

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**1702nd  
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 22 October 1968,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> ):	
Speech by Mr. Tomeh (Syria) . . . . .	1
Speech by Mr. Tudor (Barbados) . . . . .	7
Speech by Mr. Al-Jaber Al-Sabah (Kuwait) . . . . .	11
Statement by the representative of Guatemala . . . . .	15

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

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Lopez (Philippines), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): When I, as the then Chairman of the Asian Group, had the honour and the privilege of congratulating the President on the first day of his election to the high post of President of the General Assembly, I observed that "your election comes at a time when dark and heavy clouds hover over the comity of nations, when a sense of deep crisis faces the conscience of mankind" [1674th meeting, para. 111]. A majority of the speakers have, in one way or another, emphasized this sense of crisis and its manifestations. We would be failing in our responsibility—indeed, it would be cynical—were we to minimize the gravity of the imminent dangers that threaten to cause a universal conflagration. In Viet-Nam, a savage, immoral, illegal war is still being waged by the United States Government against the heroic people of that land. Their subjection to the most sophisticated modern American weapons and to the continued bombing of the North has raised violent protests, not only throughout the world outside but within the United States itself as well, against what constitutes war crimes. In the Middle East, the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, coupled with war crimes and crimes against humanity, continues unabated till today. Many of the speakers have referred to the fact that, should the tragedy of the Middle East continue and persist, that very sensitive area of the world might be the powder keg for a third world war.

2. Faced with this situation, there are two principles which I would like to emphasize and within the context of which the various problems will be discussed. The first principle is implied in the very first words of the United Nations Charter: "We the peoples of the United Nations . . .". It is the peoples' needs, aspirations and hopes for a world of peace and security that we are committed to observe. The peoples who have been victims of aggression look towards a world ruled by law, not by greed and violence—we, the Arabs, among them. Our generation and

our fathers' generation have been involved in unexpectedly tragic events. Yet the recent history of the Middle East would not have been as tragic, as it has been so far, if the legal imperatives had been implemented. The same applies to the suffering of peoples wherever suffering exists.

3. The second principle is the rule of law. The most radical revolutions have not always been accompanied by storm and bloodshed, but have sometimes changed the life of mankind through the silent workings of ideas and doctrines embodying the longings of peoples for peace and order. Nor have the most effective of such ideas been the most complicated and complex in character. They have emerged from the natural anxieties of mankind. In the chasm between the pious pretensions of righteousness and their denial in action flourish the deep roots of the crisis existing all over the world.

4. The people and the Government of Syria, inspired by an unshakable faith in the rule of law, have always taken a very active role in the legal work of the United Nations. It is our considered belief that with the growth of international law, enriched, after the establishment of the United Nations, by all schools of legal thought, a world order can be established. It is only on a contractual basis, namely, the free and equal association of all States, great and small alike, that this order can be strengthened. Thus, the codification of international law in various fields can ultimately be one large guarantee of the rights of peoples, basic among which is the right to self-determination. In this context my delegation welcomed the submission for the first time to the General Assembly of a report by the International Court of Justice [A/7217]. We hope that it will inaugurate a closer relationship between the two bodies, especially as the Statute of the Court and the United Nations Charter constitute one document.

5. It is also within this context that we deplore, as we have done consistently in the past, the absence of the People's Republic of China from the membership of the United Nations and the denial up to the present of its legal rights, due to the adamant opposition of the United States Government. The absence of that great nation from our Organization makes it lacking in universality.

6. The first United Nations Development Decade is coming to an end, and the problems of the developing countries still remain far from being solved. The *per capita* income gap between the rich and the poor is widening, and, in the words of the Secretary-General, U Thant, "a large proportion of the world's population is still subjected to an inadequate and unacceptable standard of living" [A/7201/Add.1, para. 62].

7. We are fully aware that the task of accelerating the economic development and growth of the developing

countries depends mainly on their ability to mobilize effectively their internal resources and use them efficiently for the purpose of increasing the material welfare of their peoples. In addition, and to this end, they should work out schemes for trade expansion and economic integration among themselves on a regional or subregional basis.

8. But such internal efforts to increase their rates of growth are hampered by the unfavourable external environment which gives rise to fluctuations in the prices of their exports and primary products, and therefore to instability in their foreign exchange receipts. This hampers their development. Moreover, the external environment impedes the growth of their exports and leads to their exploitation by the rich countries. There is no better index of the degree of that exploitation than the long-term loss in the purchasing power of their exports in terms of their imports. Thus, the report of the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development states:

“... taking as a base for estimation the average export and import prices ruling in the years 1953-1957, the average annual magnitude of this loss has been put at nearly U.S. \$2.2 billion ...”<sup>1</sup>

9. This does not include the loss suffered by the oil-producing countries as a result of getting an inadequate share of the profits that accrue from the exploitation and marketing of their oil by the international oil monopolies and cartels. Thus while we are living in an era of decolonization, it is a sad fact that the economic system which still rules the world is in many aspects a continuation and an extension of the colonial system.

10. It is also a sad contrast to observe that when most of the present-day capitalist economies embarked on early industrialization they confronted an external environment which enabled them to exploit the present-day underdeveloped world, whereas the latter is trying to industrialize with the sword of exploitation hanging over its head.

11. We believe it is high time that the international community adopted concordant measures that would eliminate those inequalities and injustices. For a long time the developing countries have been advocating the conclusion of new commodity agreements in order to stabilize commodity prices. The results have been to say the least, disappointing. Moreover, they have been urging—with dismal results—the developed countries to take measures that would ensure freer access to their markets for the exports of developing countries.

12. We believe that in addition to the aforementioned measures, the developed countries should increase the flow of external development financing and relax the terms on which external development assistance is given, for they still remain too hard and too harsh. We should like, therefore, to reiterate our support for the recommendations made by the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development concerning the aid volume target and the improvement of the terms and conditions of aid.

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Second Session*, vol. I, *Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.II.D.14), part one, chap. III, para. 30.

13. Finally, we should like to stress that an international development strategy for the next United Nations Development Decade should contain precise commitments on the part of the developed, as well as the developing countries, with regard to measures that should be implemented by both groups of countries. An international development strategy which contains no such commitment will be no more than a declaration of pious hopes and intentions.

14. In the field of decolonization—and that is indeed a noble task that the United Nations undertook to carry into fruition, for the benefit of mankind and the achievement of equal societies in independence and sovereignty—the road ahead lies blocked. This would not be so were it not for the adoption by the Governments of South Africa and Portugal of reactionary theories opposing discrimination to equality, conquest to emancipation, and assimilation to self-determination. Do those policies breed anything other than struggle, blood, ruthless repression and a definite threat to international peace and security? Does suppression of the political rights of 4 million Africans in Zimbabwe by a minority racist régime result in anything else but racial hatred and the poisoning of the atmosphere of universal brotherhood upon which the Charter is based? And are the illicit profits realized by the strong international monopolies, to the detriment of the indigenous African peoples, worth the dangers that they spread in South Africa and the uncertainties they cause to the future of that highly sensitive region of the world?

15. The irony of it all is that the culprits often enjoy imperialist support. They sometimes even find a ready welcome in a so-called defensive alliance whose members loudly condemn such policies but quietly supply those who perpetrate them with money, arms, and investments. The travesty of truth is at its most deplorable. No era has witnessed to such a degree the contradiction between words and deeds. This very disquieting picture gives us even more reason for hope and joy at seeing Swaziland and Equatorial Guinea accede to independence, sovereignty and membership of the community of nations. Particularly deserving of high tribute in this respect, is Spain's co-operation with the efforts of the United Nations during the process leading Equatorial Guinea to independence. The other administering Powers, which have adopted a rather obstructive course in the field of co-operation with the United Nations, may now change their attitude and follow the example of Spain. To the peoples and leaders of Swaziland and Equatorial Guinea, we express our sincerest congratulations.

16. The Middle East crisis to be adequately assessed, must be understood in depth. Any other approach would lead to nothing but palliatives, especially in the absence of the people directly concerned—I mean the Arab people of Palestine. The Israeli war of 5 June against the Arabs is the culmination—though not yet the climax—of the Western colonial economic onslaught on the Arabs for oil and strategy which started in the last century. The total profits of oil companies operating in Arab countries are of the magnitude of \$3,000 million a year. The total United States official bilateral assistance to the whole African continent for 1969 will be less than one quarter of the profits that American oil companies derive from operating only in one Arab oil-producing country. These figures are startling—but they are there.

