiance of the facts.

106. What is even more deplorable, the Secretary-General himself, in the introduction to his latest annual report [A/7201/Add.1], in total disregard of the true state of affairs, can foresee only a collision course for southern

Africa. I do not wish to analyze here today the Secretary-General's forewarnings of doom, or for that matter his condemnations of, amongst others, my own country. I must, however, emphatically reject his premises and conclusions, for the facts of life in southern Africa so patently present a totally different picture. It is, as I will indicate, a picture of achievement and progress, in the spirit of the Charter, one which calls for recognition and acclaim, instead of incitement to confrontation. Is it not ironic that while bloody warfare is devastating a region of Africa for which so much was hoped, while so many innocent men, women and children are exposed to suffering, starvation and death, so much time, money and energy should be devoted in this Organization to attacking my country as a so-called "threat to world peace"?

107. And, meanwhile, what of our task to lighten the burdens, to bring increased prosperity to the peoples of the world? Being from Africa I pose this question particularly in regard to that continent. A recent survey by the Economic Commission for Africa, of economic conditions in Africa⁸ has revealed some disquieting statistics about the continent. In many African lands, the standard of living has actually declined during the past six years. At the present rate of growth it will, it is said, take 273 years before African incomes reach present British standards and 343 years before they reach American standards. The conclusion would seem to be that, if the present tempo is maintained, there will be no hope for Africa to bridge the economic gap which separates it from the developed lands; indeed, greater poverty and misery may well be in store.

108. We in South Africa have studied this document carefully and while we share the concern of the experts about the economic future of the continent, we believe that something can be done about these problems. And here, in the interests of humanity, I renew the plea I made last year and to which I have just referred. Problems and difficulties do exist, in no small measure, but we do not feel that they are insurmountable, given patience, goodwill and co-operation. For us in South Africa, it is important that the problems should be tackled, for we are ourselves a part of the continent and whatever happens elsewhere in Africa has its repercussions upon us. It is very much in our own interest that Africa should be peaceful, stable and prosperous.

109. We, for our part, are doing our best to live up to the spirit of the Charter. Not only has a great deal been achieved as regards the internal development of our own country for the benefit of all sections of our multinational population, but in co-operation with our neighbours much has been accomplished to provide hope for the future in the southern portion of the continent.

110. It is our belief that, with an expanding economy, we are in a position to provide an effective stimulus to economic growth in other countries in our region of the continent. Similarly, economic progress in those countries must have a beneficial effect on our own efforts. When I therefore say that we in southern Africa may confound the prophecies and fears of the economists, I say it in the full confidence that we shall progressively overcome our economic problems in co-operation with each other.

⁸ Document E/CN.14/409.

111. What is already happening in our part of the world? Let me start by taking a few illustrations from my own country.

112. The South African economy as a whole has in recent years succeeded in combining to a remarkable extent stability with rapid economic growth. Not only have our currency and general financial state remained healthy, but our real gross domestic product has, over the past five years, shown an annual average increase of almost 7 per cent. This has produced benefits for all our population groups and economic projections indicate that during the next thirty-five years the living standards of our total population will at least more than double. During the same period the total purchasing power of the population should increase more than sixfold.

113. Our industrial growth averaged more than 9 per cent during the last five years, an achievement almost unequalled in the rest of the world. In 1967 South Africa generated 37,869 million units of electricity, which is more than 60 per cent of all the electricity generated in Africa. The consumption of electricity in South Africa amounts to somewhat more than 2,000 units per head of our total population, or more than twenty times the average figure per head for the rest of Africa. The generating capacity now installed in South Africa exceeds 7,000 mW, and with an annual increase of about 8 per cent, its generating capacity will more than double during the next ten years. South Africa is, moreover, one of the important trading nations of the world, and in 1966 its foreign trade amounted to \$5,664 million.

114. While, in 1948, South Africa provided only 39 per cent of its capital requirements from its own sources, this percentage has now risen to well over 90. Thirty-two per cent of the national income is saved. The corresponding figure for the United States and Britain is approximately 14 per cent and for the Federal Republic of Germany 23 per cent. The stage has now been reached where foreign investment, though still useful, is no longer essential for the growth of the South African economy.

