



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	
Speech by Mr. Secco García (Uruguay)	1
Speech by Mr. Brewah (Sierra Leone)	3
Speech by Mr. Eban (Israel)	7
Speech by Mr. Kjartansson (Iceland)	13
Speech by Mr. Benites (Ecuador)	16

President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. SECCO GARCIA (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): First, I should like to congratulate Dr. Arenales, Foreign Minister of Guatemala, on his well-deserved election as President. His intelligence and experience lead us all to expect that our affairs will be conducted with distinction. Our pleasure is enhanced because he represents not only Latin America but also a country which, though far from ours, is linked to it by strong ties of brotherhood and friendship.

2. We also wish to pay tribute to the tact and efficiency shown during our proceedings by the outgoing President, Mr. Corneliu Manescu, Foreign Minister of Romania. He represents a country whose political philosophy separates it from our own but which is likewise bound to us by an ancient and common Latin heritage.

3. Furthermore, we welcome Swaziland, which has now become a member of this community of nations and will, we are sure, play an effective part in truly uniting the people of the world and ending colonialism wherever it exists.

4. I shall be brief. I can add little concerning the policy followed consistently by Uruguay in international affairs. It is well known to the Assembly. The various encouraging or disappointing events that either promote or delay practice of the principles which are so dear to us only reconfirm our belief in those principles.

5. We are happy to say that in international law there has been steady even if slow and difficult progress. It can be compared *mutatis mutandis* with progress in private law. The delegation of Uruguay always comes to this Assembly in the hope of seeing the adoption of new measures for improving coexistence. I must confess that this makes us impatient, and we see the obstacles as reasons that reason itself cannot understand. This parliament seems to us slow

to establish the rule of law in practice and to create awareness of its benefits. We know that there are factors beyond its control, but we have a common duty to correct them, because they not only endanger freedom and justice but also raise problems which affect intelligence itself.

6. We have to confess our disappointment at the outset of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. We have recently heard arguments rather similar to those used in the distant past, back in the eighteenth century, to justify the distribution of spheres of influence, which recall the domestic law of feudal days.

7. In face of such theories, which endanger the very existence of nationality, we reaffirm our faith in the will to survive and the desire for independence of all the nations of the earth, especially the small and militarily weak which look for protection to the rule of law rather than to the political or economic paternalism of Powers whose real aim is to dominate on the pretext of promoting their own development or security. Uruguay once again reaffirms its belief in the principles of self-determination of peoples and non-intervention by States. We regard them as plain rules of positive international law. Every country has a right to its own culture, trade and government. To quote from Corneille's "Cinna",

"Chaque peuple a le sien conforme à sa nature,

"Qu'on ne saurait changer sans lui faire une injure."

(Each nation has its own true attribute that cannot suffer any change unscathed.)

8. Today no treaty based on such old-fashioned concepts can be viable. It would be incurably void, either for want of motive, or for defect in its spirit or letter where these purported to take away sovereignty. It would recall the Italian Popular Party's counter-slogan to Mussolini's electoral law: "We'll co-operate on our feet, not our knees."

9. In 1928¹ at Havana, Uruguay proposed that the principle of non-intervention, based on the indispensable legal equality of all States without which this Assembly cannot even exist, should be made an institution. These joint efforts culminated at Montevideo in 1933² and were reaffirmed at Buenos Aires in 1936,³ in the Charter of Bogota in 1948,⁴ and more fully in Lima in 1938,⁵ Mexico

¹ Sixth International Conference of American States, 16-20 February 1928.

² Seventh International Conference of American States, 3-26 December 1933.

³ Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1-23 December 1936.

⁴ Charter of the Organization of American States, signed at Bogotá on 30 April 1948.

⁵ Eighth International Conference of American States, 9-27 December 1938.

City in 1945,⁶ Rio de Janeiro in 1947,⁷ Caracas in 1954,⁸ Santiago de Chile in 1959,⁹ and Costa Rica in 1960.¹⁰ It would be inconsistent not to call attention to every infraction of this principle, such as the one that has just occurred.

10. The United Nations has also ruled in this matter. In its resolution 2131 (XX) of December 1965 the General Assembly voted in favour of this principle and referred specifically to the precedents mentioned above and to the charters of the League of Arab States and of the Organization of African Unity. It follows that this Assembly also should be consistent and vigorously reject all violations of the rule, regardless of their nature and of the attempts at explanation.

11. We reject intervention of any kind, not only flagrant military intervention but also other more subtle and cunning forms. Uruguay has established a stable, democratic system of government firmly based on popular support; it has brought about peaceful coexistence and has changed enemies into mere opponents, as can be seen in the membership of our own delegation, which includes representatives of all the democratic parties. Like other Latin-American nations, we suffer from the propaganda and activities of small groups with alien and undemocratic ideas which seek to promote, particularly among our young people, outlandish revolutionary ideas and to advocate violence as a means of progress. In financing this propaganda and these activities, other Governments commit actual unlawful and reprehensible intervention. Revolutions without any guiding philosophy destroy existing spiritual and moral values and prevent adaptation of democracy to modern times, which we seek as the way to orderly and peaceful progress. As has been said, we will not agree to any demand in the name of our principles for freedom to destroy freedom in the name of the principles of others.

12. We are concerned about the slow progress of disarmament, the insecurity and expense of armaments and the means of development of which they deprive mankind. In our view this is another obligation. Uruguay has always been a fervent champion of peace and believes that all efforts should be directed towards strengthening it. To strengthen peace is to do more than merely maintain it. Peace can be maintained through force or fear; it is only genuine when based on confidence and brotherhood. These presuppose duties and demand sacrifice. In particular they oblige the major Powers to assist in establishing peace. The results of the Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, for instance, give us no cause for optimism on this score.

13. The technological advances which should have opened a bright future have instead ushered in one of deep gloom. I would point out that Latin America, as in its advocacy of

⁶ Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, 21 February-8 March 1945.

⁷ Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace and Security, 1947.

⁸ Tenth International Conference of American States, 1954.

⁹ Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, 1959.

¹⁰ Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, San José, August 1960.

non-intervention, has again taken the lead here with the Treaty of Tlatelolco,¹¹ which in the words of the delegation of Uruguay "is an exemplary instrument by virtue of its juridical acumen, its technical precision, its feeling for reality, and the clear-cut differentiation it establishes between the atom for war and the atom for peace".¹² Nevertheless, Uruguay has subscribed to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII)*], which was signed in Washington, London and Moscow on 1 July 1968, accepting it with its defects as a stepping-stone towards the solution of the problem. As we have said before, the Treaty "does not in any way deal with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but rather with the non-proliferation of nuclear States";¹³ it does not really provide for the peaceful use of atomic energy for all nations, and, as was so aptly pointed out by the Argentine delegation, merely guarantees "the disarmament of the unarmed".¹⁴ Disarmament must be general and complete, and the guarantees should be given absolutely and convincingly by the armed. Only thus will peace through fear be ended, and the gap reduced between ourselves and those few countries that manipulate both the atom and the veto as instruments of obstruction.

14. Another factor for strengthening peace must be the settlement of all other conflicts, overt or covert. For the Middle East a complete solution must be found, not a partial or temporary one. We hope that such a solution can be reached through law and mutual understanding, and similar solutions for the other more serious conflicts that disquiet the world. That will be the way to win back the confidence of world public opinion in these organizations and in their thinking and procedures.

15. I cannot refer to all the items on our agenda, and if I could I should risk repeating what previous speakers have said here. But I wish to say a few words on one matter which has hardly been discussed but which I think is fundamental for this Assembly. It is the problem of man, or rather of the individual. Peace is indivisible, and there can be no lasting peace in the world unless all individuals can be at peace with themselves. The human personality is the pivot of the universal system.

16. There would be no point in organizing the law of nations or their coexistence if nations continued to have subjects but not citizens. The word "citizen" is not merely a convenient phrase; it postulates the enjoyment of rights and freedoms unknown in most of the world. Nor can any State be a genuine democracy if its internal domestic peace is imposed by force or fear. We therefore hope sympathetically for the liberation of countries with autocratic or totalitarian régimes kept in power by a system of repression that stifles freedom, or by a social system that insults justice.

17. The people's misery undermines domestic order just as the misery of States undermines international order. That is

¹¹ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, signed in Tlatelolco, Mexico, on 14 February 1967.

¹² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, First Committee*, 1579th meeting, para. 69.

¹³ *Ibid.*, para. 110.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1572nd meeting, para. 93.

why we are convinced that universal order cannot be strengthened without democratic States.

18. I have to point out that, as the name indicates, human rights belong not to the community nor to the State but to the individual. States owe a duty to ensure respect for human rights and must discharge it, just as they have duties towards each other for ethical reasons. The individual must also be given moral and material international protection. Self-determination for peoples is very good, but self-determination for the individual is better. He must be helped to strengthen his freedom; and, as Uruguay has already proposed, he should have access to international courts. If under recent international penal law judges are to be empowered to punish an individual, it would seem more logical that judges should also protect and safeguard his interests. Human rights are still in danger twenty years since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [*General Assembly resolution 217 (III)*], which was proclaimed as “a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations . . .”.

19. Let us serve this ideal, which is a mainstay of coexistence!

20. The United Nations must redouble its efforts in that service. Perhaps the Commission on Human Rights should have the status of a Council and report directly to the General Assembly.

21. There can be no peace anywhere without justice, and in a country there can be no peace without social justice. Justice is endangered by lack not only of rights but also of equal economic opportunity. States must therefore develop in accordance with their people's needs. A government has no right to demand or to receive aid that is not to be devoted to its citizens' well-being without discrimination of any kind. Special emphasis must be laid on this need so as to speed economic, social and industrial work for the development of all nations.

22. In the world today we cannot allow hunger to persist, or the protein deficiency that is retarding irreparably the physical and mental development of more than 300 million children. Just as it is a common duty to distribute the new resources of the sea and of nuclear energy among all mankind, so it is a common duty to abolish these terrible evils. The greatest battle of all, in comparison with which all others are insignificant, is mankind's battle against the shameful suffering in the world today—against the suffering of people who are not free, of people who lack education, health, housing, clothing, and hope. This is the great challenge, and we owe it to ourselves, as men and as leaders, to take it up.

23. The task before us is enormous and urgent. For my part, I pray that God will enlighten us in our work.

24. I would conclude by quoting one of the “thoughts” of Pascal which in a way sums up my whole speech. God grant that soon in this world “Justice will be forceful and force will be just”.

25. Mr. BREWAH (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate you, on behalf of my

Prime Minister and the Government and people of Sierra Leone and as head of our delegation to this Assembly, on your election as President of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. Your long association with international affairs and your tremendous experience in matters pertaining to this Organization lead us to believe that you will undoubtedly conduct the business of this twenty-third session of the Assembly with great success.

26. We should like at the same time to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Corneliu Manescu, the outgoing President, who we understand is the first to come from a socialist State. He has done great credit to his country in the statesmanlike and dignified way in which he conducted the last session of the Assembly.