17. What reward did the Arabs get from the United States Government? Israel, its aggression and its continued occupation of Arab land. In the words of a distinguished Jewish historian, J. L. Talman, "the establishment of Israel confronted the Arabs with the injury and shame of having an alien race injected by imperialism into the nerve centers of the Arab homeland". The United States itself, born from one of the greatest revolutions of modern history, which has influenced the progress of mankind, has, unfortunately, through the retrogressive policies of its Government inherited Western colonial domination and consequently become the staunch enemy of every revolution in the world. Such was and still is its policy towards the Arabs. The Arab peoples, heirs to one of the greatest and most universal cultures of mankind, still living legacy, have been striving to liberate themselves from centuries of alien domination to build a better and fuller life. In this their legitimate struggle for liberation, they have been confronted with the radically anti-democratic and destructive United States policy. To achieve these ends Israel is but one of the means the United States has been using. It would take long to retail our bill of complaints, but I shall confine myself to the following.

18. First, the negotiations initiated by the United States Government to give fifty Phantom jets to Israel comes as no surprise to us, knowing the unblushing support that this Government has given Israel for the last twenty-five years. To the Arabs, giving Israel such offensive arms while it occupies Arab territories three times its area is exactly as though the Nazis had been given arms by the United States after their *blitzkrieg* of Europe in 1941. The ultimate objectives have been to put pressure on the Arabs to accept the *diktat* of Israel.

19. Secondly, a more ominous measure is the amendment to the 1967 Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, which took effect on 2 January 1968, directing the President to "subtract from United States aid to all but seven underdeveloped nations the equivalent of what each country spends for such modern arms as jet aircraft and missile systems". Among the seven exempted nations is Israel. But Israel, by the economic standards of the United Nations—and, in fact, by all economic standards—is considered to be among the developed, not the underdeveloped, peoples. Israel boasts of its technical assistance programmes to underdeveloped countries. As to its military power and capabilities, suffice it to mention that on 4 October 1968 Mr. Eshkol stated that Israel had the know-how to make atomic bombs. Should we not be surprised, then, when Israel is converted by American legislation into an "underdeveloped" country to enable it to procure free, supersonic jets, missiles and the like for use in pressuring, devastating, conquering and killing the Arabs?

20. Thirdly, the stand of the United States Government on supporting the continued Israeli occupation of Arab lands is flagrant. The United States Government must recognize its utter inconsistency before and after the 5 June Israeli war against the Arabs, for in May its representative in the Security Council, while we were sitting there, urged the restoration of the *status quo ante* between the Arabs and Israel. After the Israeli victory the same representative of the United States stated that the restoration of the *status*

*quo ante* would constitute, in his own words, a "prescription for war", and not a "prelude to peace".

21. If further proof is needed, it comes from Mr. Eschkol himself, when he stated on 22 June of this year, over a radio station called "Israel":

"As for the Security Council resolution of last November, only after the United States had made it clear that it concerned new fixed borders, different from the 4 June lines, to be determined by agreement between Israel and its neighbors, could we co-operate with the United Nations envoy."

22. That a great Power should abuse its power to that extent, leading the Middle East to the brink of another war, is a blunder which will be harshly judged by the living conscience of mankind and by history.

23. Fourthly, Israel plainly declared its annexation of occupied Arab territories, including the Syrian Golan Heights. The Jewish Agency's American section announced, on 15 July 1968, plans to exploit those Heights. The plan envisaged 15 thousand head of cattle on 600 thousand dunams of natural pasture in the occupied Golan of Syria. That Jewish Agency "represents in the United States the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Israel, which is recognized by the State of Israel as the authorized agency to work in Israel for development and colonization and the absorption and settlement of immigrants", according to the 1967 American Jewish Yearbook. Similar colonization and the settlement of Nahal colonies are taking place in occupied Arab territories. So far they number forty-eight, and maps of those territories were distributed to the Second Immigration World Zionist Conference which was held in Jerusalem.

24. A grave international legal problem is involved here; and it is no accident that I mention this fact. The Jewish Agency, American section, operates freely inside the United States as an integral part of the Israel Government. The like of this exists nowhere in the world. American capital and tax-free help amounting to billions of dollars is being permitted by the United States Government, in the words of the Jewish Agency, to "colonize, settle and exploit the conquered lands of Member States of the United Nations". I need not elaborate on the legal aspects of this problem, but I leave it to the considered judgment of the great many jurists in this Assembly to ponder its grave implications.

25. The bitterness which the Arabs feel towards that American policy has been recognized very recently by a great American international figure, the Honourable Mr. Eugene Black, former Director of the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development. In an address given in Washington on 4 October 1968 he pointed to the fact "that Israel was established in part by an international enactment in which the United States and the former imperial Powers of Western Europe played a leading role". Continuing in the same vein, Eugene Black said of the Arab refugees: "Those millions of cases of individual tragedy and personal suffering, whose plight is like a dagger in the heart of humanity."

26. Fifthly, the United States Government has been a culprit in the creation of this tragedy as proved by officially published documents of the State Department which show

that the United States Government knew as early as 1943 that the Israeli terrorist underground had "plans fully made" to drive the Arab majority out of Palestine by provoking them into war. But to add fuel to the fire, it has been playing a predominant role in the perpetration of this human tragedy. It has systematically fought every effort in the United Nations to safeguard Arab property rights in Palestine, thus preventing the Arab refugees from receiving the benefits of their still legally owned properties in Palestine and forcing them to continue living in inhuman conditions, utter misery and despair. This it did while it played a predominant role in securing from West Germany reparations to world Zionist organizations and Israel collectively and individually—not to speak of the vicious arming of Israel through West Germany and its connivers.

27. Bearing in mind this tragedy, which has continued to be the source of wars upsetting the area and is still threatening it with explosion, we approach the grave Palestine problem with the utmost responsibility a problem of such great magnitude it deserves.

28. On 8 October this year the Israeli Foreign Minister, Mr. Eban, gave this Assembly a very detailed statement lasting exactly one hour and fifteen minutes, embodying his so-called plan for peace. In it he criticized the Arab speakers who had preceded him for "the lack of detailed and organized comment on concrete issues" [1686th meeting, para. 87].

29. If my delegation has waited so long to offer its comments, it is because we were sure that the answers to refute Mr. Eban would be forthcoming from three sources—Israel itself, the United Nations documents and Mr. Eban himself.

(1) On 9 October Defence Minister General Moshe Dayan said, after Mr. Eban had delivered his statement, that "the Sinai Peninsula is as vital to Israel's security as are the Golan Heights of Syria."

(2) On 16 October Mr. Samuel Tamir, an opposition member of the Israeli Parliament, speaking here in New York at a press conference, maintained that "Israel must hold permanently the territory she occupied in the six-day war with the Arab States in 1967." Mr. Tamir is a member of the party funded by Menachim Begin, the Irgun Zvi Leumi, the HERUT Party, whose slogan is "Israel on both sides of the Jordan."

(3) Against the background of sharp divisions inside the coalition Government of Israel, Mr. Eban, while giving the impression of being specific in detail, was indeed only too general. The crux of this division within the Israel coalition Government is not what territories to return to the Arabs, but how much to hold. Thus, everybody knows by now that there is the Menachim Begin plan—of which a map is annexed to my text—which aims at annexing all the occupied territory, plus the east side of the Jordan. There are also the "Dayan Plan, the Allon Plan and, last but not least, the "greater Israel plan" of Mr. Eshkol himself, who on 22 June 1968 declared over Quol Yisrael that "Israel would insist that the River Jordan remain the country's security border." He said that Israel distinguished between political borders, cease-fire lines and security borders, and

that the historical rights of the people of Israel to the land of Israel would have to be taken into account. A map of the greater Israel of Mr. Eshkol and Itzhak Rabin is also attached to my text. But with respect to Mr. Eshkol's statement, special attention should be paid to the remark related to "the historical rights of the people of Israel to the land of Israel" because, according to them, the land of Israel has not been completely "liberated" from the Arabs, to use Zionist terminology. What Mr. Eban said boils down to the fact that Israel will never return to the 4 June 1967 armistice lines.

(4) On 10 October, that is two days after Mr. Eban's speech [1686th meeting], with its routine refrain about peace, Israeli demolition teams bulldozed the Syrian village of Ahmediye in the occupied Syrian territory, as witnessed by the United Nations Military Observers, and erased all remnants and traces of Arab life. Bulldozers, the eviction of Arab populations and atrocities against Arab civilians have become the distinguishing traits of Israeli mastery.