115. On completion of the Orange River Project—which is one of the biggest combined irrigation and hydro-electric projects in the world—as well as several other projects at present being planned and those already under construction, agricultural production in South Africa will increase considerably. Despite the fact that our population groups comprising about 18,400,000 people are expected to increase two-and-a-half times to at least 40 million in thirty-five years, we expect to be able to feed all our people and we may even be in a position to be of assistance to other countries. Industries are now being brought to the doorstep of scattered areas of the country, thus providing labour opportunities and currency in sectors previously mainly engaged in traditional subsistence agriculture.

116. The domestic market, small in comparison with those of the great industrial nations of the world, is expanding rapidly as the population swells and the increased prosperity of the various peoples creates demands which can be filled by local manufacture. More and more goods which previously had to be imported can now be supplied by our own industries.

117. However important these facts and developments are to all the population groups in my country, I refer to them merely because they must be seen as a future pattern of development for southern Africa as a whole. From this economic hub radiates growth to the other parts of our region. I do not wish to suggest that a new and developing State cannot by itself attain economic growth, but we all know that the creation of the prerequisites for such development requires not only vast capital investment, experience and acquired skill, but also time. For example, transportation—one of the essentials for economic development—requires not only railways and roads but also ports.

118. In the field of transportation, Africa provides 1.8 per cent of the world's rail freight, although the total population of the continent comprises 8.5 per cent of the total world population. Southern Africa has a railway mileage of about 20,655 route miles of which 13,702 miles are in South Africa and South West Africa. South Africa possesses the required heavy machinery and the knowledge of similar environmental conditions to assist others in the construction and expansion of railway routes. Furthermore, our transportation system, serving as a link with the outside world, is available to other countries in southern Africa; so is our entire communications system.

119. Let me quote from another document produced by the Economic Commission for Africa and circulated by the United Nations:

“... if the tempo of development is to be accelerated, and if an intensification of economic inequalities within the sub-region is to be prevented, there appears to be no alternative to increasing economic co-operation and co-ordinated development in the sub-region.”

South Africa shares these views and has for some time been applying them in southern Africa.

120. Technical co-operation within this region is of long standing. Because of similar climate, soil and plant growth, as well as similar problems, there are large areas of common concern to the countries of southern Africa. In this technical field South Africa has had the advantage of many years of co-ordinated scientific research, and the findings of its well-established and experienced research institutions are freely communicated within the region.

121. Since many of the neighbouring territories are largely dependent upon the agricultural sector of their economies, co-operation with South Africa in combating the various animal and plant diseases is of the utmost importance. Technical aid, as for example in projects for the improvement of the cattle herds of our neighbours, is already being provided, while South African scientists have also been of assistance in connexion with other development projects.

122. South Africa's proximity to its neighbours makes it possible for technicians to be supplied at short notice to cope with emergencies or problems which can be tackled only on the spot. The technicians themselves thus widen their experience of the region while simultaneously supplying the needed assistance. In this regard, I may mention our assistance to Lesotho with the recent outbreak of plague and to Swaziland with the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease some time ago.

123. Incidentally, this is not solely a question of governmental policy; it is symptomatic of the spirit of our people in their approach to co-operation with our neighbours. Very recently, for example, a group of South African farmers took 200 of their tractors to a neighbouring country to plough the lands of African farmers who, because of losses suffered during the preceding drought, were unable to do it themselves.

124. Possibly the most important area of co-operation at the moment is that directed towards improving the supply of water and power to the region. About one-half of southern Africa receives less than 600 millimetres of rain per annum, which is the minimum required for producing crops successfully under dry-land conditions.

125. In addition, the growth of industries will impose far greater demands on existing resources. The building of dams for irrigation purposes and the provision of hydro-electric power have thus become an urgent priority. Since many of the large perennial rivers of the region form boundaries with, or flow through, two or more countries, the need for co-operation is obvious.