27. We also commend our distinguished Secretary-General, U Thant, whose strength and courage have continued to gain great respect for this Organization and all it stands for. We feel confident that his presence in our midst ensures the maintenance of the principles of fairness and objectivity which the United Nations must continue to preserve.

28. As an African State, Sierra Leone takes great pleasure in welcoming into this Organization the newly independent African State of Swaziland, whose membership of this Organization marks a step towards the attainment of universal representation. We feel confident that the presence of Swaziland in our midst will be a blessing, not only to Africa in particular, but also to all nations in general.

29. My duty as the first civilian leader of my country's delegation in two years to this twenty-third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization is to express publicly on behalf of my Government and on behalf of our peoples throughout Sierra Leone the relief we feel over our achievement of a peaceful and bloodless return to civilian rule, and to a resumption of the institutions of parliamentary democracy under which we had hitherto lived. To those of you who may not be too familiar with the background of my country's history, permit me the indulgence of reciting cursorily for your benefit some of the highlights of that history in order to accentuate the reasons for the sometimes seemingly inordinate emphasis which, as a people, we tend to place upon the rule of law and on constitutional forms of Government.

30. If in the eyes of the world we have sometimes appeared to be a people inordinately proud and boastful of our democratic traditions to which we have been heirs for nearly two centuries, it is because we have never wished to be unmindful of our ancient role as the cradle of parliamentary democracy in Africa. Particularly, this is the case in these times when it has almost become a commonplace to regard the African peoples as being inherently incapable of sustaining those institutions associated with the democratic way of life.

31. Fully twenty-four hours before the Philadelphia Convention of 25 May 1787 was to begin its deliberations, we in Sierra Leone had already begun to exercise ourselves in the art of self-government and in some inchoate practice of representative institutions, no matter how crude or erratic they might now appear in retrospect. Our adherence to the

rule of law, to practices—not mere principles—in defence of individual liberties, to respect for fundamental human rights and freedoms, to tolerance and respect for all men regardless of race, creed, colour and ideology enshrined in our first Charter of Government of 1787, has now come to be accepted as an almost instinctive part of our way of life. Let me, therefore, crave your indulgence, further, by adverting to the first “Speech from the Throne” to be heard within the chamber of the House of Representatives of my country barely six months ago after an enforced silence of fifteen months—indeed, the first “Speech from the Throne” or State Message to be heard in more than two years in any of our three large Commonwealth West African States.

32. In the “Speech from the Throne”, the Acting Governor-General declared, *inter alia*:

“Mr. Speaker and Honourable Members, it is exactly two years since this country had a state opening of Parliament. The events which led to the seizure of power from a constitutionally appointed Government and the suspension of parliamentary rule are well known. My Prime Minister and his Cabinet and all the peoples of Sierra Leone join me in expressing our gratitude to Almighty God for having delivered the nation from military rule. My Government wishes to commend and pay tribute to the warrant officers and the rank and file of the Royal Sierra Leone military forces and the Sierra Leone police through whose valiant intervention a return to constitutional Government has been made possible. Their heroic achievement and their loyalty to the State will go down in history.

“One of the first tasks which have engaged the attention of my Government has been to review the various decrees which were passed during the past fifteen months. You will be asked during this session to consider a number of bills which seek to repeal those decrees which are inconsistent with constitutional government, and to restore the provisions of the Constitution and other Acts of Parliament which had been suspended.

“It is the firm intention of my Government to abide by and maintain the Constitution and the rule of law, to respect the rights of the individual irrespective of race, religion or political opinion, to support an impartial civil service and to uphold at all times the traditions of parliamentary democracy.

“The Electoral Commission, established under the Constitution, will continue in being for the purposes set out therein. My Government will take steps to ensure its impartiality and independence.

“In the conduct of its external affairs, my Government will follow a policy of friendship with all countries through their legitimate governments, irrespective of race, religion or political ideology. My Government will continue to support the principle of respect for the territorial integrity of all States as well as its complement of non-alignment and shall endeavour to judge the actions and policies of all nations objectively. My Government believes in the equality of all men, irrespective of race or colour, and is opposed to any form of racial discrimination.

“My Government subscribes to the principles enshrined in the Charters of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. Sierra Leone is a peace-loving

country and it will be the constant aim of my Government to work for the preservation of world peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means.”

33. It is in this spirit of a renewal and reaffirmation of our dedication to a heritage of liberty, freedom and democracy and to tenets based upon a recognition of the universal fatherhood of God and its concomitant, the universal brotherhood of man, that we today come to this Assembly once again.

34. Pray pretend with us that the recent rude and abrupt interruption of our traditionally peaceful and democratic way of life was no more than a nightmare. It did not last the night.

35. In the seven-year period since my country acceded to statehood, each succeeding delegation to this Assembly has gone on record to affirm and reaffirm our adherence to the principles of the Charter of this Organization and, more recently, to the charter of the Organization of African Unity.

36. On such thorny and hotly debated issues as Southern Rhodesia, the admission of the People’s Republic of China, South Africa with its *apartheid* and South West Africa questions, the liquidation of the remnants of colonialism everywhere, the tyranny of minorities over majorities and vice versa—on all of these issues the position of my Government remains unchanged.

37. Let me now, with your continued indulgence, turn briefly and more specifically to some of those issues with which my Government is more deeply concerned.

38. First, the Nigeria-Biafra war. It must come as no surprise to Member States of this Organization that this year, in contrast with the preceding two years, my Government places the greatest importance upon the Biafra-Nigeria *débâcle* rather than upon the continued obstreperous and dastardly acts of the Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia. This is not in any way to suggest that the degree of my Government’s and our people’s disgust and distress over the wanton and inhuman acts of bestiality and murder being perpetrated in that unhappy country—namely, Southern Rhodesia—is any less today than it has always been. However, the fate of the 55 million of our kith and kin in what was once the great and populous Federal Republic of Nigeria but today has been torn apart by internecine strife, fills us with great horror and is to us a matter of the greatest urgency and one which demands full-scale attention by this twenty-third session of the General Assembly.

39. Historical, cultural and sentimental ties apart, the ties of affinity and consanguinity which bind our two peoples—the peoples of Sierra Leone and the peoples of that great Federal Republic—go too far back into history to warrant any lengthy recital from this platform. Hardly a chapter of modern and contemporary Nigerian history can be written or adequately explained without references to modern Sierra Leone history.

40. My Government, therefore, notes with gratitude and satisfaction the current and active efforts being exerted by

the Organization of African Unity to bring both sides in the conflict once again around a common table to find ways and means of bringing to an end the bloodshed, famine, hunger and death which continue to denude an already under-populated continent of hundreds of thousands of its potentially useful citizens.

41. My Government has followed with close and studious attention the day-to-day activities at Kampala, Niamey and Addis Ababa in recent weeks. We have noted with pain and regret, however, that the leader on one side of the conflict has felt it inconvenient to avail himself of the rich opportunities which Niamey and Addis Ababa offered him. We continue to hope that it is not yet too late to bring both sides to the conference table.

42. We feel that an immediate cease-fire supervised by neutral observers on both sides of the battle line would save thousands of lives and would open the way for relieving the disastrous famine now existing in Eastern Nigeria. We feel that there are enough arms and ammunition in the whole of Nigeria to endanger even post-war peace-time operations in future, and we would urge them to cease the importation of any more. This would also give time to the leaders of both sides to settle the future of all tribes in Nigeria.

43. With regard to Southern Rhodesia, my Government will continue to regard the illegal Government operating in Southern Rhodesia as a fraud upon the entire African population by a minority of persons of white-settler descent.

44. We would urge upon the United Kingdom Government once again to live up to the expectations of those of us in this Organization in particular, and the world at large, who look up to it to bring about a speedy and just conclusion to the farce in Rhodesia and, through the force of sanctions or otherwise, call a halt to a régime which has no standing in the eyes of civilized humanity.

45. In less euphemistic terms, let me make the position of my Government and delegation clear. The pattern of implementation which the British Government has deemed appropriate and adequate to give force to those sanctions has clearly proved to be altogether ineffective and must be revised and greatly strengthened if Britain is to maintain its reputation as a just arbiter in Africa.

46. The rights of freedom and self-determination are such basic human rights that one is alarmed at the thought that a legitimate demand for the enjoyment of those rights should be met by acts of savagery, carnage, bestiality and murder, such as we are today witnessing in Rhodesia. And what is more, these acts of depredation are being actively condoned, aided and abetted by those nations which speak so glibly about the "free world".

47. Those States which continue to support the Lisbon-Pretoria-Salisbury axis—that is to say, Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia—will never know peace in Africa, or indeed in their own countries, as long as they continue to support tyrannical and feudal régimes.

48. On the subject of South Africa, the spate of words which have issued forth from this chamber on the subject

of the Republic of South Africa—vis-à-vis its Government's unwarranted and unpardonable attitude towards its indigenous African citizens, on the one hand, and its relations with the new African sovereign States, on the other, is already too copious for me to wish to add my own fragile dissertation to an already existent mountain of views and opinions on the subject. My Government deplores as much the *apartheid* policy of the Republic of South Africa as we do its attitude of outrageous recalcitrance in the comity of nations; not to speak of its blatant defiance of the authority of this Assembly, as well as of the Security Council, on the question of South West Africa (Namibia). The only goal—if not, indeed, the highest goal—which would meet the demands of my Government and the aspirations of all peoples of African descent throughout the continent is that which will ensure full and complete participation of that country's well over 10 million Africans in the affairs of their country. One would have thought that the lustrous examples of full harmony and co-operation between black and white in all facets of national life in the sister Republics of Tanzania, Zambia and Kenya, in that same geographical zone, would by now have forced a change of policy, if not a change of heart, in South Africa.

49. Instead of a change of heart, the racist minority Government of South Africa, in its determination to keep its indigenous population in a perpetual state of slavery, has passed a whole range of oppressive laws such as the "Suppression of Communism Amendment Act", whereby South Africans opposed to the system of *apartheid* are labelled as communists; the "Mixed Marriages Act", ensuring that only persons of the same ethnic groups can marry each other—an act contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; "The 180-Day Law", whereby black South Africans can be arrested and imprisoned for 180 days without trial, and "The Unlawful Organization Act", depriving the indigenous people of South Africa of their simple and basic right to form any organization whatsoever that might improve their social status. These are only a few examples.

50. Let me quote from the report of the United Nations *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of prisoners in South Africa:

"Prison conditions are made especially inhuman for non-white prisoners. Food, sanitary conditions, clothing, bedding and accommodation in South African prisons fall short, lamentably, of all international and civilized standards."¹⁵

The report goes on to say:

"The *apartheid* laws and the treatment of political detainees and prisoners is turning or has turned the Republic of South Africa into a police State and the laws and methods in question increasingly resemble those adopted under fascist régimes."¹⁶

51. It is all the more revolting to the human mind when one realizes that many of those Western States which criticize South Africa encourage it by keeping its economy booming through trade. More than three-fourths of South Africa's total imports come from Britain, the Common

¹⁵ See document E/CN.4/950, para. 1127.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 1136.

