



CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

Speech by Mr. Rabasa (Mexico)	1
Speech by Mr. Eban (Israel)	5
Speech by Mr. Ratsiraka (Madagascar)	10
Speech by Mr. Thorn (Luxembourg)	16
Speech by Mr. Vignes (Argentina)	19
Speech by Mr. Raymond (Haiti)	23
Reply by the representative of Spain	26
Reply by the representative of Saudi Arabia	27
Reply by the representative of Egypt	28
Reply by the representative of Iraq	29

Agenda item 23:

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	
Report of the Fourth Committee	30

Agenda item 85:

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly:

(a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions	
Report of the Fifth Committee	30

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. RABASA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, greeting you on behalf of the country that I have the honour to represent is not only the fulfilment of a routine, but it is a resumption of a personal dialogue and an official exchange that we started in Mexico, when you were Secretary-General of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [OPANAL], a post in which you, as usual, performed brilliantly. I therefore am fully aware of your ability and your capacity, which have justifiably placed you in the post of President of the twenty-eighth regular session of the General Assembly. I am convinced that you will fulfil your duties as President with the good judgement and calmness that you have always shown in your long career in different international bodies. I congratulate you most sincerely.

2. The breath of death sweeps America and the world as a whole. A cold spectre lowers over our continent. A cham-

pion of democracy who tried to achieve the redemption of the needy of his country has died.

3. A few days ago you yourself, Mr. President, in your inaugural statement mentioned your deeply felt conviction that the constitutional President of Chile was "... a man who loved his people and defended his ideals with his blood and his life." [2117th meeting, para. 40.]

4. We fully share that assessment. It is for that reason that we wish to pay a tribute to the memory of Salvador Allende, who died in the defence of freedom and social justice. This enlightened Head of State waged war without quarter to achieve the desires of his country. Perhaps for the first time, a real effort was made to achieve profound structural changes in the life of a nation heading towards socialism, while remaining within the democratic, legal and peaceful way of life. The entire world followed that new experiment with great interest, and a number of nations, with deeply-rooted hope. Today that hope has perished—even though the fervour and the love for the hero that fell will continue—exactly as five years ago that noble effort of giving socialism a human visage died also.

5. My country believes that violence is not the answer, nor is the destruction of freedom. The President of Mexico himself put it: "Any action adopted against a free people diminishes the total freedom of all, and thus inevitably affects us all."

6. It would appear that at this tragic moment Chile has lost its best sons: Pablo Neruda is dead. When my country learned of the horrors in the La Moneda presidential palace in Santiago we invited the great poet of Isla Negra to reside in Mexico and restore his precarious health. The invitation was accepted, but, unfortunately, it could not be complied with.

7. We have always scrupulously respected that noble institution of Latin America, the right of asylum, quite irrespective of the ideology or political leanings of the one persecuted. Thus the Mexican Embassy in Santiago opened its doors to all who felt themselves seriously threatened, and a good number of them are today on Mexican soil. We hope that the requirements of the existing inter-American agreements on this question will be strictly complied with, for we are convinced that the eyes of all the peoples of the world are now focused on Chile and are carefully watching the evolution of the situation.

8. As far as the foreigners there are concerned, many of them refugees from other Latin American countries—whose number has been assessed at approximately 14,000—we are encouraged by the information made public by the Secretary-General of the United Nations regarding his own

efforts and those of other high international officials and regarding official safeguards offered by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile.

9. However, the situation prevailing is still extremely grave. We are particularly concerned about the fate of the political prisoners for whose lives and freedom—within the framework of human rights—the General Assembly should continue to be alert and vigilant.

10. The situation prevailing in southern Africa continues to be intolerable. There the most elementary human rights are ignored because of the colour of a person's skin, and the practice of racial discrimination has been raised to the level of State policy. But, like peace, freedom is indivisible. While there are peoples subjected to colonialism or racial discrimination, men of good will cannot remain calm or satisfied. Our Organization must continue to struggle in order completely and definitely to eliminate colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, whether direct or indirect, whether political or economic. The Mexican delegation is ready to contribute to the study of measures that should be adopted to achieve that end.