30. This leads me to the humanitarian aspect of the Palestine tragedy. In the same statement Mr. Eban said, in criticism of United Nations procedure, that:

"Resolutions are often adopted in a rhetorical spirit irrespective of their equity or prospect of fulfilment. . . . 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 or sentimental predilections are entirely on one side, the majority vote loses its moral and political worth." [Ibid., para. 78.]

31. First, this necessitates "detailed and organized comment", as Mr. Eban himself demands. The humanitarian resolution which became resolution 237 (1967) of 15 June 1967—was submitted by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia and adopted unanimously by the Security Council. Its operative paragraph 1 specifically:

"Calls upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities."

32. It was later confirmed in the General Assembly by resolution 2252 (ES-V), adopted on 4 July 1967 by 116 votes with none against. Both were recently confirmed by resolution 259 (1968) adopted by the Security Council on 27 September 1968 by the affirmative vote of twelve members with none voting against. I now put the question: Does Mr. Eban consider that this vote, reflecting the will of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations representatives and world public opinion, was merely a "mathematical accident . . . rather than a balanced verdict" [1686th meeting, para. 78]. And did Israel respect the call of the United Nations to facilitate the return of the now over half a million newly displaced Arabs, in addition to the old refugees? Did Israel permit the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to go to the area in implementation of three solemn humanitarian resolutions?

33. Secondly, I said that the answer to Mr. Eban would be forthcoming from the United Nations itself. In fact, on 14



October the Secretary-General, U Thant, issued his third report on the implementation of the humanitarian resolutions. From his answer to the Israeli representative dated 7 October I quote the following:

“The unavoidable conclusion to be drawn from your letter, as I interpret it, is that my approach has been met with only a conditional and therefore inadequate response. In this regard, may I repeat that my letter of 28 September was written in pursuance of Security Council resolution 259. You will note particularly that operative paragraph 2 of the resolution makes a request of the Government of Israel which envisages implementation without conditions. Further, please note that operative paragraph 1 of the resolution in question refers exclusively to ‘... the Arab territories under military occupation by Israel ...’. It will be understood, I am sure, that it is not within the discretion of the Secretary-General to modify the requirements of a Security Council resolution or to concur in a course of action less than or different from what is called for in that resolution.”<sup>2</sup>

34. Thirdly, on 15 October the Commissioner-General of UNRWA released his report on the work of the Agency to this the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. In it the following is stated:

“Those who became refugees for a second time (about 175,000), together with most of the 350,000 or more other persons newly displaced from the occupied areas of southern Syria, the West Bank of Jordan, Gaza and Sinai, were in need of the very essentials of physical survival – food, water, shelter, blankets, clothing, and health care and, scarcely less important, the education of their children. For many, these needs could be met only in tented camps, where winter cold and storms brought additional suffering.” [A/7213, para. 1.]

35. Fourthly, the Economic and Social Council on 31 May, the Teheran International Conference on Human Rights on 7 May, the Commission on Human Rights on 27 February all confirmed the humanitarian resolutions. The same Commission on Human Rights on 8 March cabled a strong protest to the Israeli Government against its violations of Arab human rights and fundamental freedoms. Yet, up to this hour Israel continues its Nazi-like policy against the Arabs and in occupied Arab territories. This it does in complete violation of Articles 31, 32, 33 and 53 of the Geneva Conventions, of which it is a signatory.

“The razing to the ground of the installations of refugee camps ... in the Gaza Strip ... and the systematic destruction of houses as reprisals against acts of resistance, are violations of these conventions. The perpetrators of these acts could be prosecuted ...

“It is sad to note that these texts which were specifically formulated in order to prevent the recurrence of crimes of which the Jews were the unhappy victims during the Second World War, are transgressed by these very same people.

“By a bitter irony of fate, the victims of today have no links with the perpetrators of yesterday’s crimes. And it is to the prejudice of these innocent victims that the sons of

yesterday’s victims today commit some of those crimes which vengeance in itself could not excuse.”<sup>3</sup>

36. Fifthly, what about the resolutions voted by this Assembly and the Security Council asking Israel to rescind all the measures it has already taken vis-à-vis Jerusalem? The Israeli Government stated that Jerusalem is non-negotiable and that its decision is irrevocable. Could there be more withering contempt for the will of this world Organization? But the best comment on Israel’s utter disregard of all laws of civilized nations came from Mr. Eban himself when he stated in Jerusalem:

“... if the General Assembly were to vote by 121 to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the armistice lines tomorrow, Israel would refuse to comply with that decision”.

37. The statement by Mr. Eban just quoted is a very fitting introduction to what Mr. Eban described as “the nine principles by which peace [*with the Arabs*] can be achieved” [1686th meeting, para. 109]. These nine principles resolve themselves into two main problems: (1) secure and recognized boundaries, and (2) the Arab refugee problem. I shall address myself to the first. The terms “secure and recognized boundaries”, “boundary settled”, “agreed territorial boundaries”, “permanent boundaries”, and so forth, occurred in his speech at least ten times. Emphasis was laid by him on precise conditions, and in his words, “including an agreed map of the secure and recognized boundaries” [ibid./].

38. Here again I shall be very specific. I want to take one single page of the tragic history of Palestine to show the pattern of Israel expansionism, arrogance and cynicism. I refer to the Protocol of Lausanne of 12 May 1949, contained in the third progress report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, dated 21 June 1949<sup>4</sup> and I must add that I am not the first Arab speaker to refer to this Protocol. Now I urge all Members of the United Nations genuinely concerned with the Middle East crisis and the Palestine problem to read this Protocol in its entirety. Both Israeli and Arab representatives signed it, under the auspices of the United Nations Conciliation Commission. For the sake of the membership of the United Nations, which has more than doubled since 1949 and to whom this Protocol may be unknown, I shall read it because of its brevity and its relevance to the issues of borders and refugees. The Protocol is as follows:

“The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, anxious to achieve as quickly as possible the objectives of the General Assembly resolution of 11 December 1948 regarding refugees, the respect for their rights and the preservation of their property, as well as territorial and other questions, has proposed to the delegations of the Arab States and to the delegation of Israel that the working document attached hereto be taken as a basis for discussions with the Commission.”<sup>5</sup>

39. To this document was annexed a map, as required by Mr. Eban, indicating the boundaries defined in General

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1968, document S/8851, para. 4.

<sup>3</sup> R. de Geouffre de la Pradelle, “Occupation and the Law” in *Israel and the Geneva Conventions* (Beirut, The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1968), p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, document A/927.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., document A/927, annex A.

Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 concerning partition. One day before the signing of this Protocol Israel was accepted into the membership of the United Nations. The fourth paragraph of resolution 273 (III) accepting Israel as a Member State says:

“Noting . . . the declaration by the State of Israel that it ‘unreservedly accepts the obligations of the United Nations Charter and undertakes to honour them from the day when it becomes a Member of the United Nations’.”

40. A few days later, according to paragraph 33 of the Third Progress Report, the exact words of which I will quote:

“... the attitude of the Israel delegation is that it could not accept a certain proportionate distribution of territory agreed upon in 1947 as a criterion for a territorial settlement in present circumstances.”

41. By then—that is, between 1947 and 1948—Israel had conquered 77 per cent of Palestine: that is to say, 25 per cent more than it was given by partition. It also asked clearly that the Gaza Strip should be annexed to Israel, and at the same time put aside the objections of the Conciliation Commission to its transferring its capital from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Paragraph 25 states that:

“The Israel delegation proposed that the political frontier between Israel and Egypt and Lebanon respectively should be the same as that which separated the latter countries from Palestine under the British Mandate.”

42. The Arab refugee problem mentioned in the Lausanne Protocol was completely ignored and sidetracked.

43. Now I address myself to jurists in this Assembly. When, as far back as 1949, Israel solemnly demanded in an official document of the United Nations that the international boundaries of Palestine within which an Arab majority lived and 95 per cent of which was owned by Arabs should be the boundaries of Israel, did this not legally constitute open belligerency and a declaration of war on the Arabs? One wonders what Israel means by “secure and agreed upon boundaries”.

44. To clarify the matter and to save the time of the Assembly, I have annexed four maps<sup>6</sup> to my statement. The first shows the Israel of the United Nations in 1947 when, on 29 November, in accordance with the partition, the Jews who owned only 5.6 per cent of the area and represented only 30 per cent of the population, were given 55 per cent of the area of the country, as against the Arabs, who owned 95 per cent and constituted 70 per cent of the total population of Palestine. The second is a map of the Israel of 1948 when, after attacking the Arab States, Israel occupied 77 per cent of the area of Palestine. On the same map there are two side maps showing what 77 per cent of the United States and of Great Britain would constitute. The third map shows the Israel of David Ben-Gurion of 1956 and the fourth is a map of “Greater Israel”, the Israel of Levi Eshkol, Abba Eban and Itzhak Rabin after the 5 June 1967 war. Then there are two other maps which represent the still unfulfilled claims of Israel. The first shows the Israel of the World Zionist Organization presented to

the Peace Conference in 1919, which included all Palestine, the southern part of Lebanon up to Sidon, Hauran, which includes the Golan Heights where the Israeli armies now are and goes down to Maan near the Arabian peninsula. The second is a map of the Israel of Menachim Begin, the hero of Deir Yasseen, now a member of the Israeli Cabinet.