126. Furthermore, it would be of no avail if a developing country were to start large-scale power and water projects unless the bulk of the power produced could be sold elsewhere. South Africa provides such a market, making possible the production of cheap power and thus providing a valuable stimulus for the development of these countries. Indeed, without South Africa as a market, many of these projects would not be economically viable.

127. May I, by way of illustration, mention a few examples such as the Cahorabassa hydro-electric scheme on the Zambezi, the so-called Oxbow scheme in Lesotho and the Kunene project. The power from Cahorabassa is expected to become of immeasurable importance to several countries in the area. Oxbow, while on a more limited scale, could become an important factor in the economic development of Lesotho, because water and power sold to South Africa could make a considerable annual contribution to the economy of that country. Likewise, the Kunene project will become a key factor in the development and economic well-being of the peoples of South West Africa and Angola. This is but the beginning. Other projects on the Limpopo and Okavango Rivers and on the rivers of Swaziland are in the process of investigation.

128. Another very important field in which the countries of southern Africa closely co-operate is that of marketing. The agricultural and mineral products which form the basis of economic activities in South Africa's neighbouring countries are, to a very large extent, marketed through the same channels. In fact, three of our neighbours have, through the long-existing Customs Union, virtually free access to our markets. There is a reasonably free movement of capital between our respective countries, and our infrastructures are closely bound up. Apart from the flow of goods and services, there is also a flow of labour from countries in southern Africa to my country. Well over half a million foreign African workers are employed in the Republic of South Africa and remit substantial amounts to their home countries. In this way the pressure on inadequate resources in these countries is considerably relieved.

The remittances of foreign African workers employed in South Africa add significantly to the value of the exports of their countries and in certain cases amount to one and a half times the value of exports. In addition, the countries concerned benefit from the skills brought back by their citizens.

129. In these ways southern Africa is forging ahead. We, for our part, are happy to participate in this great venture, because the increased prosperity of the region will bring, and is bringing, increased prosperity for all. Neighbouring peoples have a duty to co-operate; they have to find a formula for peaceful and amicable coexistence in order to ensure, on the regional level, the successful implementation of long-term planning and meaningful development. It is self-evident that such a formula will not be found if neighbours are preoccupied with possible differences of opinion on domestic matters. It is obvious that such a formula must be based on common interest. In southern Africa we have a multitude of problems but at the same time we have developed a successful pattern of peaceful coexistence that can make a real contribution to peace and progress in our own sub-continent and thus promote world peace.

130. To the outside world, it often seems strange that we are not for ever at loggerheads with our neighbours. Indeed, the prophets of doom have for long forecast constant strife. Instead of that, our part of the continent is one of the few areas where peace reigns, where peoples do not pose a threat to one another and where the future holds promises of growing prosperity. When peace in our part of Africa is threatened it can only be from without—but I am convinced that we can jointly resist any such threat. And it is our hope that the notes of discord that are still being heard in some parts will give way to harmony—in the interest of us all.

131. From our earliest history we have sought amicable and peaceful coexistence. Conquest and aggression have never been our policies. The peace that we have sought, we have sought in negotiation and co-operation—not by force.

132. The peoples of southern Africa know one another's history and know one another's ways. We have also suffered under imperialism. Our neighbours know that no principle is more strongly embedded in our traditions than that of self-determination. What we claim for ourselves we concede to others. We believe that when the separate identity of each people is being respected and protected, when no nation is threatened by domination, only then can there be real co-operation. Our desire to live in peace with our neighbours is thus in the first place firmly based on our traditional respect for the right of self-determination for all peoples.

133. Today we have already a number of independent States in the sub-continent which, in the exercise of their political independence, are building up a pattern of peaceful co-operation. This, in the light of experience elsewhere, would not have been the case if the separate nations had felt that their right to control their own future was being jeopardized. After all, it took Europe centuries of strife and destruction before it was realized that countries could maintain their political independence while co-

operating in the economic sphere to the advantage of everyone. And it is only now that Europe can enjoy the fruits of such a community pattern.