11. I should like to congratulate the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany on their admission to membership in our Organization. Thus our Organization is coming even closer to the effective fulfilment of the principle of universality. We trust that soon we shall be able to welcome equally those States that are not yet Members of the United Nations.

12. The International Law Commission has just celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of its existence. Its work has contributed greatly to the codification and progressive development of international law. A not unimportant portion of contemporary international law has now been incorporated in a number of treaties, thanks to its constant activity. I am very happy to extend our congratulations to that body on its praiseworthy efforts.

13. There are many items on the agenda of the present session of the Assembly that call for our particular attention. However, it would be impossible for us at the moment to examine them all. We shall have an opportunity to present our views on the majority of them when they come up for consideration in the relevant main Committees or in the plenary meetings of the Assembly. Therefore, I shall limit myself at this time to making known the views of Mexico on four of those items which, because of their ramifications and important implications, are of greater significance and, we believe, cannot be over-stressed: the law of the sea, disarmament, the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the charter of economic rights and duties of States.

14. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, which has been preparing the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea has just concluded its work in Geneva without having achieved significant agreement on substantive questions, such as the demarcation of the territorial sea, the nature and characteristics of the zone of national jurisdiction—which we have baptized the “patrimonial sea”—certain aspects of the delimitation of the

continental shelf, and the régime to be applied to what has been called “the common heritage of mankind”.

15. Doubtless that situation arose owing to the fact that all the efforts made were not sufficient to achieve agreements that are indispensable. We wonder, in these circumstances, whether we are in a position to start a conference on the date set by the General Assembly, or whether we might not be better advised to make a last effort that would allow us to go to that meeting with an adequate basis to work on.

16. In order to do so, we believe that the best procedure might well be the following: to inaugurate the Conference here, as provided, in the month of November; to hold an organizational and procedural session for a period of two weeks; to convene a preliminary meeting in which all States invited to the Conference would take part. The preliminary meeting could be held in March or April, either in New York or in Geneva; negotiations would concentrate on those problems that constitute the nub of the future law of the sea, leaving for July and August the task of elaborating the corresponding instruments.

17. We are convinced that, during the three years of preparatory work, although agreements have not been arrived at, nevertheless the essential basis of what might become the common concepts of a great number of countries has been laid. I refer to the new concept of the “patrimonial sea”, as we, the countries which signed the Declaration of Santo Domingo,¹ have called it, or the “exclusive economic zone”, as the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] have preferred to call it.

18. This concept includes two inseparable elements: a territorial sea with a maximum width of 12 nautical miles, over which the coastal State exercises full sovereignty, and a zone adjacent to the territorial sea and extending for a distance of 200 nautical miles.

19. In that oceanic zone the coastal State does not exercise sovereignty as it does over the territorial sea, since it must scrupulously respect the rights of all States, either coastal or land-locked, to the freedom of navigation and overflight and to the laying of submarine cables or pipelines. However, in that zone the sovereign rights of the coastal States would be recognized with respect to renewable and non-renewable resources that may be found in the water column, on the sea-bed and in the subsoil thereof, together with rights relating to the regulation of scientific research and the prevention of the contamination of the marine environment.

20. As was evident during the negotiations that have taken place, we believe sincerely that this new definition can satisfy the great majority of States.

21. Fortunately, this time we are not facing a position whereby the developing world is placed in confrontation with the highly industrialized countries. We have noted with satisfaction that the concept of an exclusive economic zone, or patrimonial sea, has been accepted and defended by members of both groups.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 21*, annex I, sect. 2.

22. We are now approaching the middle of the decade which the General Assembly agreed in 1969 to proclaim as the Disarmament Decade [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*]. At the same time, and with good reason, the Assembly emphasized the beneficial influence that this Decade could have on the strengthening of international security and on the encouragement of economic development.

23. We therefore find it inexplicable that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should once again come to this high body of the United Nations, just as it did last year, with empty hands.

24. We share the view expressed by many of its members, among them Mexico, and reflected in the 1973 report [*A/9141-DC/236*], namely, that the primary responsibility falls on the two States that have been jointly serving as Chairmen of the Committee, and that there is no reason whatsoever that can justify the stagnation in the Committee's work or the present lack of effective negotiations.