45. All these maps show the expansion of Israel and the claims which are still voiced by Israeli and Zionist leaders against the Arab lands and the Arab people. Rivers, mountains, valleys, seas and other such natural physical features used to constitute natural frontiers and boundaries but today, with the advance of science and technique, these concepts have become more or less obsolete. The very basis of international law has been changed. What, therefore, does the Israeli concept of “secure and agreed upon boundaries” boil down to? It boils down to acceptance by the Arabs of another *fait accompli* and of the *diktat* of Israel. In fact, if we take into consideration the specific details I have given concerning the expansion of Israel during the period 1947 to 1967, with the Lausanne Protocol including a map of the partition boundaries rejected by Israel, we cannot but draw the logical conclusion, based upon our factual, bitter experience, that the ultimate “secure and agreed upon boundaries” remain fluid and yet to be fulfilled. In fact, Mr. Eban himself has alerted the Arab Governments. He said:

“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.” [1686th meeting, para. 126.]

46. If that statement is not pregnant with belligerency and does not constitute in fact an ultimatum as regards the annexation of Arab lands and further wars, I leave it entirely to this Assembly to weigh its implications.

47. With regard to Mr. Eban’s three points purporting to solve the refugee problem, they amount to the following. First, a complete, cynical ignorance of all United Nations resolutions affirming the right of refugees to return to their homes as recommended by the Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, who was assassinated by Zionist terrorists in Jerusalem, and stating that they should do so at the earliest practicable date in accordance with paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. This has since been confirmed by twenty-one solemn resolutions of the General Assembly. The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine was created for their implementation and it still exists. Its work has been frustrated by Israel and its protector, the United States.

48. Indeed, on 19 December 1967 the twenty-second session of the General Assembly voted resolution 2341 (XXII), operative paragraph 4 of which states:

“Notes with regret that the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine was unable to find a means to achieve progress in the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), and requests the Commission to exert continued efforts towards the implementation thereof.”

49. Secondly, the Conciliation Commission and a land expert have identified and established Arab property in Palestine, militarily conquered and usurped by Israel and

<sup>6</sup> See A/PV.1702/Add.1 (mimeographed only).

the Zionists. According to international law authorities, a military occupation does not terminate a legal right. The Legal Department of the United Nations put out a special legal study in October 1961<sup>7</sup> to secure the implementation of paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III).

50. Thirdly, Mr. Eban's three points ignore, with equal cynicism and arrogance, the recent humanitarian resolutions concerning Israel's obligation to facilitate the return of the Arab inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities—on which I have dwelt at length. Consequently, his scheme to widen what he called the uniting of families is only a cheap bluff and would become obsolete if the humanitarian resolutions were implemented by Israel, as requested by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

51. Fourthly, Mr. Eban's three points concerning the refugees amount to a liquidation of the Palestine problem. But there was, there is, and there always will be a Palestine problem. For as long as the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, as enshrined in the Charter, remains denied to them by international intrigues and brutal force, that problem will persist. The Arabs of Palestine refused and will continue to refuse Israel's verdict, as well as the verdict of Zionism and its protectors asking them to commit collective suicide.

52. For those who are genuinely interested in world peace and who consider the Middle East to be an explosive area, there is one question that should be asked. Why is it that the United Nations since 1947 and up to the present day, and before it the League of Nations during its whole life, have been continuously seized of the Palestine question and its derivative issues? Why is it that peace in the area has so far been illusive? The answer is to be found in the two principles which I affirmed at the outset of my statement, namely, the legitimate rights and aspirations of peoples and the rule of law to sustain those rights. Once there has been a travesty of right and law, there is no force in the world—no matter how great and crushing it may be—that can overwhelm a people which believes in its rights. One irreducible fact must be reckoned with: there are two and a half million Arab Palestinians who constitute a people and a nation. From 1921, when the British mandate was imposed upon them, purporting to treat them as “a sacred trust”—which was anything but sacred—up to this very moment, their history has been a continuous, heroic struggle to secure their sacred rights. Secretary-General U Thant spoke truly when he said:

“People everywhere, and this certainly applies to the Palestinian refugees . . . have a natural right to be in their homeland and to have a future.”<sup>8</sup>

53. Intrigues, schemes worked out in the dark, will end in failure. On 13 October 1964 I stated from this rostrum:

“The Arab struggle for Palestine is basically a struggle of a people for liberation, a people whose right to self-determination was denied, a people asking for nothing less than the right of self-determination, a people whose lands, territories, homes and farms have been

stolen from them, and they are asking them back. In a word, it is a struggle for liberation from a brand of imperialism the like of which has never been known in history. Ideologically, it is a struggle to purify Judaism from the distortions, attritions and criminality of Zionism. History, the final and ultimate tribunal of mankind, will prove that Arab struggle will ultimately save Judaism from the clutches of Zionism.” [1359th meeting, para. 99.]

54. The problem of Palestine is not only a political problem, a dispute over boundaries, rivers and stolen lands; but beyond that, it is fundamentally a moral problem. If politics will not submit to the rule of law and the aspirations of people and suffocates the moral conscience of mankind, as Zionism has succeeded in doing so far, nothing but catastrophe will result unless and until the right is re-established.

55. That Israel was able, after its *blitzkrieg* of 5 June 1967, to occupy Arab territories three times its area will not alter by one iota the essence of the Palestine problem. I might only add that our struggle, founded on universal human values born in our own lands and given to the world, and inspired by those values, might also result in giving a guilty conscience to the West, in purifying the Western liberal and humanistic tradition of its divisiveness, double standards and schizophrenia. The Arabs have suffered enough from such apathy and conspiracies of silence. But one great lesson of history is that apathy can lead to war—and surely we all hate war. It is only on the basis of understanding and the recognition of the rights of peoples, including the Arab people of Palestine, that an everlasting peace can be achieved.

56. Mr. TUDOR (Barbados): It is indeed a great pleasure and honour for me to extend the congratulations of my Government to Mr. Arenales on his attainment of the high office of President of the General Assembly at its twenty-third session. At the same time I wish to place on record our deep appreciation to the outgoing President, the distinguished Foreign Minister of Romania, His Excellency Mr. Corneliu Manescu, for the way in which he has steered the deliberations of this body during the past session. I must confess to a sense of personal pleasure in offering these congratulations in my capacity as Minister of State for Caribbean and Latin American Affairs in the Cabinet of Barbados. Indeed I cannot help but feel that this high honour which has been accorded to Mr. Arenales in recognition of his distinguished talents, experience and diplomatic skill will be amply justified by his performance in the exacting role which he will be called upon to play during this session.

57. The country I have the honour to represent is distinguished from the majority of countries in the hemisphere by different traditions of government and by different ethnic and cultural affiliations. These differences are the result of a colonial past over which we had no control. Even before we gained our independence my Government began to take a hard look at that history and that past. With independence it became possible for us to put into practice the results of that examination. Barbados is now a member of the Organization of American States and is fully committed to its hemispheric destiny. For while it is not possible to unmake history, it is the prerogative of

<sup>7</sup> Document A/AC.25/W.81/Rev.2.

<sup>8</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A (A/6701/Add.1), para. 49.*

an independent State to choose at least some of the priorities of its future. We in Barbados are profoundly convinced that only through mutual co-operation at the regional level can our country and the other countries of Latin America hope to reach the goal of self-sustaining growth.

58. At the same time, my Government cannot pretend to be unconcerned when the aims of hemispheric co-operation are endangered by disputes and disagreements within the hemisphere itself. Such disputes impose crippling limitations on the capacity of the region to play its full role in world affairs and indeed restrict the individual States in their attempts to achieve solidarity within the hemisphere. One such dispute has been brought to the attention of the General Assembly by the Minister of State of Guyana in his address on 3 October 1968 [*1680th meeting*]. It is a dispute which threatens Guyana with the loss of nearly two thirds of its land area and, thus, with the loss of much of its potential for development. It is a dispute founded on a unilateral allegation which would set aside a boundary settlement that was accepted by the parties as being a "full, perfect and final settlement", sixty-nine years ago. My Government deeply regrets that Venezuela has seen fit to reopen this matter and to take action culminating in the Decree of 9 July 1968, to which reference was made by the representative of Guyana. We hope that it will not be beyond the powers of the more influential States in the hemisphere, with the assistance if necessary of the United Nations, to put an end to a quarrel that has dangerous implications for the solidarity and security of the entire region.