Market countries, the United States of America and Japan, to whom in return South Africa exports more than two-thirds of its total output of goods. Britain and the United States have investments worth billions of dollars in South Africa, and we feel strongly that this should not be so with declared standard bearers of democracy and friends of independent African States.

52. If I have not felt compelled to catalogue in terms explicit and unequivocal my Government's feelings of detestation over the atrocious crimes against humanity for which the Republic of South Africa must stand condemned before the bar of world public opinion, it is because I already sense from the corridors and in this chamber the feelings of revulsion which engulf the large majority, if not indeed, all of us assembled here, over the behaviour of this barbaric State. Should a State behaving like this continue to have a seat in this Assembly or maintain diplomatic relations with any self-respecting and civilized State?

53. As regards the question of South West Africa, it will be recalled that Britain had entrusted to South Africa its mandate to govern that Trust Territory. The United Nations recognized the situation and continued to hold South Africa as the Power responsible for that Trust Territory, expecting South Africa, of course, to recognize and carry out the provisions of Trusteeship vis-à-vis the inhabitants of the Territory.

54. The provisions of the United Nations Charter in relation to Trust Territories are well known. These provisions in relation to South West Africa have been consistently flouted by South Africa. South Africa has in fact gone beyond this to implement its abhorrent *apartheid* laws there which are contrary not only to the visions of the Charter in relation to Trust Territories but also to the provisions relating to human rights. In accordance with the spirit of the Charter, the General Assembly by resolution 2145 (XXI) brought to an end the mandate entrusted by Britain to South Africa and by resolution 2248 (S-V) established a United Nations Council for South West Africa.

55. However, the Government of South Africa has repeatedly continued to prevent the Council set up by the General Assembly from carrying out its work of administering the country. Mr. Michel Botha, the South African Minister for Bantu Administration and Development, said *inter alia* on 16 May 1968:

“The Government is not prepared to allow overseas bodies to dictate what it should do about the peoples of South West Africa”.

This statement shows South Africa's repeated determination to flout decisions of this Assembly. My Government is therefore pleased with the steps taken by the General Assembly on 12 June [*resolution 2372 (XXII)*] in asking the Security Council to take effective measures to implement the internationalization of the Territory of Namibia.

56. As regards the Portuguese Territories, at present Portugal allocates 42 per cent of its annual budget to defence purposes; that is to say, defence of its decadent colonial régimes in Africa. The economy of Portugal and its backward position in Europe makes it impossible for it to pursue a colonial war in Africa or anywhere else. The fact

remains, however, that thanks to its allies, the NATO Powers, it is carrying out and continues to carry out a ruthless colonial war against Africans in Portuguese Guinea, Angola and Mozambique. The Portuguese Foreign Minister, Mr. Franco Nogueira, has stated categorically that Portugal is a vital link in the NATO defence system. Statements by Portuguese ministers indicate clearly that notwithstanding any United Nations resolutions in regard to its colonial policies in Africa, it will continue to receive aid from its allies. It is clear to everyone that without the help of the NATO Powers, Portugal would not last one more day in Africa.

57. In regard to the Security Council, organs of the United Nations charged with the responsibility of ensuring that Non-Self-Governing Territories are liberated have now come up against a deliberate posture assumed by Administering Authorities. This situation gravely threatens the inalienable rights of millions of colonized peoples.

58. The responsibility for peace and security rests squarely on the Security Council and if peace and security are threatened, this Assembly, conscious of the legitimate rights of suffering peoples, should at this session review the whole question of the decolonization process.

59. The dialogue among Member States concerning the legal status of United Nations resolutions has made it difficult to implement them. Member States will have to decide on this matter which is so essential for improving the effectiveness of this Organization.

60. As regards the Middle East, by virtue of those ties of culture and commerce which have long bound the peoples of our countries and the peoples of the Middle East in an almost indissoluble bond of fraternal relations, my Government is compelled to express at all times our equally great concern over events in that part of the world, as that which we are wont to express over events touching any African State. The commercial and cultural links which have bound us to our sister States of the Arab world, we regard as no less tenuous than those spiritual and emotional ties which exist between our country and the Republic of Israel.

61. We have in the past urged, as we shall continue to do, that those two great peoples, Arabs and Israelis, should come early to grips once and for all with the deeper issues of human survival which have always been the prime concern of the two great religions which their respective cultures and civilizations have contributed to mankind.

62. We in the southern half of the great continent which we share with the dynamic Republic of Egypt, and bordering the waters which wash the shores of the Holy Lands, cannot look with indifference upon a situation which threatens not only the survival of the parties directly involved but also the tranquillity and stability of those of us who are their neighbours or who enjoy bonds of fraternal relations with them. In this connexion, our appeal is directed to the great Powers of the East and West, in particular to the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that they reconsider their stance on the matter of the Middle East. We, for our part, shall continue to use all measures available to us—the United Nations, the Organization of

African Unity and other forums committed to the exercise of moral suasion, as a means of harmonizing conflicts—to bring about a state of rapport between the two sides. We are dedicated to the task of building bridges of peace and understanding between nations and men.

63. On the subject of the People's Republic of China, we are almost reluctant to express the view which has been heard within these halls in session after session of the General Assembly for nearly twenty years now, namely, that the world community has been denied the benefit of the "wisdom of the ages" which the great Chinese people have been known to offer to mankind throughout history.

64. My Government would like to ask once again, even if in the same old hackneyed clichés with which members of this Assembly are all too familiar, is it not time that we extend the hand of welcome to the great People's Republic of China and invite it to occupy the vacant chair which has long been its chair as of right? Or, in a parodied version of that same query put to this august body only a short while ago by His Holiness Pope Paul VI, permit me to ask: "Is there not room enough at this our banquet table for all?"

65. Year after year, we have come here and voiced our support for adherence to those principles of international law which have long qualified the Government of the People's Republic of China for a place of equality with other Member States within this Organization. Yet, year after year, we witness those same principles we profess to protect and defend being prostituted where they are not altogether mutilated at the altar of narrow national and ideological prejudices and interests.

66. It is the view of my Government that the time is now ripe for us as Member States of this Organization to act with courage and expeditious dispatch during the current session of the General Assembly to correct this fatal blunder which we have all been goaded to pursue for nearly two decades. The cause of world peace demands no less of us as honourable men and women—delegates and representatives of civilized States.

67. With respect to Korea and Viet-Nam, the concern of my Government over our failure in this Organization to fulfil our obligations to the People's Republic of China in no way lessens the concern and anxiety we feel over the problems affecting the happiness, welfare and stability of the Korean and Viet-Nam Republics, respectively. We may be the least competent of States, at this juncture in time, to offer any form of counsel, least of all censure, to those powerful external forces whose ideological, military, strategic, economic and other undeclared interests have clearly militated against the settlement of these long-standing feuds between brothers of the same household. The unification of these two countries, Korea and Viet-Nam respectively, which, until less than twenty years ago, were each one and indivisible, their peoples, brothers and compatriots within one common body politic, is as much our concern as is the problem of any African State.

68. The dedication of my Government to the principle of "malice towards none and charity to all", leaves us with no other option but to join our voices with all peace-loving Member States which, in this Assembly over the years, have

sought to arouse the conscience of the two super-Powers of the world, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to relax the positions they have long held with respect to these two groups of States.

69. Let us spare no energy, relax no effort, until the peace-loving peoples of Viet-Nam and Korea are once again united in their traditional bonds of harmony and fraternity.

70. To conclude, it is my hope as well as the hope of my Government, that as we meet in this Jubilee Year of the great Armistice of 1918, we shall once more renew our affirmation in the sacredness of human life and return to our respective countries to do all that lies in our power as Governments of civilized men to bring about a state of society where peace, justice and security will reign supreme.

71. Mr. EBAN (Israel): Mr. President, Israel sincerely welcomes your election to the Presidency of this General Assembly. Your elevation to this office does honour to Guatemala and to the entire family of the American Republics. It is also a well-deserved tribute to your eminent personal qualities which have so often been put to the service of the United Nations. You follow in the footsteps of our colleague, Mr. Corneliu Manescu, the Foreign Minister of Romania, who directed our work with high distinction and energy during the last session.

72. The world scene today is remarkable for a multiplicity of grave issues and for the marginal role of the United Nations in their solution. Since we last met, the peace of Europe has been shaken by the Soviet military occupation of Czechoslovakia. The invasion was openly designed to prevent a Member State from freely following a peaceful course in pursuit of its sovereign rights. Thirty years after the political settlement at Munich, we see the darkness fall again upon the Czechoslovak nation.

73. No less ominous than the invasion itself are the reasons adduced in its support, for if these are accepted there is little safety for small nations anywhere. The argument touches the very heart and essence of national sovereignty. Are the nations of eastern Europe truly sovereign? Or must the smaller States in the area be subservient to the interest and will of the region's leading Power? And does a strong Power have some inherent right to impose its will and interest on smaller States in disregard of their will and their interest? If so, what is left of the Charter principle of the sovereign equality of States?

74. Now the question is heavy with significance in the light of Europe's tormented history, but its relevance is not confined to Europe alone. It is relevant particularly to the Middle East, where the Power that invaded Czechoslovakia has adopted a one-sided attitude in the political dispute and has at every stage stimulated an arms race. If an issue of such massive scope as that of Czechoslovakia is abandoned by the United Nations after a few days of inconclusive discussion in the Security Council, will not the result emphasize the constitutional weakness of the international tribunal and its lack of centrality in the life and thought of our age?

75. A similar conclusion flows from the continuation of the war in South-East Asia, on which the United Nations

has had no effect. Here, at least, the opening of direct talks has evoked profound relief. In this, as in all other conflicts, there can be no peace without agreement, and no agreement without negotiation. But while the talks go on, the bombs, the shells and bullets reap a deadly harvest. There is no cease-fire; and although there is a wide consensus for de-escalation, this has not yet led to any operative agreements. The need is urgent for the establishment of peace on the basis of the Geneva Agreements, in conditions which would let the peoples of Viet-Nam, South and North, determine their future, free from intimidation or constraint.

76. The absence of such major problems from our agenda illustrates the declining place of the United Nations in modern international life. The main currents of action and discourse amongst nations seem to flow increasingly outside these walls. It is only superficially consoling that one conflict—in the Middle East—is under constant United Nations discussion. For this crisis, too, arises largely from the fact that for twenty years the United Nations was not able to end the Arab war against Israel; and in the early summer of 1967 the Security Council abdicated its function. As the clouds of war gathered and Israel's peril grew, the highest organ of international security fled from the scene, impotent to act and unwilling to speak. There are few more disquieting documents in modern international history than the record of the Security Council's proceedings in May-June 1967. It tells small States with lucid clarity that they cannot yet in the present situation count on obtaining their security from here. If threatened with aggression, their choice is often to perish or surrender, or to save their lives in future by their own responsibility and sacrifice.