134. In southern Africa the importance of economic co-operation can hardly be overemphasized. As I have indicated, it is for us not merely a question of the usual forms of economic co-operation—it goes much further. We are determined to accelerate economic growth and to enable the countries of our region to reach the present economic standards of the developed countries in a much shorter time than is generally expected.

135. We realize that there is a long and difficult road ahead. But as long as we honour the traditional principles for international co-operation, we shall successfully meet the challenge. I therefore urge a better understanding of the problems of southern Africa and greater appreciation of its efforts, and I appeal to others not to let their quarrels extend to our part of the world. Plans to extend political and economic influence can only bedevil the honest efforts of the nations of southern Africa to improve the standard of living of their peoples.

136. To sum up: our formula for co-operation in southern Africa and for our political relationships rests on proven principles and communal interests. We believe that differences in political systems need not be an obstacle to co-operation. We can peacefully live together because we recognize one another's sovereign equality and in our relations we show mutual tolerance and respect and we do not interfere in one another's domestic affairs.

137. Although the world labours under perplexing and intractable problems and much confusion exists as to what constitutes healthy norms and principles for international co-operation, in southern Africa we are endeavouring to provide a practical example of a viable solution. Those who do not wish to see us succeed are the enemies of all the peoples of southern Africa. Is it too much to hope that in this Organization responsible voices will be raised to condemn violence and terrorism in a region which has so far been spared these horrors?

138. I am confident that left in peace the peoples of southern Africa can assure for themselves a bright future. I return, therefore, to my starting point, and reiterate my plea for respect and tolerance in our relations with each other so that we may be free to press forward in our efforts to create a better world.

139. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Guatemala has expressed the wish to exercise his right of reply. I invite him to do so.

140. Mr. HERRERA IBARGÜEN (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation had not intended to participate in the general debate because the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, on his election as President of the United Nations General Assembly, stated in his acceptance speech the broad outlines of our policy. Nevertheless, my delegation feels bound to exercise its right of reply in order to comment on one passage in the enlightened statement made by Mr. Allen, the Minister of Education of Jamaica, who said *inter alia* that his delegation viewed with concern

the existence of border disputes in the Western Hemisphere, and who specifically mentioned the Territory of Belize.

141. On this subject my delegation states that the dispute concerning the Territory of Belize has, by agreement with the United Kingdom, been submitted to the peaceful means for the settlement of disputes prescribed by the Charter of the United Nations, and that the object of the negotiations still in progress is to find a solution which is acceptable and fair to the parties and which takes into account the interests and well-being of the population of Belize. Until such a solution is arrived at, Guatemala will continue to reserve its rights of sovereignty over this integral part of its territory.

142. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Somalia has also expressed the wish to exercise his right of reply. I invite him to do so.

143. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): As a representative of a State which is honoured to serve on the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, I should like to say a few words in reply to the statement of the representative who claims to speak for the people of South Africa.

144. The speaker represents a régime whose conduct towards the non-white population under its control is incompatible with the obligations of a Member State. He represents a régime which has contemptuously flouted decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on *apartheid*, on Namibia and on Southern Rhodesia. He represents a régime based on racism, chosen by Whites alone in a country where the overwhelming majority are Africans. He represents a régime whose policies and actions have been recognized by the General Assembly as a "crime against humanity".

145. He had the temerity to come to the rostrum this afternoon and picture the policies and actions of his Government in rosy colours. He gave some details of the economic achievements of his régime, but he was careful—indeed very careful—to omit the methods which his régime employs to exploit the riches of South Africa. Furthermore, he was very careful to omit the fact that the greater portion of the wealth of South Africa is denied and does not go to the majority of the people.

146. My delegation does not intend to comment in any detail on his statement, as it will have occasion to discuss during this Assembly the grave situation created by the policies and actions of his régime and the measures which need to be taken by the international community. My intervention now is to remind this Assembly that while the representative of the Pretoria régime speaks here, during this International Year for Human Rights, thousands of people are in gaols in South Africa for upholding the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Robert Sobukwe, leader of the Pan Africanist Congress, one of Africa's outstanding leaders in South Africa, is still in gaol, this year being the sixth year of his detention. What was the reason for his detention? It was simply that he had asked for fundamental freedoms, the fundamental rights that we at the United Nations believe should be given to all peoples

wherever they are. Mrs. Helen Joseph, another valiant person who has struggled for the rights of the people of South Africa, is in gaol. She has also been there for six years—without even the farce of a trial. Over thirty Namibian patriots are being held illegally in South African gaols, and we understand that over 200 other Namibians have been detained for months under the notorious Terrorism Act.