59. I must now offer our congratulations to the Government and people of the Kingdom of Swaziland, our newest Member State, on its admission to the deliberations of this forum. Though greater in size and population than we are, Swaziland is also a small nation, whose presence we are sure will add immeasurably to the contribution which small States are making to the maintenance of international peace and stability. The independence of Swaziland is another blow struck in the fight against the twin problems of colonialism and racial discrimination. We pledge our firm support to the battle which this Assembly is waging for the liberation of the peoples of southern Africa. We are equally happy to learn of the attainment of independence of Equatorial Guinea and look forward to welcoming that country into our family of nations.

60. Our support of self-determination is not restricted to any one geographical region. Thus it is that my delegation finds it hard to understand why this Assembly should have treated the question of British Honduras so summarily during its last session. Are the aspirations of the people of that dependent Territory to freedom and self-determination not to receive the fullest consideration in all the organs of the United Nations? We are pleased by the recent statement by the United Kingdom promising an early conference to discuss independence for British Honduras. We shall be even more happy to be reassured that the Assembly of nations is watching vigilantly over the progress of the people of that Territory towards unfettered and uncompromised nationhood.

61. Then there is Southern Rhodesia. The rebel Government manned by a minority régime of unabashed racists has

now been offered respectability by the Government of the United Kingdom. The gift has been tied together with gaily coloured ribbons of "constitutional reform", a technique at which the British Government considers itself a past master. There are "blocking quarters", "cross-voting", and "entrenched provisions", and we are told that the famous "six principles" remain sacrosanct.

62. A small nation like ours, in which different races have learned to live together in peace and joint endeavour, suffers a particularly exquisite kind of anguish when it contemplates the fate of millions of Africans in the southern part of that troubled continent. It used to be fashionable not so very long ago for publicists in the West to speak of "darkest Africa". Is there anything in Africa darker than the chronicle of white racism in South Africa, in Namibia and in Southern Rhodesia? The family of nations is now being called upon to acquiesce in the handing over of four million Africans to the mercies of a quarter of a million non-Africans who have shown no disposition at all to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person", to quote from the brave words of the preamble to the Charter of this Organization. The Government and people of Barbados do not intend to acquiesce and we hope that the Members of this Organization, weak or powerful, large or small, will not acquiesce in the sale of 4 million human beings for a mess of parchment and £50 million.

63. Perhaps because mine is a small nation with no vested interest in aggrandizement or aggression, our commitment to the United Nations as the key instrument for the maintenance of international peace is total. Perhaps because mine is a poor nation scratching a bare living for its people in the infertile fields of commodity agreements, the daily wastage of the world's wealth in Viet-Nam and in the stockpiling of armaments and in arms races arouses in the Government and people of Barbados a genuine horror.

64. This commitment and this horror have led my Government to give its whole-hearted support to the efforts during the last session of the Assembly to obtain an international agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is somewhat dispiriting to find that some of those same Powers that chivvied and shooed nations like mine into this ark should now themselves be hesitating on the brink of actual ratification of the treaty.

65. We have also supported the effort, so brilliantly and tirelessly spearheaded by the Government of Mexico and its representatives to create a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. Indeed a few days ago we signed and ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco.<sup>9</sup> But my delegation must say to this twenty-third session of the General Assembly, as we said to the twenty-second, that a partially nuclear-free zone is not a nuclear-free zone. So long as there is one country in that zone which is not bound by the international contract, then that contract comes dangerously close to being a futility. The refusal of Venezuela to countenance signature by Guyana of the Latin American denuclearization treaty is, in essence, a threat to the security of the hemisphere. My Government must hope that this is no more than a temporary obstacle; our hemisphere cannot afford a thermonuclear loop-hole.

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes agenda item 91, document A/C.1/946.*



66. We cannot believe that national independence and the exercise of sovereignty must be subordinated to considerations of ideology. This would be to deny the very basis upon which this Organization is founded. Even in the days when my country was directly under colonial control, we took for granted a certain freedom to experiment with the social order. The flagrant intervention of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries in Czechoslovakia in August has shocked and horrified the people of Barbados, as it has the people of many small countries throughout the world. Once more we see a great Power asserting, in the crudest way possible, its conviction that strength, technological superiority and the dictates of its own brand of ideology place it above the law, and above any considerations of international morality.

67. A succession of crises, beginning at least as far back as 1956, seem to be bringing the world inexorably towards a *real politik* based on a tacit demarcation of spheres of influence. A country like mine must hope that this reading of developments in international relations is radically wrong; "spheres of influence" sounds to us ominously akin to the bad old concept of "balance of power", and any undergraduate knows what the world has suffered in the name of that wicked, immoral euphemism for the law of the jungle.

68. It was none other than this concept that was at the heart of the "scramble for Africa" in the late years of the last century. Our own decade has seen what might be called "the scamper from Africa" with its obverse side of economic imperialism which some have called neo-colonialism. It is not difficult to see the traces of this virus in the suffering of our brothers in Nigeria today, in the internecine conflict which may set back by two generations the development of the most populous country in the African continent. We, the newly independent countries, ignore at our own risk the virulence of the spores left behind by departing imperialism. Many of the people of the Caribbean and of Latin America have roots in Nigeria, as the Assembly well knows; for us it is a family tragedy of universal proportions.

69. For us, one of the more positive aspects of international life has been the observance of this year, 1968, as the International Year for Human Rights. It would, perhaps, be too much to expect that the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should have become the focal point of government policies throughout the world. At the same time, we must confess to disappointment at the evidence, in this year of celebration, that there is very little to celebrate, that in too many countries fundamental human rights have received only marginal attention from the policy makers.

70. Last year we approached the discussions of the second session of UNCTAD<sup>10</sup> with genuine optimism. There was much brave talk of points of crystallization, centres of gravity and such, all suggesting that the time had come when all the Member States of this Assembly, despite their differing ideological viewpoints or stages of development, were ready to make a concerted effort towards the fulfilment of resolution 2296 (XXII). In this same resolution this Assembly decided to consider at its twenty-third

session the results of this conference. What results? If there is one word which sums up our feelings on this marathon confrontation, that word is "disappointment".

71. After the "Second UNCTAD", the gap between what the richest nations are ready to promote and what they are actually prepared to deliver yawns as large as ever. We are now faced with the threat of a retreat from the principles enshrined in the Charter into a phase of new isolationism. Countries like my own cannot but feel dismay at the delay in concluding international commodity agreements, when the problem of export instability strikes at the core of their economic existence.

72. My delegation has made its stand clear on the need for fundamental change in the pattern of world economic relations. The effects of years of systematic pillage by the colonial Powers cannot be undone overnight; it is daunting now to find that those same nations which have been the major beneficiaries of those wicked years are shirking their responsibility to assist in the rehabilitation which is necessary with the plea of "pressing domestic problems" as their excuse.

73. I would not wish this Assembly to believe that the Government and people of Barbados are standing, hat in hand, waiting for largesse from the carriages of the rich. Self-help is one of the ruling concepts in our policy. In the Caribbean area there are many countries and territories of like mind with us. Barbados is proud to have played a leading role in the establishment of the Caribbean Free Trade Association.

74. But our aspirations are not limited to our own development and that of the countries closest to us by reason of history, geography and sustained association. We have closely followed similar efforts on the mainland of Latin America, and we are convinced that the way to self-sufficiency for our region lies in total economic integration.

75. I wish to place on record the deep appreciation of my Government for the work which the United Nations Development Programme, the specialized agencies, and our regional Economic Commission for Latin America have been carrying out in my country. Small States have no choice but to accept the challenge of manipulating their environment, and to co-operate with larger nations to acquire the technology on which such a task is dependent. My Government deeply appreciates the efforts of the United Nations Development Programme in the evaluation of the resources of the sea around us, and in the training of our nationals in the techniques of its exploitation.

76. A somewhat unedifying debate has been pursued during this decade, so optimistically named the United Nations Development Decade, as to whether the rich countries should devote one per cent of their national income to assisting the poorer countries with their development or whether it should be one per cent of their gross national product.