77. Now this frustration of the Charter vision arises partly from the prolonged discord and contention of the major Powers. There are other causes.

78. A report by the Secretary-General some years ago contained a plea to give greater emphasis "to the United Nations as an instrument for negotiation of settlements as distinct from the mere debate of issues". The plea was vain. Debate, not negotiation, dominates the United Nations practice. Resolutions are often adopted in a rhetorical spirit irrespective of their equity or prospect of fulfilment. These texts often reveal the mathematical accident of membership rather than a balanced verdict. For example, in a dispute between two parties, one of which has a single vote and the other fifteen, the mere assertion of majority power is not likely to be of moral weight. The Security Council has dealt often with the Middle East, but when more than one-third of its Members are States whose diplomatic relations or ethnic and sentimental predilections are entirely on one side, the majority vote loses its moral and political worth.

79. The difficulty can be overcome only by steadily seeking a consensus including the interested States, and by encouraging agreement between the two parties at interest rather than by injunction and enforcement. In short, there should be a diplomatic rather than a parliamentary approach to United Nations activities.

80. The harsh fact is that, except for occasions of special urgency and tension, there is a diminishing public resonance

to United Nations activities. The political difficulties of our Organization would be counteracted if it were able to play a more decisive role in the development process. But the Development Decade is now coming to an end in disappointment, with none of its goals attained. Sixteen per cent of the world's population commands 70 per cent of the world's resources. Of the movement of wealth from the advanced to the developing countries in 1966, less than 2 per cent came from all the multilateral agencies combined. Of the 80,000 technicians and experts in developing countries during 1960-1967, only 3,000 were United Nations representatives in the framework of the United Nations Development Programme.

81. To such sources of debility we must add procedural weaknesses, such as the excessively long and repetitive agenda of the General Assembly and the tendency to hold massive conferences of which the fruits are not always easily visible. And yet with all this there was never a greater objective need for a unitary framework of international relations than in this age of global history. The United Nations, with all its imperfections, is still the only incarnation of a planetary spirit. It alone involves all States in the adventure of world community. But the gap between the dream and the reality is inordinately wide. The time is ripe for a review conference at which the United Nations will not celebrate its past, but plan its future. The Organization should look at itself, classify its experience, and reform or rationalize its procedures within the text of the present Charter. The twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation might be due occasion for this exercise in frank and creative self-criticism.

82. The United Nations has been a proud and active witness of African liberation. The admission of Swaziland to our membership brings deep satisfaction to all amongst us who have supported African nations and communities in their pursuit of national independence, human equality and accelerated development of their economies and societies. Today, the liberty of nations is often peacefully achieved under the benign impact of world opinion. And when a small new State comes into the light of freedom, it is its flag in the United Nations, above all else, which symbolizes and excites its sense of identity.

83. But the task is not ended. There are still relics of colonialism which must be replaced by independence; and racial discrimination still deprives millions of their birth-right of dignity in large areas of Africa. The habit of forcibly segregating and separating peoples on grounds of ethnic and cultural differences began with the Jewish ghetto system in Europe. My people thus has the longest recollection of the agony to which this principle inevitably leads.

84. Our particular memories have also sharpened our reaction to the cruel suffering now passing over populations and tribes in the eastern regions of the Nigerian Federation. Our Government, Parliament and citizens have been moved not only to make a special effort to bring relief to those who suffer, but also to raise an urgent voice for a solution which will end the bloodshed and famine whose vast dimensions give this problem its universal human context. While African statesmanship seeks an outcome to the political dilemma, the whole world community should co-operate in the relief of human anguish.

85. It is not only on the African continent that human rights are jeopardized. In Eastern Europe we have seen the odious spirit of anti-Semitism evoked to justify repressive policies. In other areas of Eastern Europe Jews still suffer grave disabilities in their cultural and religious self-expression, and in other fields. And in some Arab lands ancient Jewish communities have been victimized in revenge for the failure of the assault upon Israel in 1967, while any international interest in their plight is stubbornly obstructed. They cannot speak; they cannot even bring petition.

86. My Government has decided to give the Members of the United Nations a detailed account of its views on the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Amidst the tumult of a rancorous public debate the deeper motives of our policy have not always been clearly perceived. A structure of peace cannot, of course, be built by speeches at this rostrum. It may, however, be useful for the parties to clarify their intentions and to draw a picture of their policies beyond the routine vocabulary in which this discussion has been held down for sixteen months.

87. In the interest of peace, I shall refrain from detailed comment on the polemical observations made here by Foreign Ministers of Arab States. The total and unblemished self-satisfaction with which they have spoken; the complete absence in their words of any self-criticism or innovation; above all, the lack of detailed and organized comment on concrete issues—all these illustrate the inhibition which still prevents Arab Governments from thinking lucid and constructive thoughts about their relations with Israel. Indeed, yesterday, the Foreign Minister of Sudan actually recommended that Israel simply be dismantled and its people dispersed. Here we have the oldest and most tenacious link in all history between a people and a land, a link which is part of the universal human experience; and yet a Foreign Minister speaks of Israel as though it were a temporary international exhibition to be folded up and taken away. Such intellectual frivolity is not heard on any other international issue.

88. Israel cannot easily forget the immense loss and burden which it has borne through the implacable hostility directed against it for twenty years, culminating in the unforgettable summer of 1967. For there has not been any six-day war: there has been a twenty-year war conducted by Arab States in varying degrees of intensity with the candid hope of Israel's ruin and destruction. The issue is whether this war is now going to be ended by a final peace or merely interrupted in order to be resumed in conditions more propitious for Arab success.

89. Our danger in 1967 was the climax and not the whole story of our predicament. No other people has had to live all its days with a mark of interrogation hanging over its collective and individual survival. Behind Israel's quest for secure life there is a particular and hideous legacy of wholesale death in the European slaughter-house. In May 1967 we found ourselves beset by deadly peril which we faced in utter solitude of action and responsibility. Maritime blockade, murderous incursions, military encirclement, declarations of overt war, a frenzied torrent of violent threats and a formal announcement by President Nasser that the battle was joined for Israel's extinction all

came together in a cumulative assault on Israel's life and security.

90. All the acts which fall under the widely supported definitions of aggression were simultaneously concerted against us. The universal conscience was deeply stirred. Millions across the world trembled for Israel's fate. The memory of those dark days broods over Israel's life. Our nation still lives intimately with the dangers which then confronted us. We still recall how the imminent extinction of Israel's statehood and the massacre of its population were seriously discussed across the world: in wild intoxication of spirit in Arab capitals, and with deep impotent sorrow in other lands. To prevent the renewal of those dangers is the first law of our policy. The gravest danger is lest through lassitude of spirit or imprecision of diplomatic craftsmanship or collapse of patience we again revert to fragile, false and ambiguous solutions which carry within them the seed of future wars. Those of us who bear responsibility for our nation's survival and for our children's lives cannot have anything to do with vague solutions which fall short of authentic and lasting peace. June 1967 must be the last of the Middle Eastern wars. That resolve has moved our policy at every stage of the political discussion from the outbreak of hostilities to this very day.

91. In June and July 1967 the General Assembly rejected all proposals which sought to condemn Israel's resistance or to reconstruct the conditions which led to the outbreak of the war. A new stage was reached when the Security Council adopted its unanimous resolution [242 (1967)] on 22 November 1967. That resolution was presented to us for our acquiescence not as a substitute for specific agreement but as a list of principles on which the parties could base their agreement. It was drafted, as Ambassador Ball recalled on 11 September, as "a skeleton of principles on which . . . peace could be erected".¹⁷ It was not meant to be self-executing. As Lord Caradon said, it was not a call for a temporary truce or a superficial accommodation. It reflected, as he said, a refusal to be associated with any so-called settlement which was only a continuation of a false truce. Its author stated that any "action to be taken must be within the framework of a permanent peace, and withdrawal must be to secure boundaries".¹⁸ The term "secure and recognized boundaries" had first appeared in a United States draft, the author of which pointed out that this meant something different from old armistice demarcation lines. Secure and recognized boundaries, he said, had never existed in the Middle East. They must, therefore, now be fixed by mutual agreement of the parties in the course of the peace-making process.

92. Those were the understandings on which Israel's co-operation with Ambassador Jarring's mission was sought and obtained. Whatever our views might be on these formulations by other Governments, it has been evident at every stage that the two central issues are the establishment of a permanent peace and an agreement for the first time on the delineation of secure and mutually recognized boundaries. These are the conditions prerequisite for any movement. It is here that the peace-making process must

¹⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year*, 1451st meeting.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, *Twenty-second Year*, 1381st meeting.

begin. If these problems are solved, all the other issues mentioned in the resolution fall into place. To seek a change in the cease-fire dispositions, without the framework of a just and lasting peace and the determination of secure and recognized boundaries, is an irrational course for which there is no international authority or precedent. That would be a short and certain route to renewed war in conditions hostile to Israel's security and existence.

93. Our contacts with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General began in December 1967. At the end of that month, on 27 December, I conveyed a document to the Egyptian Foreign Minister through Ambassador Jarring, proposing an agenda for a discussion on the establishment of a just and lasting peace. In that communication I expressed a willingness to hear the United Arab Republic's views and suggested that representatives of our two Governments be brought together informally in order to explore each other's intentions and to derive assurance and confidence for future contacts. In our letter we made it clear that the establishment of the boundary was fully open to negotiation and agreement. The United Arab Republic made no reply, offered no comment, presented no counter-proposals. Indeed, from that day to this, the United Arab Republic has not sent us a single document referring to or commenting specifically on any Israeli letters.

94. On 7 January I conveyed to the Jordan Government, through Ambassador Jarring, a letter in which we sought to open a constructive dialogue. That letter reads in part:

"History and geography create an objective affinity of interest between the two countries. More than any other relationship between Middle Eastern States this one involves human interests in a close degree of interdependence. A close and confident association would seem to be as necessary for Jordanian as for Israeli welfare.

"The major problems at issue between Jordan and Israel are closely interconnected. Territorial security, economic and humanitarian problems impinge directly on each other. Moreover, the political and juridical basis of this relationship is of overriding importance. If there is a prior agreement to establish relations of permanent peace, the specific problems at issue between the two countries can be effectively and honourably solved."

95. I went on to list the five major subjects on which we should seek agreement. These included the establishment of the boundary and security arrangements, which were specifically described as being open to negotiation and agreement. No reply was made to that approach.

96. On 12 February, by the same means, I conveyed the following to the Governments of Egypt and Jordan through the Special Representative of the Secretary-General:

"Israel has co-operated and will co-operate with you in your Mission. We accept the Security Council's call, in its resolution of 22 November 1967, for the promotion of agreement on the establishment of peace with secure and recognized boundaries.

"Once agreement is reached on a peace settlement, it will be faithfully implemented by Israel.