25. It is now up to the Assembly to pass judgement and adopt decisions in order to remedy this disturbing situation concerning disarmament. As an illustration, it is sufficient to recall that nuclear arsenals exist that represent such a capacity of "over-kill" that they are more than sufficient to blot out, not once but many times over, every sign of life on this planet; that the amount annually squandered in military spending amounts to more than \$220,000 million, in other words, a sum 30 times greater than the amount the developed countries are induced, with a great effort, to earmark annually in the form of official assistance for development; and that we are confronted with an unbridled arms race aimed at increasing the already terrifying destructive potential of nuclear weapons and designed to produce, among non-nuclear weapons, refinements of cruelty and indiscriminate extermination that must be inconceivable to any sound mind.

26. Among the decisions that the General Assembly should adopt, there should be one, we believe, unequivocally reaffirming that general and complete disarmament under effective international control—that same question which, first in 1959 [*resolution 1378 (XIV)*], and for a second time 10 years later [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*], the General Assembly itself described as the most important question facing the world today—continues to be, and must continue to be, the final goal of all the efforts of the international community in this sphere of action. Thus, too, it should be made perfectly clear that one of the primary stages to be achieved in order to reach that goal must be the destruction of the enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons already accumulated, and a strict prohibition on any future resumption of their production.

27. Among those same decisions, we believe that there should be one involving also the approval of a number of resolutions calling for a total cessation of nuclear weapons tests and the elimination of all chemical weapons. These are two matters which, as the United Nations has so often repeated, warrant the highest priority.

28. The frustrating sterility of the negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament led Mexico, last February, at the beginning of the 1973 session of that body,

to suggest an immediate examination of other subjects, first and foremost among them the reduction of military budgets. It is therefore natural that we should have been gratified at the formal request submitted by the Minister for Foreign Relations of the Soviet Union, Andrei Gromyko, that there be included in the agenda of the present Assembly session an item, the consideration of which might lead to an agreement among the permanent members of the Security Council making possible equitable reductions in their respective military budgets, together with the employment of the resources thus saved for assistance to developing countries [*A/9191*].

29. With regard to the machinery available to the United Nations for disarmament, the experience of the last two years has made apparent the urgent and unavoidable need to strengthen the only deliberative body—the General Assembly—which in practice has been functioning, and to reorganize thoroughly or to replace the negotiating body, namely the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

30. We are convinced that it is indispensable for us, at this session, to establish a body whose task will be to bring about the timely convening of a world disarmament conference at which all States will be able to set forth adequately their views on the problem of disarmament that so vitally affects the interests of all peoples. We venture to hope also that such a body, regardless of the name it may be given, should have a membership and terms of reference that will guarantee the co-operation of all the nuclear Powers, so that a repetition of the sad experience of the so-called Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference may be avoided.

31. With regard to the negotiating body, we believe it would be advisable for the General Assembly, using whatever procedures it may deem appropriate, to explore without delay the question of what reforms in composition and in procedure should be recommended, so that the negotiating body on disarmament may be rendered more effective and, in particular, be able to count on the participation of all the nuclear Powers.

32. Quite contrary to what has been occurring in the rest of the world, in Latin America the régime of total absence of nuclear weapons set forth in the Treaty of Tlatelolco²—for which the Government of Mexico has the honour of serving as depositary Government—has continued to progress and gain strength.

33. As a result of the discussions held by the President of Mexico with the Heads of State of the French Republic and the People's Republic of China in the course of the visit he made to both those countries in the spring of this year, the French Government decided to sign Additional Protocol II of the Treaty on 18 July last, and the Chinese Government did so on 21 August.

34. Those significant acts, which will doubtless be complemented in the near future by the corresponding ratifications, have strengthened the efficiency of the Treaty. In fact, it will be recalled that the nuclear Powers Parties to the Protocol committed themselves both to the obligation of

² Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (No. 9068), p. 326.

fully respecting the statute of denuclearization in respect of warlike purposes as defined in the provisions of the Treaty and pledged themselves not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the contracting parties to the Treaty.