147. Only a few days ago half the students of the University College of Fort Hare, a segregated college for Africans in South Africa, were summarily expelled and forcibly removed by the police for demanding academic freedom and protesting the banning of the University Christian Movement.

148. In recent months, the South African régime has abolished even the very meagre representation of coloured voters in Parliament. It has prohibited multiracial parties and forced the multiracial Liberal Party to dissolve itself. Yet this afternoon the representative of Pretoria had the audacity to say that he believes in the principle of self-determination, that he believes in co-operation with all peoples. On what basis?

149. There has been no slackening in the determination of the South African Government to pursue its policy of racial separation and segregation. Under the Group Areas Act many thousands of non-Whites have been ordered this year, as others were ordered last year, to move out of their homes and communities. This destruction of society has been carried down to the smallest unit, the family. Not a day passes without a report in the South African Press of one family or another being torn apart because of some slight and often imperceptible difference in the colour or physical appearance of its members. The application of the laws concerning race classification continues to lead to broken homes and families and is a source of great personal distress to all those directly involved and to those who harbour feelings of humanity.

150. Arbitrary punishment has been meted out increasingly to the opponents of *apartheid*. Banning orders, house arrests, arbitrary imprisonment and banishment without charges or trial continue to be the order of the day. And yet the representative of Pretoria this afternoon informed this Assembly that in South Africa conditions are good, that the people are happy and that everyone is living quite happily and harmoniously under its laws. Indeed the disturbing aspect of the problem is the fact that South Africa is bent on exporting its discredited system to neighbouring territories, backed by force as a means by which the white minority Governments in southern Africa can maintain their hold over the non-white populations. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has himself quite recently warned the international community of the dangerous situation which is developing in that region. On 13 September 1968, in a statement in Algiers to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the

Organization of African Unity the Secretary-General observed:

“The continuing enforcement by the South African Government of its policies of *apartheid*, including recent attempts to extend the philosophy of racial discrimination and segregation to neighbouring territories, has given rise to a loss of faith in many quarters in the possibility of peaceful evolution towards a society based on justice and equality.”

151. I should like the Assembly to take note of those words and contrast them with the picture which was presented here this afternoon by the representative of Pretoria. The Secretary-General also said at the same conference that recent developments point to the danger of violence which, though limited in scope at this stage, might well have grave consequences for the future of that part of the world and for international harmony. The chances of averting this danger depend essentially on the willingness of the great Powers and the major trading partners of South Africa to persuade the South African Government to abandon its present course.

152. All efforts by the United Nations to persuade South Africa to abandon its inhuman policy of *apartheid* have not met with success. The Pretoria régime has treated the measures taken by the United Nations with contempt. In the opinion of my delegation, it is imperative that the United Nations take more decisive measures and make certain that they will be fully implemented by all States so that the dangerous situation developing in southern Africa can be resolved. The United Nations should demand that the South African régime abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and come to this rostrum to report on compliance with those resolutions—not to make statements of the kind that we have heard this afternoon, which reflect a defiance of this august Organization and a contempt for the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

153. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I invite the representative of the United Kingdom to exercise his right of reply.

154. Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom): I do not wish to delay the proceedings of this Assembly at this late hour, but I feel that I must comment briefly on the statement made by the representative of Guatemala. I entirely agree with the representative of Guatemala that Guatemala and the United Kingdom are still engaged in trying to reach an amicable and peaceful solution to their differences with regard to British Honduras which will take into full account the interests of the people of the Territory. As regards present sovereignty over the Territory, however, I must reaffirm that Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has no doubt whatsoever in regard to its sovereignty over British Honduras.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.