"As I indicated to you on 1 February 1968, Israel is prepared to negotiate on all matters included in the Security Council resolution which either side wishes to

raise. Our views on the problems of peace and our interpretation of the resolution were stated by me in the Security Council on 22 November 1967.

"The next step should be to bring the parties together. I refer to the agreement which I expressed to you on 1 February for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to convene the two Governments."

97. That message elicited no substantive response. On 19 February I communicated another message to Mr. Jarring for transmission to Cairo. This message assured the Secretary-General's representative of Israel's full co-operation in his efforts to promote agreement and to achieve an accepted settlement for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in accordance with his mandate under the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

98. It further pointed that the United Arab Republic is aware of Israel's willingness to negotiate on all matters included in the Security Council's resolution. It drew attention to the fact that the resolution is a framework for agreement and that it can be fulfilled only by an exchange of views and proposals leading to bilateral contractual commitments. It accepted the sponsor's view that the principles recommended for inclusion in the peace settlement are integrally linked and interdependent, and it proposed to move forward to a more substantive stage and to embark on a meaningful negotiation for achieving a just and lasting peace called for by the Security Council.

99. Early in March of this year our reaction was sought to a proposal to convene Israel, the United Arab Republic and Jordan in conferences under Ambassador Jarring's auspices to seek an agreed settlement in fulfilment of his mandate under the Security Council's resolution. We accepted this course. We were later informed that the United Arab Republic had rejected and that Jordan had not accepted this course.

100. On 1 May, Ambassador Tekoah was empowered to indicate on Israel's behalf, in the Security Council, Israel's acceptance of the 22 November resolution for the promotion of agreement on the establishment of a just and lasting peace. The Israeli representative was authorized to reaffirm that we were willing to seek agreement with each Arab State on all the matters included in the resolution, and that we accepted the suggestion of Dr. Jarring to bring about meetings between Israel and its neighbours under his auspices in fulfilment of his mandate for the purpose of achieving a peaceful and accepted settlement.

101. On 29 May, after a discussion in our Cabinet, I made a statement in the Knesset proposing a method of implementing the Security Council resolution through negotiation, agreement and the signature and application of treaty engagements to be worked out between the parties. In this, as in previous documents, it was made clear that we regarded the establishment of the boundary as a matter for negotiation and agreement.

102. On 14 June, I was informed that this proposal had been conveyed to the United Arab Republic's Permanent Representative who had noted it without reaction. At the end of August, I submitted to the United Arab Republic's Foreign Minister, by the same means, a series of ideas and

viewpoints on the implications of the term, "a just and final peace". This was developed in further communications early in September. To these detailed proposals, the United Arab Republic replied declining direct or specific comment, and limiting itself to a general reference to the text of the Security Council's resolution. The United Arab Republic would recite the resolution in a declaration of acceptance without any specification to us of how it proposed to reach concrete agreements. In the meantime, Egyptian policy had been authoritatively defined by President Nasser in a formal utterance on 23 June. In that statement, the United Arab Republic's President expressed willingness to attempt, as in March 1957, "a political solution" on condition that certain principles of Egyptian policy be recognized. He said:

"The following principles of Egyptian policy are immutable: (1) no negotiations with Israel; (2) no peace with Israel; (3) no recognition of Israel; (4) no transactions will be made at the expense of Palestinian territories or the Palestinian people."

No negotiation, no peace, no recognition, no transactions.

103. How one can build peace out of such negative and immutable principles, how one can build bricks with straw such as this, defeats the imagination.

104. I have taken the General Assembly into the knowledge of our initiatives and proposals. I leave it to my fellow representatives to judge whether their complete rejection was justified or compatible with a sincere attempt to reach agreement on the establishment of peace.

105. In discussing the reason for the lack of substantive progress, we cannot fail to perceive that the discussion of peace has revolved too much around semantic expressions, too little around the solution of contentious issues. There is no instance in history in which a stubborn and complex conflict has ever been brought to an end by the mere recitation of texts without precise agreements on the issues of which the conflict is composed. Israel, as I have said, has accepted the Security Council's resolution for the establishment of a just and lasting peace and declared its readiness to negotiate agreements on all the principles mentioned therein. We hold that it should be implemented through negotiation, agreement and the joint signature and application of appropriate instruments.

106. When the parties accept a basis for settlement, their first duty is to clarify what they mean by their acceptance. To make identical and laconic statements with diametrically opposed motives and interpretations would come dangerously close to international deceit. All parties must say what they mean, and mean what they say. And the heart of the problem is not only what we say, but what we do. The construction of a peaceful edifice requires sustained action in order to bring the vital interests of the parties into an acceptable harmony. There is no such thing as peace by incantation. Peace cannot be advanced by declarations accompanied by a refusal to negotiate viable agreements. The Security Council's resolution has too often been used not as an instrument for peace. It has been invoked as an obstacle or alibi to prevent its attainment.

107. In these conditions my Government has given intensive consideration to the steps that we should now take.

Our conclusion is this. Past disappointment should not lead to present despair. The stakes are too high. While the cease-fire agreements offer important security against large-scale hostilities, they do not represent a final state of peace. They must of course be maintained and respected until there is peace. They must be safeguarded against erosion by military assault and murderous incursion. But we should not be content with this. The exploration of a lasting peace should be constant, unremitting, resilient and, above all, sincere. My Government deems the circumstances and atmosphere afforded by our presence here as congenial for a new attempt. We for our part intend to make a new effort in the coming weeks to co-operate with Ambassador Jarring in his task of promoting agreement on the establishment of peace.

108. It is important to break out of the declaratory phase in which the differences of formulation are secondary and in any case legitimate, in order to give tangible effect to the principles whereby peace can be achieved in conformity with the central purposes of the United Nations Charter, with the Security Council's resolution, and with the norms of international law. Instead of a war of words, we need acts of peace.

109. I come to enumerate the nine principles by which peace can be achieved: First, the establishment of peace. The situation to follow the cease-fire must be one of just and lasting peace, duly negotiated and contractually expressed. Peace is not a mere absence of fighting. It is a positive and clearly defined relationship with far-reaching political, practical and juridical consequences. We propose that the peace settlement be embodied in treaty form. It should lay down the precise conditions of our coexistence, including an agreed map of the secure and recognized boundary. The essence of peace is that it commits both parties to the proposition and the consciousness that their twenty-year old conflict is at a permanent end. Peace is more than what is called "non-belligerency". The elimination of belligerency is one of several conditions which compose the establishment of a just and lasting peace. If there had previously been peace between the States of our area and temporary hostilities had erupted, it might have been sufficient to terminate belligerency and to return to the *status quo ante bellum*, to the previously existing peace. But the Arab-Israel area has had no peace. There is nothing normal or legitimate or established to which to return. The peace structure must therefore be built from its foundations. The parties must define affirmatively what their relations shall be, not only what they will have ceased to be. The Security Council too called for the establishment of peace and not for any intermediate or ambiguous or fragmentary arrangement such as that which had exploded in 1967.

110. The second principle refers to secure and recognized boundaries. Within the framework of peace, the cease-fire lines will be replaced by permanent, secure and recognized boundaries between Israel and each of the neighbouring States and the disposition of forces will be carried out in full accordance with the boundaries under the final peace. We are willing to seek agreement with each Arab State on secure and recognized boundaries within the framework of a permanent peace.

111. It is possible to work out a boundary settlement compatible with the security of Israel and with the honour of Arab States. After twenty years, it is time that Middle Eastern States ceased to live in temporary "demarcation lines" without the precision and permanence which can come only from the definitive agreement of the States concerned. The majority of the United Nations have recognized that the only durable and reasonable solutions are agreed solutions serving the common interests of our peoples. The new peace structure in the Middle East, including the secure and recognized boundaries, must be built by Arab and Israeli hands.

112. The third principle: security agreements. In addition to the establishment of agreed territorial boundaries, we should discuss other agreed security arrangements designed to avoid the kind of vulnerable situation which caused a breakdown of the peace in the summer of 1967. The instrument establishing peace should contain a pledge of mutual non-aggression.

113. The fourth principle is the principle of an open frontier. When agreement is reached on the establishment of peace with permanent boundaries, the freedom of movement now existing in the area, especially in the Israel-Jordan sector, should be maintained and developed. It would be incongruous if our peoples were to intermingle in peaceful contacts and commerce only when there is a state of war and cease-fire—and to be separated into ghettos when there is peace. We should emulate the open frontier now developing within communities of States, as in parts of Western Europe. Within this concept we include free port facilities for Jordan on Israel's Mediterranean coast and mutual access to places of religious and historic associations.

114. The fifth principle concerns navigation. Interference with navigation in the international waterways in the area has been the symbol of the state of war and, more than once, the immediate cause of hostilities. The arrangements for guaranteeing freedom of navigation should be unreserved, precise, concrete and founded on absolute equality of rights and obligations between Israel and other littoral States, and indeed all members of the maritime community.

115. Sixthly, refugees. The problem of displaced populations was caused by war and can be solved by peace. On this problem I propose:

(1) A conference of Middle Eastern States should be convened, together with the Governments contributing to refugee relief and the specialized agencies of the United Nations, in order to chart a five-year plan for the solution of the refugee problem in the framework of a lasting peace and the integration of refugees into productive life. This conference can be called in advance of peace negotiations.

(2) Under the peace settlement, joint refugee integration and rehabilitation commissions should be established by the signatories in order to approve agreed projects for refugee integration in the Middle East, with regional and international aid.

(3) As an interim measure, my Government has decided, in view of the forthcoming winter, to intensify and accelerate action to widen the "uniting of families" scheme, and to process "hardship cases" amongst refugees who had

crossed to the East Bank during the June 1967 fighting. Moreover, permits for return which had been granted and not used can be made available to other refugees who meet the same requirements and criteria as the original recipients.

116. The seventh principle refers to Jerusalem. Israel does not seek to exercise unilateral jurisdiction in the Holy Places of Christianity and Islam. We are willing in each case to work out a status to give effect to their universal character. We would like to discuss appropriate agreements with those traditionally concerned. Our policy is that the Christian and Moslem Holy Places should come under the responsibility of those who hold them in reverence.

117. The eighth principle refers to the acknowledgement and recognition of sovereignty, integrity and right to national life. This principle, inherent in the Charter and expressed in the Security Council resolution of November 1967, is of immense importance. It should be fulfilled through specific contractual engagements to be made by the Governments of Israel and of each Arab State, to each other, by name. It follows logically that Arab Governments will withdraw all the reservations which they have expressed on adhering to international conventions, about the non-applicability of their signatures to their relations with Israel or about the non-existence of Israel itself.

118. Ninth, regional co-operation. The peace discussion should include an examination of a common approach to some of the resources and means of communication in the region, in an effort to lay the foundations of a Middle Eastern community of sovereign States. I expressed some ideas on this subject in an address to the Council of Europe in September 1967.