35. Since it is well known that the United Kingdom and the United States had already in the past acceded to the Protocol, the steps now taken by France and China mean that only one of the five nuclear Powers is still withholding its co-operation regarding the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone, the only densely populated zone thus far established as nuclear-free.

36. I take advantage of this opportunity to appeal to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to reconsider its attitude and to accept the obligations deriving from Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

37. It might almost seem redundant—since they are so obvious—for us to stress the grave crises that afflict our world today, but we cannot complacently watch world inflation, the imbalance of the terms of trade, the food crisis, the absence of regulations governing the transfer of technology, the interventionist and unbridled attitude of a great number of transnational corporations, the lack of an adequate demographic programme, the lack of a balanced and generalized utilization of the resources of the sea and of a rational preservation of the environment. All those deplorable conditions are just so many serious problems which the United Nations must consider, and regulate—and do so immediately.

38. To refer merely to what I might term the “food crisis”, damaging meteorological phenomena, plagues, diseases, human carelessness and the irrational utilization of natural resources all depict a panorama of despair. In 1972 wheat production was limited to 300 million tons, that is to say, 6 per cent less than the 1971 world harvest. For the present year the supply of rice has been termed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO] as barely enough, in marked contrast to the abundant surpluses during the last three years. With regard to secondary cereals—corn, sorghum, millet, barley, oats and rye—it has been calculated that in 1972 their production amounted to 555 million tons, that is to say, 20 million tons less than in 1971. Generally speaking, the reduction of food supplies has increased the demand and, therefore, caused a general rise in the cost of the majority of food products. They have also suffered very adversely from speculation and financial crises which have also aggravated the situation.

39. In the last few years the Mexican Government has stressed its foreign trade, seeking to promote and diversify our international economic relations. It was for this reason that we went to the Tokyo Ministerial Meeting to start new trade negotiations of a multilateral nature within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT].

40. In the course of the GATT negotiations the fundamental concepts of non-reciprocity, non-discrimination and preferential treatment in trade relations of the developed countries with the developing countries were encouraged and advanced, so that the developing nations can enjoy fair and increased participation in world trade.

41. Mexico was also present at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund [IMF], held from 24 to 28 September in Nairobi, Kenya. The Secretary of Finance and Public Credit, Mr. José López Portillo, was selected as the spokesman for Latin America, and through him Mexico reiterated its traditional position concerning international monetary reform. He emphasized the fact that Latin Americans do not consider a reform complete unless it simultaneously and interrelatedly includes the transfer of real resources to the developing countries, at adequate rates and on adequate terms. One sentence by the Mexican Secretary of Finance summed up the philosophy that should underlie economic relations among nations. He said: “The powerful countries belong to humanity and not humanity to the powerful countries.”

42. Aware of the problems and the crises afflicting our generation and threatening to continue with greater recurrence in the times through which our descendants will live, the President of Mexico, Mr. Luis Echeverría, sensing the feelings of all and consonant with the active foreign policy that his Government is pursuing, proposed to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD] at its third session, held in Santiago, Chile, in April 1972, that there be prepared and approved a charter of economic rights and duties of States.³ The proposal was approved and transmitted to the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, and the Assembly decided [resolution 3037 (XXVII)] that a group of 40 nations, to be designated by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, Mr. Manuel Pérez Guerrero, would devote itself to the noble task of drafting the charter. That group of 40 has earned our congratulations for its hard work. It has concluded its task and its report is now before the present session and is to be considered in the Second Committee.⁴

43. One extremely important point in the course of elaborating that charter is the fact that it was the subject of a special section of the Economic Declaration approved at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Algiers, at the beginning of September of this year. Section XIII reads:

“The non-aligned nations deem it necessary that the United Nations General Assembly should give priority at its twenty-eighth session, to the elaboration of the Charter of economic rights and duties of States.

“This document should give expression to the economic aspirations of countries struggling to achieve over-all development as well as those of the international community as a whole.” [A/9330 and Corr.1, p. 73.]

44. The manifest support given by the Heads of State and Government of so many varied and important countries present at that Conference of non-aligned countries comforts us greatly. We are also grateful for the express reference which was most constructively and positively made by the recently designated Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Henry Kissinger, when he spoke of the charter

³ See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Third Session*, vol. 1a, part one, *Summaries of Statements by Heads of Delegations* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.II.D.Mim.1, part one), p. 186.