77. A look at the figures of the outflow of capital from developing countries to the developed countries puts this argument in proper perspective. Indeed, I should like to

<sup>10</sup> Held in New Delhi from 1 February to 29 March 1968.

take this opportunity to congratulate the Organization on the impressive work of information and research it has carried out successfully over the years. That work has contributed fundamentally to the destruction of some of the more dangerous illusions under which countries without the necessary skills or data might have laboured. We now know a little more about the nature of that half-chimerical substance called "aid". It is therefore easier for us to assess the results of the Kennedy Round and to put that exercise in a realistic perspective.

78. The principle that friendly relations and co-operation among States must be based on the respect of equal rights and self-determination of peoples is enshrined in the Charter of this Organization. My Government attaches the highest importance to that principle. Thus, my Government has paid close attention to the work being done by the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States since its admission to this Organization even though my country had not attained the essentials of nationhood when the General Assembly resolved to undertake a study of these principles.

79. It is our earnest hope that those efforts will result in the codification and progressive development of accepted legal principles for friendly relations and co-operation. My Government must voice its firm conviction of the perpetual need for respect for the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter and regards the task of formulating the content of principles on which friendly relations among States may be established as a commendable effort which should soon be brought to fruition. We would wish to see those principles formulated in the light of a universal concept of justice based on the objective of creating a world community in which international law and an international standard of conduct are safeguards to justice and to liberty.

80. There is a well-known dictum that the price of liberty is unceasing vigilance. The small nation, steadfast in the pursuit of equity and justice in international relations, conducted in an atmosphere of respect and of peace, must guard against the sneaking growth of novel conceptions of international law which serve merely as a thin veneer to hide the creeping twilight of new imperialisms.

81. Today, despite the continued existence of divisive forces in each major area of the international scene and the threatening onset of new disturbances, there is still room to view with tempered optimism the prospect of the fulfilment of those ideals on which this Assembly was established.

82. At least once a year, and occasionally more than once in each year, it is the heavy responsibility of the representatives who speak in this forum to adumbrate exhaustively the several problems which beset the States whose spokesmen they are. Each speaks for his country, setting forth the hopes and grievances of a Member State. From these deliberations we try, with frequently disappointing results, to pluck flowers of safety from the nettles of danger. We must never weary of trying. We dare not disband. Even if laws are silent amid the clash of arms, we must shout above the din that, while we strive for a world

of peace, we would rather endure a world in disarray than have no world at all. Peace must, therefore, be at all times our first concern. We must somehow try to bury those turbulent egoisms which have been woven into the fabric of the Nation State and which distract, derange and dethrone the peoples of the world from that sovereignty over their environment which it is their business to uphold.

83. Unfortunately, however, the peoples of the world are often ill-served by the international posturing of the great Powers. So long as nuclear diplomacy remains the ultimate reality in world affairs, so long as humanity cowers and skulks in the shadow of terror, blinded by the dust blown back from the nuclear charioteers, we cannot hope to teach the illiterate, to employ the jobless, to heal the sick, to house the homeless or feed the hungry.

84. Yet it is the illiterate, the jobless, the sick, the homeless and the hungry who, in the persons of their distinguished champions in this Assembly, constitute the conscience of mankind. These inarticulate hundreds of millions of our fellow men look to this Assembly to rescue them from their long torment, firstly by securing for them a peaceful world and secondly, by bringing to their easy reach within that world all those boons without which the independence of their countries will continue to be poor, solitary, brutish and short.

85. The country and people who speak through me in this forum entertain no illusions about the world in which they now exercise their sovereignty. We are not terrified of the great Powers, because we are convinced that the contradictions within their several systems, despite their monopoly of terror, will soon, to the advantage of the rest of mankind, cut them down to size. We are a small, underdeveloped nation whose citizens manipulate with accustomed ease a democratic system in which those elected to govern are proud to be the servants of the people and would scorn to be their masters. Since in our country no one is above the law, we naturally bring this entrenched experience with us to the council of nations. The people of my country cannot, therefore, admit the preposterous contention that they, together with the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America, must continue to loiter around the enclaves of a few nations, while these nations, already sated, drench us with advice, sometimes wrong-headed and often gratuitous, about the backwardness of our populations and their propensity to multiply.

86. In short, the people of Barbados would like to see and read for themselves that clause in Adam's will which has bequeathed to a score of nations most of the bread of the world and has contemptuously flung all the stones of the world to the others. Without even reading that clause in Adam's will, we are prepared to denounce it for the clumsy forgery it is. In this conviction my delegation makes the plea in this Assembly of equals that there is little time left to redeem the substantial pledges which this Assembly, by its mere existence, has made to mankind. My delegation feels that some of the States represented in this place might with profit consult their consciences and ask, in the words of a famous American poet:

"Who hath given to me this sweet?  
 "And given my brother dust to eat?  
 "And when will his wage come in?"

87. Let us, therefore, be united in the quest for achievement of these goals of amelioration of our human condition. I pledge you, Mr. President, the unstinting support of my Government in your enlightened contribution to this effort.

88. Mr. AL-JABER AL-SABAH<sup>11</sup> (Kuwait): It gives me great pleasure to extend to our President my warmest congratulations and those of my Government on his unanimous election as President of the General Assembly during its present session. His election is a tribute to his country, his person and the Latin American Republics. I sincerely wish him a speedy recovery to good health and hope that he will very soon be able to preside over the Assembly meetings.

89. I should like to congratulate his predecessor, Mr. Corneliu Manescu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania, on the manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the previous session, which contributed so much to the success of its work.

90. May I also take this opportunity of commending our Secretary-General, U Thant for the efforts he is making to realize the principles on which our world Organization is founded. I should like to express to U Thant the appreciation and support of my Government; and I wish to reassure him that the hopes he cherishes for the establishment of world peace do evoke an immediate response among my people and Government.

91. Kuwait has an unshakeable faith in the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and has formulated its policy in the spirit of the Charter from which it derives constant inspiration in tackling international problems and seeking to find solutions for them. However, the principles of the Charter which truly reflect the hopes of mankind to live in peace and security are still without substantive and practical application in the international field. This is due to the fact that some governments, especially big Powers, pursue policies which promote narrow national interests and seek to impose their will regardless of the principle of sovereign equality of all members of the international family.

92. The main shortcoming is that the United Nations is not effective in dealing with international problems which constitute a threat to world peace and security; we must seriously consider applying the enforcement measures embodied in Chapter VII of the Charter regarding the action to be taken with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. Only thus can the United Nations become an effective instrument in upholding the rule of law and justice in international relations.

93. Previous experience has taught us that we must accord to the Secretary-General of the United Nations wide powers, in accordance with Articles 98 and 99 of the Charter, so as to give effect to the principles of the Charter and to prevent their infringement. The assumption of greater responsibilities by the Secretary-General is tantamount to enhancing the prestige of the world Organization

and enabling it to perform a more effective role, not merely in the maintenance of peace and security, but also in coming to grips with the most difficult international problems objectively. In this manner we can dispel the impression in the minds of peoples that the main organs of the United Nations are merely a debating forum and have no efficiency in enforcing the provisions of the Charter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security.

94. Foremost among the questions which concern Kuwait is that which is inscribed in our agenda under the title, "The situation in the Middle East". This designation is euphemistic; it conceals far more than it reveals. For it is clear that the "situation" under reference is that which has resulted from the Israeli invasion, carried out in June 1967, of the remainder of Palestine and some adjacent Arab States—the situation, namely, of military occupation of Arab territories, of formal annexation of portions of those territories and extensive colonization of the rest, of exploitation of their wealth and natural resources, as well as the dispersion of hundreds of thousands of their inhabitants and the subjugation of the rest to oppressive military rule.

95. But this new phase of the Middle Eastern situation, resulting from the most recent Israeli aggression, together with the antecedent condition of continuous conflict between Israel and the Arab States, jointly constitutes only one facet of the total situation obtaining in the Middle East. The other facet pertains to the assault upon the Palestinian Arab people, in consequence of which that people finds itself dispossessed, dispersed, and deprived of the most elementary and sacred of rights: the right to peaceful existence in its homeland; and the right to exercise, freely and honourably, self-determination on its own national soil.

96. "The situation in the Middle East", in other words, subsists on two distinct levels: the first, pertaining to the destiny of the Palestinian people, and its fate resulting from the creation of Israel; and the second, pertaining to the continuing conflict between the Arab States and Israel, resulting from what Israel represents—an encroachment on the existence of the Palestinian Arab people, on its homeland, and on its rights.