119. So much for the content of a peace. The process of exploring peace terms should follow normal precedents. There is no case in history in which conflicts have been liquidated or a transition effected from a state of war to a state of peace on the basis of a stubborn refusal by one State to meet another for negotiation. There would be nothing new in the experience of the Middle East or in the relationship of Israel and the Arab States for them to meet officially to effect a transition in their relationships. They have done so before. What is new and unprecedented is President Nasser's principle of "no negotiation".

120. But in the meantime we are ready to exchange ideas and clarifications on certain matters of substance, through Ambassador Jarring, with any Arab Government willing to establish a just and lasting peace with Israel. There can be a preliminary stage.

121. I have expounded our views on peace in more detail than is perhaps usual in General Assembly debates. On each of these nine points we have elaborated detailed views and ideas which we would discuss with neighbouring States in a candid exchange of views, in which we should, of course, consider comments and proposals from the other side. No Arab spokesman has yet addressed himself to us in similar detail on the specific and concrete issues involved in peace-making. Behind our proposals lie much thought and planning which will bear fruit when our minds and hearts interact with those of neighbouring States.

122. We ask friendly Governments outside the region to appraise the spirit as well as the content of the ideas which

I have here outlined. We urge the Arab Governments to ponder them in a deliberate mood and to explore their detailed implications with us in the normal and appropriate frameworks.

123. The solutions which I have outlined cover all the matters mentioned in the Security Council resolution and would constitute the effective fulfilment of its purpose, which is to inaugurate a new era of just and lasting peace.

124. We base ourselves on the integral and interdependent character of the points at issue. Nothing is less fruitful than an attempt to give separate identity or precedence to any single principle of international policy, thus destroying its over-all delicate balance.

125. Moreover, the obligations of Israel and the Arab States to each other are not exhausted by any single text. They are also governed by the United Nations Charter, by the traditional precepts of international law, by constructive realism, and by the weight of human needs and potentialities.

126. Lest Arab Governments be tempted out of sheer routine to rush into impulsive rejection, let me suggest that tragedy is not what men suffer but what they miss. Time and again these Governments have rejected proposals today—and longed for them tomorrow. The fatal pattern is drawn across the whole period since 1947—and before. There is nothing unrealistic about a negotiated peace inspired by a sense of innovation and constructed by prudent and flexible statecraft. Indeed, all other courses are unrealistic. The idea of a solution imposed on the parties by a concert of Powers is perhaps the most unrealistic of all. The positions of the Powers have not moved any closer in the last fifteen months than have the positions of the parties themselves. A close study of how the commitments of certain Powers and maritime States were interpreted in May 1967 does not encourage excessive confidence in this formula. Moreover, and above all, the Middle East is no longer an international protectorate. It is an area of sovereign States which alone have the duty and responsibility of determining the conditions of their coexistence. When the parties have reached agreement, it would be natural for their agreement to receive international endorsement and support.

127. To the Arab States we say: “For you and us alone the Middle East is not a distant concern, or a strategic interest, or a problem of conflict, but the cherished home in which our cultures were born, in which our nationhood was fashioned and in which we and you and all our posterity must henceforth live together in mutuality of interest and respect.”

128. It may seem ambitious to talk of a peaceful Middle Eastern design at this moment of tension and rancour. But there is such a thing in physics as fusion at high temperatures. In political experience too the very intensity of peril often brings about a thaw in frozen situations. In the long run nations can prosper only by recognizing what their common interest demands. The hour is ripe for the creative adventure of peace.

129. Mr. KJARTANSSON (Iceland): Mr. President, allow me to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to you and to

extend to you my delegation's congratulations upon your election to this high office of President of the General Assembly. It is with a sense of gratification that my delegation sees this office occupied by a representative of another small country. Your well-known experience in United Nations work, and your outstanding personal qualities, which have been eloquently described by other speakers, are certain to add lustre to the office of President of the Assembly, and your performance of your duties will most certainly cast new distinction upon yourself as well as upon your country.

130. Allow me also to express, on behalf of the Icelandic delegation, our thanks and appreciation to the President of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, His Excellency the Foreign Minister of Romania, Mr. Manescu, who handled his delicate and often difficult job with such outstanding tact, ability and efficiency.

131. The past year has been a year of contrasting developments in international politics, a year of hopes and a year of frustrations. There were hopeful signs of progress in the conclusion of the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and in the opening of preliminary peace talks between North Viet-Nam and the United States. But those hopes have been marred by the frustration over our Organization's inability until now to solve the bitter conflicts that threaten the peace in the Middle East and in southern Africa, or to avert the tragic sufferings of the civilian population of Nigeria, which has been torn by a fratricidal civil war. For some years we have watched the hopeful signs of a lessening of tension between East and West. But the recent occupation of Czechoslovakia has turned back the political clock in Europe and has left a scar on the international body politic that will show for years to come.

132. The United Nations may not be formally seized of all the different issues involved. However, they have a direct bearing and impact on our work in this Assembly Hall and put our Organization to a grave test. By our Charter we have individually and collectively dedicated ourselves and this Organization to high ideals. We have resolved to maintain international peace and security and to develop friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. According to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State . . .”.

133. Our Organization has bravely endeavoured to live up to the aims and ideals of the Charter. Admittedly, there have been many failures to avert conflicts and frustrations, when it has not proved possible to contain a conflict or to reach a satisfactory settlement of a dispute. In most such cases, however, the United Nations has been faced with situations where spontaneous events have overtaken planned action by statesmen and Governments. Old enmities, national pride or economic and ethnic disparity have sparked events beyond the control of Governments and statesmen of goodwill. We must expect such setbacks even in the future, while persevering in our efforts to keep the chain reaction of political events from getting out of hand.

134. We admit the shortcomings of our Organization when it is faced with explosive situations created by a world of economic upheaval and national emancipation. At the same time, we must be permitted to voice our deep concern when a great Power, aided by its allies, invades and occupies a friendly neighbouring country, without any provocation, in order to dictate to that country the kind of Government it should have and what internal or external policies it should pursue. I refer, of course, to the recent dramatic occupation of Czechoslovakia by military forces of five Warsaw Pact countries, a country whose people are known and respected the world over for their dedication to peace and democracy, and whose Government and leaders had dedicated themselves to proceeding along the road of democratic socialism, a peaceful way of government that did not threaten any State or nation. My Government and the people of Iceland find it difficult to see how this action can be construed to be compatible with the principles of Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter of the United Nations.

135. The Government of Iceland is opposed to and condemns any threat or use of force in relations between States. We consider it to be the duty of the United Nations Organization to voice its deep concern, whenever and wherever such force or threat of force is employed, and irrespective of whether the United Nations may be in a position to avert the use of force or to solve a conflict that has already broken out.

136. Our Secretary-General has himself stated that he regards the developments in Czechoslovakia as yet another grave blow to the concepts of international order and morality set out in the Charter and also a serious setback to the détente between East and West which was showing some signs of vigour in recent months.

137. At the same time, my Government does not agree with those who feel that the tragic events which have befallen Czechoslovakia are a valid reason for discontinuing the encouraging dialogue between East and West in order to lessen world tension. Whatever setbacks we have in our common endeavour to build a world of peace should rather make us redouble our efforts to work for a real détente. So also in this case.

138. Our Secretary-General has pointed out in the introduction to his annual report that the strengthening of the peace-building and peace-keeping capability of the United Nations system would be a constructive and helpful act in this context [*see A/7201/Add.1, para. 195*].

139. Another and related area in which we can usefully continue our endeavour to reduce tension is the area of disarmament and arms control. The successful conclusion of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was an achievement of momentous importance, as a first step on the road to real disarmament. Notwithstanding the serious undermining of mutual confidence which recent events have caused, and perhaps because of that very undermining, it is now all-important to secure the ratification of the treaty by the largest possible number of States; and primarily the great Powers involved should take the necessary steps to live up to the undertakings which they entered into at the time of the conclusion of the treaty, to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures

relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament. This would help to rebuild the atmosphere of mutual trust which we must all strive to re-establish.

140. A major conflict that has proved beyond the means of the United Nations to stop is the devastating war in Viet-Nam. The fighting and destruction go on with unabating fury, and the loss of human life is a tragic and appalling spectacle. Earlier discussions of the issue here in the General Assembly had made it clear that a majority of the Governments of the world have been deeply troubled by the growing intensity of the conflict. All the same, the United Nations has been powerless to reverse the trend or to produce a negotiated settlement, despite the noble, selfless and sometimes thankless initiatives and efforts of the Secretary-General to bring the conflict to the conference table. Some hopes were raised, however, with the opening of preliminary peace talks in Paris, between North Viet-Nam and the United States. Although the talks have now dragged on for some months without any tangible results, it is the sincere hope of the Government of Iceland that they will soon result in the establishment of a cease-fire, paving the way for negotiations towards a peaceful settlement.

141. Little progress has been made towards settling the grave problem left by the war of early June 1967 in the Middle East, and no early or easy solution is in sight. The war came to a quick end; a cease-fire was brought about through the efforts of the Security Council. But the year which has followed has been marked by tensions and frustrations, with frequent breaches of the cease-fire and a series of incidents of fighting of varying intensity and scope. The Security Council has had to meet on several occasions as a result of such incidents.

142. Under the terms of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, the Secretary-General appointed as his Special Representative Ambassador Gunnar Jarring of Sweden, who proceeded to the Middle East. Since December 1967, the whole world has followed his itinerary with compassion and with fingers crossed, wishing, for the sake of all nations concerned, that he might have some measure of success. We have all watched Ambassador Jarring tread the path of peace, gingerly but steadfastly. To our dismay, however, we have seen that every breach of the cease-fire, every incident of violence in the area, has been a rock thrown onto the peace path which Ambassador Jarring has been walking on behalf of the world community.

143. My delegation fully endorses Ambassador Jarring's mission and sincerely hopes that it will be continued and that his selfless efforts may be crowned with some success—that he may succeed in bringing the partners to the conflict into a position of negotiation which in turn may lead them onto the path of a final and irrevocable settlement of their long-standing and difficult dispute.

144. The civil strife in Nigeria has caused terrible suffering to the civilian population of that country. My country has been deeply distressed by this tragic situation. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland recently joined the Foreign Ministers of the other Nordic countries in a joint message to

the Secretary-General of the United Nations, based first and foremost on humanitarian reasons, encouraging him to continue his efforts to alleviate the sufferings of the Nigerian population and asking his advice as to what additional measures might be taken. The Nordic Ministers have pledged the continued participation of their Governments in the assistance work which has been carried out by the International Red Cross, UNICEF and other humanitarian and philanthropic organizations, as well as by the Secretary-General through his Representative.