⁴ See documents TD/B/AC.12/1 and Corr.1 and TD/B/AC.2 and Add.1.

of economic rights and duties of States [2124th meeting, para. 74]. We should like also to express our appreciation to all the other representatives who have offered or may in the future offer their support for this initiative.

45. The hour to act has struck. Millions of people are concerned and worried or living in misery and want. The line of the hungry encircles the world. Technological progress is still the monopoly of a few. Many transnational corporations are continuing to disturb the situation. World inflation cruelly oppresses the developing nations and food-stuffs are lacking while populations are growing dangerously. The resources of the sea are being utilized indiscriminately by the great naval Powers. The environment is deteriorating, endangering human life. Are we to be imperturbable, indifferent and insensitive as we watch this increasingly terrifying situation? Are we going to allow succeeding generations—if they succeed in existing—to call us irresponsible?

46. The proposal of the Mexican President does not, and should not, belong exclusively to my country. It is a common cause. It is a generous and worthy undertaking of all mankind. Let us not allow routine or bureaucracy to delay, vitiate or damage that noble effort. Let us speed our procedures, come to agreements quickly—in a word, let us approve this indispensable document as soon as we can.

47. This great international pledge must contain, among other fundamental concepts, that of the right of States freely to dispose of their natural resources, to regulate and govern foreign investment, to participate in the international decision-making process in the solution of world economic and monetary problems and to share in the benefits resulting therefrom, and to participate in fair and balanced world trade.

48. We must also govern the obligation of States not to discriminate on the basis of political, economic or social systems, to introduce structural changes in the world economy in order to achieve an international division of labour that is just and rational, to facilitate the widest possible access to the benefits deriving from the progress and achievements in science and technology and to give technical and financial assistance in favourable conditions, and also the duty of all States to safeguard the common heritage of mankind and protect and improve the human environment.

49. If the Charter of the United Nations is primarily a political alliance for maintaining international peace and security, let the charter of economic rights and duties of States be an economic alliance that will unite us in progress and welfare. Once and for all, let us put an end to economic discrimination. Let there no longer be *apartheid* in the distribution of benefits. Let not poverty be a constant stimulus for revolution and war. Let us do away with what divides us. Let us exalt what unites us.

50. Greece left us an ethical heritage; Rome a legal one. The mediaeval era left us religion. The Renaissance left us aesthetics—and so on. Each generation has distinguished itself by leaving a fruitful heritage to its heirs. Our generation, that of the twentieth century, although it has been outstanding because of its prodigious technological pro-

gress, has also suffered two great world conflagrations and the threat of a third which, if it were to occur, would inevitably be the last. Are we incapable of leaving a more advantageous, more generous heritage to our succeeding generations?

51. Let us here and now prove that we have gone through this world, not leaving marks of violence and aggression, but giving birth to and creating a more just and more prosperous society.

52. Mr. EBAN (Israel): Mr. President, those of us who know you well take a special pride in your elevation to the presidency of the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. The people of Ecuador share the honour which your personal qualities have justly earned.

53. The international climate is charged with confidence and hope. Attitudes of hostility which once seemed to be an organic part of our generation's life are now giving way to patient dialogue. The Viet-Nam cease-fire, the American-Chinese encounter, the summit meetings at Moscow and Washington, the German agreements and the European treaties have been succeeded by a cease-fire in Laos, by talks between North and South Korea, and by contacts between the three States of the Indian subcontinent. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is at work, bringing a tragic era of confrontation to its end.