97. The conflict between the Arab States and Israel can be properly envisioned only within the context of Israel's encroachment on the very being of the Palestinian people. For the dark fate of the Palestinian Arab people, in consequence of the existence of Israel, is the basis of the problem; the relations between the Arab States and Israel are the derivative products. The deprivation of the Palestinian people of its inalienable right to exist, in security and dignity and sovereignty, in its native land, is the root of the problem; the conflicts between the Arab States and Israel represent the branches thereof. Endeavours to control the shape of the branches or the character of the fruits are vain as long as the roots remain unchanged.

98. Permit me then to address myself, at first, to the original facet of the subject. The Palestinian people, which today witnesses the subjection of its entire homeland to alien rule, also finds itself in an utterly abnormal and unnatural condition the like of which is experienced by no

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Al-Jaber Al-Sabah spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

other people anywhere else in the world. For Palestinians fall today into three categories: the first comprises the evictees, the dispossessed who have not only been displaced, but also prevented from returning to their homes and property; the second category embraces those who have been condemned, ever since the middle of last year, to life under alien military occupation; while under the third and by far the smallest category are subsumed those Palestinian Arabs who, twenty years ago, found their status radically transformed overnight from that of a part of the overwhelming native majority to that of a subordinate minority—a minority leading, in its own ancestral homeland, a marginal life under the domination of an alien, imported, new majority; a minority deprived of the dignity of equality and condemned, in effect, to the status of third-class citizenship.

99. This is the basic injustice—this is the original sin—underlying the chronic, twenty-year-old situation in the Middle East, which entered an acute phase of extraordinary gravity in mid-1967. No analysis of the situation that does not start from this point of departure can be sound; nor can any approach to the problems of the Middle East that does not start from the determination to remedy that primordial injustice be just or have a chance of success. For an approach that fails to correct injustice is itself unjust; and an approach that does not aim at removing the causes of grave discontent is foredoomed to failure.

100. I have heard some representatives of Member States speak, from this rostrum, about the right of Israel to existence and survival. Not all of them, I must say with sorrow, evinced equal concern for the right of the Palestinian people to existence and survival. Have they forgotten that we all belong to an Organization the very first words of whose Charter proclaim that it speaks for peoples, and the very first Article of whose Charter, as well as Article 55, asserts that fulfilment of the purposes of the United Nations demands “respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples”? If, then, in this era of the United Nations, a State forces its way into being at the expense of a given people, will it be congruent with the Charter for Member States to be so preoccupied with the “right” of that State to survival as to ignore the right of the people in question to existence?

101. Israel is a society of transplanted aliens living in the homeland of the Palestinian Arab people, which it has come to occupy piecemeal and by force of arms, usurping its wealth, exploiting its resources and barring all Palestinians whom it has evicted and dispersed from returning to their homes, while subjecting the remaining inhabitants of the recently occupied territories to harsh military rule. To ask the Palestinian people to accept this fate is tantamount to asking the victim to give his blessing to the usurpation of his possessions, and to bestow unmerited legitimacy upon unjust conditions imposed by sheer force.

102. Need I remind you that, during the self-same twenty-year period in which the Palestinian people has been experiencing, step by step, its national tragedy, dozens of other peoples have been struggling to liberate themselves from foreign domination—which is merely one fact of the total calamity befalling the Palestinian people? Fortunately, more of those peoples have now achieved their

goals; they have attained their independence and have joined the international community as sovereign States. Is there one among the representatives of those new States who would have accepted, for his own people and his own country, what the Palestinian people is now being asked by some to accept for itself, namely, dispersion, dispossession, as well as foreign occupation of the homeland? Is there one among them who would have accepted, for his own country, the logic by which the Palestinian people is asked to be persuaded?

103. Let us also recall that the Palestinian Arab people, which has undergone its tragic experience with the full awareness of the United Nations, has been the recipient of specific international assurances safeguarding its existence and its rights, assurances which the United Nations should have made exceptional efforts to put into effect. For half a century the international community has been giving, time after time, solemn pledges guaranteeing the safety of the Palestinian people; both the League of Nations and the United Nations made such formal undertakings before the national tragedy descended upon Palestine, and various organs of the United Nations have continued to make similar undertakings since then.

104. From the outset, when Palestine began to be subjected to alien, organized and purposeful Zionist immigration and the Palestinian people rose in opposition, the League of Nations rushed to give it full and firm guarantees. In article 22 of its Covenant, the League proclaimed the Palestinian people, as all other Arab peoples, provisionally independent, subject to minor limitations of temporary duration. The Mandate for Palestine safeguarded, in its preamble as well as in articles 2, 6 and 9, the rights and position of the Palestinian people. As successor to the League, the United Nations provided, in Article 80 (1) of the Charter, that none of the rights safeguarded by the League would be prejudiced within the United Nations system, save perhaps in circumstances which did not apply to Palestine. Even when the General Assembly adopted its recommendation to partition Palestine [181 (II)], it incorporated, as an integral part of its proposed partition plan, guarantees of a wide range of rights, in sections B and C of part 1 of that plan.

105. As soon as the first phase of the Zionist programme of forcible displacement of Palestinian Arabs was completed, the General Assembly recognized the rights of the expellees to return to their homes in resolution 194 (III), which has been recalled and/or reaffirmed by the Assembly in every session held since 1948. At every subsequent phase of Arab expulsion, the Security Council has demanded the immediate return of the expellees, as it did in resolution 89 (1950) and resolution 93 (1951). And, finally, when Israel succeeded in displacing another sizable group of Palestinian Arabs in the war it launched in June 1967, the Security Council demanded their return in resolution 237 (1967), which was promptly welcomed by the General Assembly in its resolution 2252 (ES-V) and again in resolution 2341 (XXII). A similar call was issued by the Commission on Human Rights, at its twenty-fourth session, in resolution 6, which was endorsed by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 1336 (XLIV). Last, but not least, came the reaffirmation of the right of the Palestinian expellees to return, in the resolution I adopted by the International Conference on Human Rights on 7 May 1968.



106. I have permitted myself to cite these pronouncements of the various organs of the United Nations in order to emphasize that the General Assembly—which is the ultimate embodiment of the will and conscience of the international community, and the last resort of oppressed peoples—bears special obligations towards the Palestinian people, in addition to the general obligations it bears towards all peoples in accordance with the principles of the Charter. The General Assembly is obligated to protect the Palestinian people; it is responsible for the destiny of that people. Such responsibility is not diminished by talk about the rights of States: for the existence of a State cannot rightfully be maintained at the expense of the existence of another people, particularly when the State in question has brought itself into being in the homeland of another people by force of arms, as has happened in Palestine.

107. The reluctance of the United Nations, thus far, to assume in full measure its responsibility for the restoration and protection of the rights of the Palestinian people has begun to create a new, important situation in the area. The Palestinian people, having despaired of attaining its legitimate aspirations and rights through the international community and its appropriate organizations, has found itself—as any other people under similar circumstances would have found itself—forced to choose between extinction and resistance. It has chosen resistance as the avenue to the liberation of its homeland from foreign domination and to the restoration of its human and national rights. It has actually embarked on the path of resistance—that path travelled earlier by many other peoples which were, until yesterday, fighting for their liberation and which are now represented here, among us, as free and sovereign States. Kuwait is proud of the vanguard of resistance and liberation fighting in the occupied territories of Palestine, and proud to endorse that cause and support that struggle.

108. The conflict between the Arab States and Israel, which is the second aspect of “the situation in the Middle East”, is derivative; it is a product of the original aspect, about which I have spoken thus far. That conflict reached its most dangerous phase during the latest Israeli aggression.

109. Since the cease-fire, Israel has persisted in its endeavour to create a new *fait accompli* in the recently-occupied territories, in accordance with a clear expansionist programme, of which the most important components are the following nine:

(1) Adoption of intensive measures to realize in practice the formal annexation of portions of the occupied territories—including Jerusalem, which has a unique and sublime position and distinctive spiritual significance, and the annexation of which has been challenged by the United Nations in successive resolutions, which I need not enumerate, adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council; and the introduction of other measures preparatory to the prospective annexation of other occupied territories—including changing their geographical names, alteration of the status of points of entry and exits, and issuance of new maps in Israel embodying the territories occupied in the June war.

(2) Expulsion from the occupied areas of tens of thousands of Palestinian Arabs since the cease-fire, in

addition to all those expelled, or otherwise prompted to leave in pursuit of self-preservation, during the war.

(3) Importation of thousands of aliens, from all over the world, for the colonization of the occupied territories, in accordance with a programme devised by Israel and formally endorsed by the Twenty-Seventh World Zionist Congress, which was held in Jerusalem about one year after the cease-fire.