145. The last stronghold of colonialism in the southern part of Africa continues to defy the authority and the will of the United Nations. Our Organization has in a series of resolutions sought to bring pressure to bear on the régimes of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal in order to persuade them to abandon their policies of *apartheid* and subjugation of the African population in their territories. These efforts are becoming increasingly difficult owing to a new and somewhat disquieting trend, namely, the formation in the southern part of Africa of an *entente* between the Governments of South Africa and Portugal and the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia. The General Assembly drew particular attention to this problem in its resolution 2189 (XXI) of 13 December 1966. The alarm sounded by that resolution was not unfounded. Co-operation is indeed increasing among the ruling groups of southern Africa. The mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council against Southern Rhodesia have been thwarted to a large, and perhaps to a decisive, extent by the help given Southern Rhodesia by South Africa and Portugal. My Government hopes, however, that the comprehensive mandatory sanctions adopted in Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 may prove effective. Iceland has declared itself ready to abide in full by the terms of that resolution. It also remains clearly and unequivocally opposed to the South African policy of *apartheid*, which constitutes a flagrant breach of the fundamental principles of our Charter.

146. At this session the General Assembly will consider the important question of the membership of China for the eighteenth consecutive year. This is one of the most difficult questions facing the United Nations and one which has divided the Member States into two opposite camps. The problem is one of fundamental importance, for it touches upon certain basic principles of our Charter and of the work of the Organization.

147. It would obviously be desirable that the biggest and most populous country in the world should be a Member of the United Nations. The present state of affairs is unnatural and there are dangers involved in perpetuating it, for by standing outside this Organization the People's Republic of China appears to become increasingly isolated from the world community and more and more unco-operative in its attitudes. My Government favours the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. It is therefore opposed to the idea of expelling Members from the Organization or from its specialized agencies on the basis of controversial policies followed by those Members in their internal affairs. In the same way and on the same premises Iceland considers that countries like the People's Republic of China should be Members of the United Nations. But it follows from that same premise that my delegation has

always been opposed to the idea of admitting mainland China at the price of expelling the Republic of China from the Organization. We believe that the only fair and reasonable solution of the problem would be that both States should be Members of the Organization. It was therefore a great disappointment to my Government that at the last General Assembly so many States rejected the draft resolution put forward by Italy and other countries proposing the appointment of a committee to explore and examine the possibilities for new solutions to this problem.

148. In keeping with the stand that I have outlined here, during this Assembly my delegation will support all efforts that aim at new approaches and solutions to this question. But the basis of such solutions will have to be that the admission of the People's Republic of China to membership of our Organization must be accompanied by a guarantee of the right of self-determination for the population of Formosa, of the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of that country and of its future membership of the United Nations.

149. I have touched briefly upon some of the most serious problems with which our Organization is faced today, directly and indirectly. The over-all picture is not an encouraging one. I therefore feel the need to reiterate my Government's faith and confidence in the United Nations. The human race has failed so far to establish effective rules for the conduct of nations, as our Secretary-General so aptly put it in a recent statement to the press. But the human race must continue to try, and try again, to establish such rules. And the instrument best suited for this continuous effort is without a doubt the United Nations.

150. While success in our different efforts in the political sphere may seem to be far off, there are other areas in which the United Nations has made considerable headway, notably in economic, social and humanitarian matters. To be frank, what has been achieved in the extremely important field of combatting the phenomenon of underdevelopment is still inadequate. That is regrettably borne out by the very limited achievements of the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development held in New Delhi this year. At the same time, the work of giving technical and material assistance to the underdeveloped nations is being pursued with dedication by the competent specialized agencies of the United Nations, despite the insufficient funds available for these very important activities. One encouraging factor was the relatively high increase in the gross national product of many developing countries in 1967.

151. A major task to which we must continue to apply ourselves is the battle against hunger. In large areas of the world, the production of foodstuffs is not keeping pace with the rapidly growing population. This alarming trend must be reversed. The United Nations and its specialized agencies have played a significant role in this field and must continue to do so.

152. My country is a producer and exporter of foodstuffs, primarily fish products, a valuable food source, rich in proteins. Our nation hopes to continue to be an important supplier of this nutritionally valuable foodstuff and thus make its contribution to the fight against malnutrition and

hunger. But the resources of the sea must be husbanded wisely in order to secure optimal yield and avoid over-exploitation. Increased international co-operation is called for. In his statements in the general debate during the twenty-first [1430th meeting] and the twenty-second [1579th meeting] sessions of the General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland called attention to this problem. A resolution adopted by the twenty-first session of the General Assembly has resulted in a study which is being submitted to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. This is a study of the resources of the sea and the possibilities for their maximum utilization, with proposals for increased international co-operation in the exploration and use of these resources. The Icelandic Government has noted with satisfaction that this matter will be pursued during the present session of the General Assembly.

153. Another important matter concerning the resources of the ocean is the subject introduced at our last session by the representative of Malta relating to the peaceful uses of the resources of the seabed and ocean floor and its subsoil. An *Ad Hoc* Committee of thirty-five Member nations was formed to make a preliminary study of this question and to report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly.

154. In the view of my delegation, the peaceful use of the ocean floor and its resources is a question of great importance. Present rules of international law are inadequate to regulate the activities of States in this new and challenging environment. New principles and international agreements need to be elaborated. It has been a privilege for my country to have been able to participate in the preliminary work done by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. We have tried to make a modest contribution to that work and hope to have the opportunity to take part in the further consideration of this item.

155. It is the opinion of the Government of Iceland that the General Assembly and its respective competent organs should prepare the groundwork for the elaboration of new and satisfactory international rules and agreements to regulate the whole marine environment—the jurisdiction over, and the utilization of, the resources of the sea and of the sea-bed and its subsoil. When that preparatory work has been completed, we foresee the necessity of convening a third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Its task would be two-fold. First, it should elaborate and conclude an international convention to fill the *lacunae* in international law regarding the sea-bed and its subsoil outside national jurisdiction. Secondly, it should take up for revision the 1958 Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea, in so far as they have become obsolete and inadequate in the light of rapidly advancing technology in the utilization and harvesting of both the living and the mineral resources of the sea and the sea-bed.

156. The delegation of Iceland has already on earlier occasions drawn attention to the necessity for expanding international co-operation and for improving international regulations for the wise utilization and harvesting of marine resources. In his statement to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly [1430th meeting] our Minister for Foreign Affairs advanced the suggestion that, at an appropriate date, a new Conference on the Law of the Sea might

be convened for this purpose. My delegation reserves its right to revert to this matter later, at an appropriate moment, and make concrete proposals.

157. The Foreign Minister of Iceland, Mr. Emil Jonsson, concluded his statement in the general debate in this Assembly last year by warning us not to expect too much, too quickly of our Organization. "Undue optimism", he said, "is a poor guide on our way to new achievements" [see 1579th meeting, para. 92]. At the same time he stressed his belief that many of the problems facing us today will be solved only through our concerted efforts within this Organization, but that patience and goodwill are of paramount importance. My delegation is ready to make whatever modest contribution it can to our common work of striving to build peace, and to the co-operation needed in order to create a better life, a life of human dignity, for all men.

158. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): Owing to the unexpected delay of some hours in the arrival of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, I have the honour to come to the rostrum at this late hour in the afternoon and extend to you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of Ecuador, our greetings and warm congratulations on your election as President of the General Assembly for this session. The confidence that has been placed in you is certainly due to your personal qualities; but it is also placed in the people of Guatemala, which has left from the remote past, in the stones of its pyramids, evidence of one of the richest cultures in history; a people which fought in the recent past and is fighting in the present to consolidate its political freedom and economic independence, and which hopes to find in a prosperous future a destiny befitting dignified, dedicated and courageous peoples.

159. I also wish to express on behalf of my Government, my delegation and myself our highest appreciation for the outgoing President, Mr. Manescu, who throughout his remarkable term of office managed to combine courtesy with efficiency, discretion with energy, firmness with cordial respect for all representatives whatever their rank, and who at all times set an example of unwavering loyalty both to the letter and to the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

160. This unwavering loyalty, which must be presumed to inspire both the person who has the honour to conduct the Assembly's debates and each of the representatives who are its members, is not easy to maintain at moments of crisis for the Organization which may impede an objective appraisal of the facts. The loyalty shown by Mr. Manescu as President of the United Nations General Assembly is particularly praiseworthy since, under his wise and calm leadership, we managed to avoid difficulties which might have shaken faith in the value of the Organization itself.

161. It would be credulous to believe that those difficulties have been overcome, but it would be too easy to blame the Organization for not overcoming them. Political difficulties, the continuing reprehensible existence of war, attacks on the independence and sovereignty of States, are all flagrant denials of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. But this does not entitle us to conclude that the twenty-three years of the Organization's life constitute the history of an immense and sad fiasco.

162. It would perhaps be more realistic to say that we are living in a transition period between two historical eras and that the United Nations has been unable entirely to detach itself from a world in conflict and hence so turbulent as it is today. On the one hand, the Organization has been asked to do more than its institutional powers permit, and on the other hand attempts have been made to convert it into a retrograde tool of power politics. Some have urged it to provide solutions for immediate problems and situations which need to be placed in an historical perspective of gradual change, whereas others have criticized it for appearing to go too fast.

163. It has not been easy for the United Nations to evolve in this world of conflict; and it must be agreed that one of the facts which confers the greatest honour and prestige on the Organization is that, instead of becoming ossified in the ideas and ideals of the men who created its twenty-three years ago, it has endeavoured to become a dynamic instrument in the service of international co-operation.

164. The great wisdom of the men who founded the United Nations was that they did not attempt to turn it into a super-State, nor to make a world parliament out of the General Assembly. National parliaments are based on elective and demographic factors which enable majorities and minorities to interact within representative democracy; whereas the United Nations was based on the sovereign equality of States large and small, whose votes cannot be weighted by the density of their populations.

165. Unlike the League of Nations—whose very name evokes the balance of power and interest inherent in any league, the United Nations endeavoured and is endeavouring to be the organization of the international community for the fulfilment of the great human purposes. The intention was not to establish a league of nations which would be used as an expression of power politics, but a community of peoples—the peoples of the United Nations to which the ever moving preamble of the Charter refers—whose aims were set out in the purposes and principles of the document which was drawn up twenty-three years ago at San Francisco. The peoples of the United Nations undertook by it to practise tolerance and co-existence, and to seek peaceful solutions for their disputes. They also undertook to set up an organization of the international community.

166. Hence the United Nations Charter which established this organization is at the same time the legal constitution of the international community and a multilateral treaty in which the States which signed it on behalf of their peoples laid down binding obligations, voluntarily accepted, to fulfil the purposes and principles on which the Organization is based.

167. The international community represented by the United Nations is necessarily based on the sovereign equality of States, irrespective of the number of their inhabitants or the number of square miles of their territory. The sovereign equality of States imports, as a logical corollary, respect for political independence and territorial integrity. The inevitable consequence of this is the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and the right of peoples to adopt whatever political system they wish.