54. Let us leave the historians to define the precise point at which the international journey took a new direction—and the causes which inspired the change. In the meantime the results are tangible and impressive, although not yet universal. In some discussions—but not in all—the old vocabularies of abuse are being softened by a welcome air of civility. It is generally understood that coexistence must be based on a separation between viewpoints and relationships. Even when Governments differ in their ideas, their viewpoints and their policies, in their social structures and in their international orientations, they can, nevertheless, foster good relations even across the gulf of their divergences. It was the cold-war philosophy that insisted on ideological agreement or political harmony as the condition of good relations between States. The *détente* accepts and admits no such condition. It respects and transcends diversities of interest and outlook. Indeed, the logical conclusion of the *détente* is the universality of international relations. Fidelity to *détente* requires all States to cultivate normal relations with each other, irrespective of differences and even of conflicts in their interests or policies. At a time when States which have real conflicts of ideology, policy and interest are establishing relations with each other, it would be a grotesque paradox if States which have never had any reason to quarrel about anything were induced to weaken or to sunder their mutual ties.

55. But we shall not do service to the spirit of *détente* if we carry our satisfaction beyond the point of reason and truth. Free dialogue and compromise have prevailed in many disputes, but they are still rejected in others, and the victories of international conciliation in the past few years have all been won outside the United Nations structure. This indicates that the growth of world community is painfully slow. Indeed, our Secretary-General, with admirable realism, has found it necessary, in the introduction to his annual

report on the work of the Organization [A/9001/Add. I], to warn us of some of the shortcomings in the work of the United Nations so far. The truth is that, while quiet, bilateral diplomacy has recorded many triumphs, strident, polemical, public debate has not brought any good result on any issue at any time. The lesson is plain. The central role of this Organization should be to promote agreements between parties to a conflict irrespective of their voting strength, and not to try to adjudicate between conflicting views on the mere basis of numerical weight. The United Nations, in short, should have a diplomatic and not a parliamentary vocation. This point was stated with great precision by the Foreign Minister of Canada. I quote his words:

"... we must try to avoid barren and abrasive confrontations, which are frequently the result of formal voting processes. Consensus is another and often surer route. ... Consensus does not mean the imposition of the will of the majority on a reluctant minority which feels its vital interests are at issue; it means the shared recognition of what should and can be done." [2126th meeting, para. 60.]

56. Now here, in a few words, is a basic evaluation of what may be wrong with United Nations techniques. The result is not only that successes have come outside these walls; failures have abounded within them. The discussions on international terrorism by our *Ad Hoc* Committee ended in fiasco, as had the debate in the General Assembly after the Munich outrage last year. In Rome the International Civil Aviation Organization sat for many weeks without being allowed to agree on any amendments to the Hague or Montreal Conventions. All Members of the United Nations are united in their ability to discuss each other's imperfections. There are majorities to be had for selective political judgements against those who do not belong to a large voting bloc. But majorities cannot always be found for objective, temperate statements free of denunciation and invective.

57. The Secretary-General's introduction to the annual report reminds us that the efforts of the United Nations in political conciliation are, in his words, "complementary" to "the normal bilateral dealings of Governments" [A/9001/Add. I, p. 5]. That is true. I also think that it is true that an attempt by all the Arab Governments to escape from the duty of engaging in "the normal bilateral dealings of Governments" to a constant reliance on public debate is one of the sources of the continuing deadlock in the Middle East. Indeed, every procedure and attitude that has proved its efficacy in other disputes has so far been ignored or rejected in our region.

58. Would we not do well then to listen to the counsel of two statesmen whose names are pre-eminent in the history of the recent *détente*. Chancellor Willy Brandt of the Federal Republic of Germany has told this Assembly that

"... it is primarily direct peace talks between the Arab countries concerned and Israel that will best secure a balance of the elementary interests of both sides." [2128th meeting, para. 63.]

And Mr. Kissinger, Secretary of State of the United States, has reminded us that not even the strongest of great Powers can "substitute for the efforts of those most directly involved" [2124th meeting, para. 56].

59. The absence of negotiation in the Middle East is the gravest obstacle to the termination of regional tension. But it is not the parent cause of the tension. The root of the conflict lies deeper; the root of the conflict lies in the refusal of Arab Governments to come to terms with Israel as a sovereign nation rising from the depths of Middle Eastern history to resume its place in the universal community. Not one of the Arab Governments whose representatives have spoken from this rostrum about withdrawal from territories held since 1967 has said that in order to achieve their territorial claims the Arab States would recognize Israel's rightful place amongst the free nations of the area and establish permanent peace, friendship, commerce and normal relations with Israel similar, for example, to the relations which exist between the States of Western Europe, which only a short time ago were locked in hostility and war. Many Arab spokesmen say the opposite. The Foreign Minister of Egypt, Mr. El Zayyat, has stated in the Security Council and elsewhere that beyond the 1967 armistice lines lie the frontiers proposed in a United Nations recommendation of 1947 [resolution 181 (II)], which Egypt and other Arab Governments destroyed, as they had promised, "by blood and fire", and these in his learned view are the only legal frontiers. Nor would this be the end of Israel's dismantlement. An article in the official Cairo newspaper *Al Gumhuriya* only several days ago tells us that