(4) Establishment of dozens of new settlements in the occupied territories—from Hermon and Al-Joulán, through the West Bank, to Al-Arish—populated in part by some of the recently-imported immigrants.

(5) Destruction of entire towns and villages, which were razed to the ground.

(6) Expropriation of private property, in addition to public property.

(7) Exploitation of natural resources.

(8) Oppressive and repressive treatment of the civilians in the occupied territories, in open violation of the Geneva Convention of 1949 and of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly which called upon Israel to abide fully by that Convention. These persistent violations have caused grave concern in the Commission on Human Rights, the International Conference on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, which have duly deplored, in their respective resolutions, Israel's conduct and called for international investigation. Little wonder that Israel has deemed it expedient to obstruct such investigation, and has in fact succeeded thus far in preventing it from taking place.

(9) Use of the occupied territories as launching pads for new aggressive, military attacks upon neighbouring Arab States—attacks which have occasioned new condemnations of Israel's behaviour by the Security Council.

110. This is the true nine-point Israeli programme, which Israel has implemented since the cease-fire. The other nine-point Israeli programme, contained in the statement of the Israeli Foreign Minister, is misleading. Not only does it contradict the actual programme put into effect by Israel, but it also embodies contradictions between its purported and its real significance, between its rhetoric and its spirit. That programme, whatever else it pretends to be, rests upon four principles.

111. First, Israel is not prepared, under any circumstances, to withdraw completely—nor even to promise to withdraw completely—from all the territories it has occupied by armed force. The readiness, of which there are some hints, to consider unspecified modifications in present positions, upon fulfilment of precisely defined conditions, is only a round-about notification of lack of readiness to evacuate other positions. And it is clear from official and semi-official pronouncements made by Israeli leaders, both civilian and military, that the areas in which Israel is determined to maintain its control under all circumstances are by far the larger of those occupied by aggressive force.

112. Even the limited withdrawal, which Israel is said to be ready to contemplate under conditions of its own

choosing, is envisioned as a part of a bartering process, through which Israel clearly aspires to obtain distinct political and economic gains in return for its giving up fragments of what it now occupies but does not own.

113. Second, Israel has no intention whatsoever of allowing the displaced and dispossessed Palestinians to return to their homes and property, although such return is in accordance with their inalienable, natural rights, with their clearly-stated wishes, and with the numerous resolutions adopted by the competent organs of the United Nations.

114. Israel, nevertheless, is prepared to call for a conference on the refugees; but the true purpose of that conference is to consecrate their displacement, and its principal function is to bestow legitimacy upon what Israel has already accomplished in its programme of emptying Palestine of the Palestinian people and refilling it with transplanted aliens. Apart from its purpose and intended function, that proposed conference is noteworthy also for its composition. It is Israel's design that neither the United Nations, nor the Palestinian Arab people, should participate in that conference.

115. Third, Israel intends, in its programme, once and for all to push the United Nations out of the situation in the Middle East, and to push that situation out of the United Nations. According to the Israeli programme, United Nations involvement in the Palestine problem will, once and for all, be terminated, notwithstanding the fact that this problem has been before the United Nations continuously ever since 1947, and has been thus far the subject of 162 resolutions adopted by the principal organs of this Organization.

116. Equally important for Israel is the termination of United Nations responsibility for the fate of the Palestinian people, a responsibility which this Organization cannot and must not abdicate. This expulsion of the United Nations has a dual significance for Israel. On the one hand, it enables Israel to extricate itself from all its obligations arising out of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations in the past; on the other hand, it enables Israel to relieve itself of the burden of international observation and scrutiny in the future, and indeed to rid itself of the very presence of the United Nations in the area as a neutral observer and an impartial umpire.

117. Fourth, the Israeli programme seeks to liquidate the entire Palestine question through the settlement of the problems arising from Israel's most recent aggression largely by Arab acceptance of the new *fait accompli*. But the Palestine question can be liquidated only by liquidating the Palestinian people itself; hence the total oblivion of the Israeli programme to the national rights of the Palestinian people to an honourable existence in its homeland and to the free exercise of self-determination on its national soil. In fact it appears as though Israel does not recognize at all that there is such a thing as the Palestinian people.

118. To envision the whole Palestine question within the limited context of Israel's relations with the Arab States is only one side of the coin, the other side of which is to deny the existence of the Palestinian people. This denial was always implicit in the practice of Israel—in its very

establishment and in its subsequent conduct. Israel's recent programme seeks to obtain acceptance of this denial by others. Israel's programme is not a programme for peace; it is a programme for continuing the war by political means. It is essentially a programme for retaining, through international politics, most of the gains obtained by war; and, indeed, for attaining by means of diplomacy those additional political and economic desiderata which Israel has consistently failed to achieve in twenty years by military means.

119. The world today is fraught with grave dangers. The war which is still being fought in Viet-Nam can lead to an international conflagration which may put an end to human life on this earth. It has not yet been possible to find an honourable solution to this conflict. We add our voice to the voices of those who have been calling for a cessation of the bombing of North Viet-Nam, because we are convinced that such a step is necessary to create a favourable atmosphere for the peace talks now taking place in Paris. We hope that those talks will be successful and will bring about the solution that is so desired by people everywhere. We believe that the ideal solution to this problem should be based on the principles of the Geneva Agreements, which emphasized the right of the people of Viet-Nam to self-determination without foreign interference.

120. The recent events in Czechoslovakia have aggravated the tension between the two blocs and revealed the possibility of a new international conflict in Europe. We believe that the withdrawal of foreign troops from Czechoslovakia constitutes a basic step towards the resumption of the dialogue between the two blocs, whose outcome determines the prospects of world peace and dispels the fears which cloud the international scene.

121. I called last year, in this forum, for the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, I should like to restate my Government's position on the necessity of its admission considering the great influence the People's Republic of China has on the course of events in South-East Asia and the world at large. The admission of the People's Republic of China implies an obligation on its part to co-operate with other countries within the framework of the Charter. Such co-operation is needed to accelerate disarmament and end the nuclear arms race. It will be a great asset in promoting world peace and security.

122. The non-proliferation Treaty was widely viewed as a positive step towards disarmament. We in Kuwait have been among the first countries to sign it because we are dedicated to the cause of complete and general disarmament. We hope that countries which have been reluctant to sign it will soon reconsider their position.

123. Kuwait, which believes in the right of self-determination, commends the achievements of the United Nations in implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and supports all nations in their struggle for self-government and independence.

124. The widening gap between the standard of living in the developing and developed countries is one of the main causes of the anxiety and bitterness which prevail in the

world today. It is inhuman to leave the developing countries at the mercy of their limited resources while they are striving to attain a higher standard of living and achieve rapid, economic and social progress. The developed countries are contributing only a negligible portion of their resources in aid to the developing countries. The second session of UNCTAD held in New Delhi has revealed that the developed countries have not met what had been agreed upon in contributing 1 per cent of their gross national product towards helping the developing countries. The gulf between the standard of living in the two groups of countries is thus expected to widen steadily.

125. In this context, I should like to state that Kuwait earmarks more than 20 per cent of its national income for assistance to sister and friendly countries, in addition to the financial resources provided by the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development, and the programmes of aid to countries of the Gulf and South Arabia. We hope that the developed countries will do their utmost to provide the aid and know-how needed to promote prosperity and stimulate progress in the developing countries.

126. Let us not lose faith in the will of man to overcome the obstacles which hamper his progress and the determination of people all over the world to live in freedom and dignity. Let us not be shaken in our belief in the principles on which our Organization is founded. Let us reiterate our faith in peace and freedom. Let us all look forward to a better future for a world now overburdened with crises, a future in which humanity will enjoy the blessings of harmony, tranquillity and prosperity.

127. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Guatemala, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

128. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): The Guatemalan delegation feels compelled to exercise its right of reply to a reference to the territory of Belize made by the Minister of State for Caribbean and Latin American Affairs of Barbados, Mr. J. C. Tudor.

129. From his important statement we note with warm cordiality his recognition of the hemispheric destiny of his country, and the corollary that its independent development, like ours, must of necessity be bound up with regional co-operation.

130. His reference to the territory of Belize has already been answered in the statement made by the Guatemalan delegation at an earlier plenary meeting of this session [*1680th meeting*], when we reported that that long-standing problem was the subject of negotiations between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of my country. However, the reference made to this subject compels us to restate with all due respect the reservation that Guatemala within its rights has maintained rights which have not been, could not be and never will be in conflict with the well-being and interests of the people of Belize.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*