168. Intervention in the internal affairs of States has left a painful mark in Latin America. For that reason my delegation has defended and will defend the right of peoples to live according to their own principles, to organize themselves as they wish, and to act in conformity with their own lines of conduct, without fearing that ideological dangers, military alliances, the pernicious doctrine of spheres of influence or any other motive may be used as a pretext by any State or group of States to impose submission to any doctrine on a people, or to dominate a people, or to establish an ideological protectorate, with tanks and guns.

169. For the same reason my delegation rejects any attempt to revive the old doctrine of spheres of influence as a means of political or economic domination. On that false doctrine colonialism was based and the old forms of protectorates were constituted, and likewise attempts are now being made to constitute the new forms of ideological protectorates. On the same basis the mandates were established, one of which—that affecting Namibia—is still claimed against all law by the former administering Power. The most obnoxious forms of imperialism are contained in that doctrine of spheres of influence as a means of domination; and that is why we condemn all types of *imperium* whether ideological or economic, whether of the right or of the left, as contrary to the United Nations Charter and a betrayal of history.

170. Since the United Nations was not constituted as a super-State, and the General Assembly was set up not as a world parliament but as an organization through which the world community of peoples could express itself, the General Assembly is obviously first and foremost a political body. As a political body it has assumed an entirely new function in history: that of reflecting world public opinion.

171. This phenomenon had existed in embryo before the United Nations was founded; but the development of electronics, the widespread introduction of electromagnetic waves for communication and the use of jet-propelled aircraft were needed to create instantaneous world-wide information and thus a world public opinion. The eminent statesman and professor of international law who was elected President of my country by spontaneous popular decision, Dr. Velasco Ibarra, recently acknowledged in his inaugural address that “the speed of information and communication is creating the people of one world”. And he added: “Only a violent upsurge of the international conscience will one day achieve general disarmament, destroy the weapons of mass murder, and create an international force which will punish the aggressor and guarantee true self-determination for the peoples and non-intervention”.

172. Although it is the essential function of the United Nations as the organization of the international community to express world public opinion and thus give a predominantly political character to General Assembly resolutions, these do not thereby lose the legal quality which the writings of eminent jurists and the practice of the United Nations have attributed to them. They frequently clarify law: for example, resolution 95 (I) affirmed the principles of condemnation of war which were recognized by the Charter of the Nürnberg tribunal and which had already

been incorporated in the United Nations Charter. Or they may be a source of international law and contribute to its progressive development, as when they establish and affirm the rules of *jus cogens*. In any case those General Assembly resolutions which are more than recommendations are the basis for the dynamic evolution of the United Nations.

173. An example of that process is given by the resolutions which have laid down and confirmed the interpretation of the General Assembly's own powers, as when it has used its residual powers where the Security Council, which has the primary but not the exclusive duty to act in questions of international peace and security, could not discharge the responsibilities delegated to it by the Members of the United Nations for rapid and effective action. We hope that in future it will not be necessary to use those residual powers; and for that purpose we welcome a suggestion made by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Mexico, Dr. Antonio Carrillo Flores, that those Powers which have veto privileges in the Security Council should exercise voluntary restriction of their negative vote [1681st meeting, para. 11].

174. Despite the mistakes and frustrations of the United Nations, its history is nor merely one of disappointment. Admittedly a most cruel war is continuing in South-East Asia and bombs are falling on peoples whose youth has never known a single day of peace. Admittedly in central Europe we have seen armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak people, who were trying to concord their socialist socio-economic system with the individual freedoms by which the Charter guarantees the dignity of the human personality. Admittedly in the same area we have heard threats against the Federal Republic of Germany based on outdated interpretations of the Charter which would amount to giving the United Nations the original meaning of the allied nations of the Second World War instead of its present meaning of the organization of the international community. Admittedly we witness the negation of human rights in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. Despite these frustrations, however, we must acknowledge the creative action of the United Nations in many fields of human activity.

175. The process of liberation of the colonial countries and peoples is a good example of the moral and legal authority of General Assembly resolutions. From my personal experience I recall that when in 1953 I attended the General Assembly for the first time, the number of Member States was less than sixty and the theory still prevailed that Chapter XI of the Charter had a purely declaratory authority. Those few of us who were then in the ranks of the anti-colonialist struggle upheld the principle of the unity and indivisibility of the Charter, which no one today would deny. The colonialists at that time maintained that the administrative authority was part of their sovereign power and fell within the restrictions of Article 2, paragraph 2 of the Charter. Interpreting the will of my Government, which was then led by the same eminent statesman who is today directing the destinies of my country, I contended that the Non-Self-Governing Territories were a class of incomplete States which had two of the three qualities of a State (a people and a territory) but not their own government, which the administering

Powers were obliged to grant them.¹⁹ According to that argument, sovereignty is vested in the peoples and is suspended until the fulfilment of that condition; but there can be no confusion between the administrative authority exercised by the administering Power and sovereign power itself. Today no one invokes (or, if they do, their claim falls on deaf ears) domestic jurisdiction in relation to colonial matters; and, with two exceptions, none of the 125 Members of the United Nations doubts the obligatory nature of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

176. Another direction in which the force of international public opinion, represented by the General Assembly, has made slow but sure progress is that of disarmament. The United Nations was born of a war to protect succeeding generations from the scourge of further wars. That war had produced the horror of mass slaughter through atomic explosions. It was natural, therefore, that the first of its resolutions, No. 1 (I) of 24 January 1946, should establish a Commission to deal with the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy, at that time limited to nuclear fission, and that in the same year resolution 41 (I) should call for the balanced reduction and regulation of armaments and armed forces. It must, however, be remembered that the problem of disarmament—not the mere reduction and regulation of armaments and armed forces—was not considered as a whole until the establishment under resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952 of the Disarmament Commission which had been preceded by the temporary Committee of Twelve, and that the present Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament was only established in 1961 under resolution 1722 (XVI).

177. No one who is not supremely naïve can believe that one fine day a General Assembly resolution will be able to decree universal peace and that all problems will be solved by implementing the utopian phrase of turning swords into ploughshares and barracks into schools. The process is long and difficult; but there have been such important achievements as the Antarctic Treaty of 1 December 1959; the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water of 5 August 1963; the Treaty of Tlatelolco for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, of 14 February 1967; the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, of 27 January 1967; and lastly the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, whose imperfections, given patience and good faith, can be corrected.

178. We hope that action by the United Nations, as the means of expressing world public opinion, will press for the achievement as the next step of effective measures for the final prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons; reduction of nuclear potential by transferring the use of all fissionable material to peaceful uses; reduction of conventional armaments; and the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interest of mankind, which is to be one of the most

¹⁹ *General Assembly, Official Records, Eighth Session, Fourth Committee, 344th meeting, para. 25.*

important items on the agenda of the current session of the Assembly.

179. Therefore my delegation will support any measure aimed not only at implementing direct or collateral measures of disarmament, but also at reducing international tensions which hinder understanding. It will also support any measure aimed at releasing resources at present devoted to armaments, so that they may be used to help the peoples who are trying to achieve development. It feels that there is a need to study not only the problem of the frantic arms race of the great Powers, but also the piling-up of surpluses of conventional or obsolescent weapons to arm the developing countries, thus creating the danger of local wars or inciting to attacks against the democratic will of those peoples.

180. My delegation believes that what is called the general debate should not be a mere catalogue of problems or a list of agenda items. These items are debated separately one by one. But we feel that there should be a statement of the guiding principles of each State's international policy. I shall therefore mention briefly some of the principal concerns of my Government.

181. One of these concerns is the imbalance between the population explosion and the available food, clothing and housing. It is true that international co-operation is making a considerable impact on this problem. Studies and technical assistance for increasing the yield and improving the quality of crops; discovery of new sources of food, especially proteins; control of plant and animal diseases; improved methods of exploiting ground water and of irrigation; housing and other programmes implemented by the Organization and the bodies known as members of the United Nations family—all these are evidence of this international co-operation.

182. Another of our concerns is the frustration entailed by the failure to make any positive progress at the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The growing poverty of the poor countries and the growing wealth of the rich is not a sound basis for a stable peace, and engenders many of the social conflicts which threaten the internal security of States. Moreover, the modest flow of official financial aid from the high-income to the low-income countries, and the establishment for 1970 of a possible treaty of unilateral preferences in favour of the poor countries, are praiseworthy but insufficient in a world where most countries suffer from such serious economic deterioration.

183. In the political field of the peaceful settlement of disputes we are concerned at the danger of conflicts, especially in the Near East, where it is essential that a negotiated peace, based on respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States of the area may be brought about under the wise leadership of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. This region, which has been the cradle of religions and great cultures, has also been a centre of dangerous tensions which must be resolved justly through the methods and principles of the United Nations Charter.

184. To sum up what I have said, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its faith in the United Nations as the organization

of the international community for the achievement of its basic purposes. Therefore, in testifying to the trust which my Government and my people place in the Organization, I declare that my delegation will be ready to condemn any aggression and to help to define aggression better within the United Nations, to promote methods for the peaceful solution of international disputes, to condemn any intervention in the internal affairs of States and any violation of their right to adopt whatever form of government they desire, and to condemn all forms of discrimination based on race, sex or religion. In that connexion, in a year devoted to the struggle against discrimination, I wish to express our repudiation of the violation of human rights based on racial prejudice which is occurring in Namibia and in Rhodesia. My delegation is ready to help in specifying the legal rules which should govern co-existence, a field in which the International Law Commission is doing magnificent work; to promote economic co-operation for the improvement of social well-being; and, in general, faithfully to discharge its duties under the United Nations Charter.

185. My delegation is sure, Mr. President, that you will conduct the debates of this Assembly with all your discretion and wisdom. I wish to repeat the confidence which my delegation places in Secretary-General U Thant's sincerity, dedication and evident awareness of his historic duties. I also wish to express my confidence that every Member of the United Nations will fulfil its duty in these difficult times, when the Organization is living at the centre of opposing forces and of drives towards conflict.

186. These contradictions and conflicts, which the Organization cannot avoid, perhaps arise because we are living in a transition period between two historical eras and therefore in a world dominated by change. During a single generation there has been a violent transformation of ideas and of attitudes to life. Forms of economic production have been changing under the pressure of new techniques; and this has led to changes in the social structure which are not always based on justice. Social forms have changed with the emergence of vast urban agglomerations and large concentrations of population. There has been an intellectual change in the prevailing world outlook, from a perspective three-dimensional world based on the immutability of matter to a world without perspective based on transmutations of matter. There have even been changes in religious attitudes. It may well be necessary in all these fields to give up something so as not to lose everything.

187. In this world in transition, conditioned by great advances in technology, perhaps the most urgent problem is whether the achievements of that technology and the forces it has unleashed are to be used for destruction or creation, for slavery or freedom, for one group of privileged nations or for the community of nations, for small national oligarchies or for the vast disinherited masses.

188. The United Nations, at the centre of this world in transition and in conflict, must remain an alert and vigilant reflection of the world community. History will say whether we have fulfilled our duty or whether we have turned the United Nations into a costly and useless glass Babel.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.