"The withdrawal of Israel from all the conquered Arab territories is an initial demand of the Arab States presented as a part of the comprehensive programme aimed at putting an end to the Zionist settlement in Palestine."

60. From such statements it is not hard to deduce the meaning of the phrase about the "legitimate aspirations of the Palestine Arab people" when employed by those in whose eyes the sole representatives of that people are the organizations which carry out murder and banditry all over the world but usually at a discreet distance from the Middle East.

61. The plain fact is that the present Arab leadership is not satisfied with the verdict of history which has led to the constitution of 18 Arab States in an area of 11 million square kilometres with a population of 100 million. Arab leadership seems to be in an excited imperialist mood. It demands the elimination of Israel, a non-Arab nation, older in its roots within the Middle East than any other, more venerable than any other in the lineage of spirit and tongue that ties it to that soil, unexampled in the persistence of its national identity.

62. Israel is the very heart and core of Middle Eastern history; but Israel is a Jewish and not an Arab entity. Therefore, there are Arab leaders who cannot sustain its sovereign presence; it must be either physically eliminated or swallowed up in something else so that its "Israelhood" would vanish under some Arab combination or domination. In its philosophy national freedom in the Middle East is an exclusive Arab right—to be monopolized, and not to be shared. There are other expressions of this hegemonistic and exclusive spirit—in Arab policy in the Persian Gulf and in the posturings of Colonel Qaddafi as he flaunts his opulent purse across the world. But it is in the Israeli context that the tendency to see sovereignty in the Middle East as an Arab monopoly has had its most ominous effects.

63. Now, what I have said is admittedly a stringent view of what Arab Governments seek to achieve. But unfortunately it is sustained by a great array of official statements. It is confirmed by the implacable warfare to which Israel, alone amongst all the States of the world, has been subjected since its birth. It is nourished by outrages such as the shooting in the head of the 11 Israeli athletes, tied hand and foot, on the floor of a helicopter in Munich one year ago. Such acts are possible only if the victims are regarded by the assassins as lying outside and beyond any human context. And, indeed, the Arab hostility towards Israel today joins hands with another and deadlier hatred to which it is akin. For where else, Members of the United Nations, other than in Cairo, can you imagine the publication by writers close to the seat of power of an article which I hold in my hand and from which I read the concluding extract:

"In the whole world people have ended by understanding that Hitler was right, for the Jews are vampires which suck the blood of humanity. They wish to destroy the world, but the world vomits them. They have been chased from land to land; they were burned in the ovens of Hitler—1 million, 2 million, 6 million. Would that he had accomplished it fully!"

That is what *Al Akhbar* wrote on 19 August this year.

64. "Would that [Hitler] had accomplished it fully!" This particular extract is only one example of hundreds of Nazi publications that have made Cairo a world centre of anti-Semitic ideology. As we listen to these obscenities on Cairo Radio, as we bury our dead after Munich or Lod, as we recall wars, assaults, boycotts and threats over these 25 years, as we read of the Covenant of the so-called "Palestine Liberation Organization", which asserts that only Arabs have sovereign rights in the Middle East, can we be reproached if we see ourselves as the target of a particularly virulent hatred, at variance with all humane values and vastly removed from anything that can be called *détente*?

65. In short, one of the components of Israel's policy—and I say this in great frankness—is a profound scepticism about the basic intention of Arab States to respect Israel's sovereignty, its national identity, its cultural legacy, its place in the Middle East and the world. There is one thing, and one thing alone, that could undermine that scepticism: negotiation.

66. For recent international experience teaches us that negotiation is not simply a procedural method: it is a principle of coexistence. Negotiation does not merely photograph established positions; it leads them towards mutual accommodation. It puts hopes and suspicions to their only viable test. At the negotiating table the discourse between the parties ceases to be rhetorical, abrasive and polemical. It becomes pragmatic, concrete, empirical. A unique kind of solidarity asserts itself between the negotiators, who become subject to the mystique of potential success and put forth their maximal effort to avoid a final break. Precisely because negotiation has such far-reaching effects, the Arab refusal to negotiate without prior conditions arouses far-reaching suspicions.

67. We have long been convinced of the need to undertake a detailed negotiation ranging freely across all the problems at issue. If this aim has not been fulfilled, we share the

universal regret—but we disclaim culpability. We have accepted Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which calls for the establishment of permanent peace by agreement between Member States in the Middle East, including withdrawal of forces from territories occupied since 1967 to secure and recognized boundaries to be determined in the peace agreement. We proposed detailed agendas for discussion with Egypt and Jordan. We accepted Ambassador Jarring's proposal, rejected by Egypt in March 1968, for convening Israeli and Egyptian representatives in conferences under his auspices to discuss a peace settlement. When four eminent Heads of African States visited our region in 1971, they submitted six proposals in writing, to which my Prime Minister made written and appropriate response on 28 November 1971.⁵ The African Presidents reported that this reply, together with that of Egypt, constituted a sufficient basis to justify negotiation. We stand by those replies today. In particular, we responded to the suggestion of the African Presidents which reads as follows:

"Acceptance by the two parties that 'secure and recognized boundaries' be determined in the peace agreement".⁶

68. In 1971, when it was pointed out that direct contact might not yet be easily acceptable to Arab Governments, we agreed to the United States procedure for proximity talks. When it was then suggested that it might be difficult to conceive a sudden transition from total deadlock to total peace, we accepted the idea of a Suez agreement involving the opening of the Canal under Egyptian administration, with a limited, agreed withdrawal of Israeli forces, even ahead of a peace settlement. We stipulated that this would not be the final withdrawal, but a phase leading to further negotiations in which the permanent and final line would be agreed upon between the parties.

69. Throughout all this period we abstained—as we still do—from changing the political and juridical status of the administered territories, and have not closed any options for a negotiated peace. We opened the river crossings and cease-fire lines to a free movement of hundreds of thousands of Arabs from areas outside Israeli jurisdiction—and indeed from all over the Arab world. We placed the Holy Places of Christendom and Islam under the administration of Christian and Moslem authorities and proposed that this principle be given appropriate statutory expression in a peace agreement. In October 1972 I suggested a meeting with Foreign Minister Riad in New York "in order to break out of old deadlocks into a new vision and a new hope". We utilized the good offices of foreign statesmen and other visitors to convey to Cairo and other Middle Eastern capitals our proposals for contact and dialogue in any form and at any level agreeable to the other side. We welcomed the Secretary-General of the United Nations on his visit to Member States in the Middle East, and appreciated his testimony to the will for peace that, in his words, he found in his contacts with the Government of Israel.

70. That is not an exhaustive list of all the soundings and gestures that we have made in an effort to generate a process of negotiation. Nor have we decided to despair of the

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10438.

⁶ *Ibid.*

prospect. But can anyone seriously believe that all these initiatives, all these responses—none of which was put in ultimative form—offered no opening whatever through which Arab Governments genuinely desiring peace could seek or accept a dialogue with us?

71. The Arab reactions to these and other initiatives have always included refusals to negotiate; or refusals to acknowledge Israel's statehood at all; or an insistence that Arab positions be accepted in advance by Israel as a condition of negotiation; or a demand that the situation which preceded and in large measure provoked the war of 1967 be meticulously restored.

72. Now, there is one important thing to be noted about those positions. If all or any of them had been adopted by Governments in America, Europe and East Asia in the past few years, there would be no agreements for the General Assembly to welcome and no *détente* for anybody anywhere to celebrate.

73. I turn from the past to the future. It is natural for the Israeli Government to use this opportunity of making a precise definition of the principles which move its policy. That policy is frequently and grossly misrepresented, especially at conferences from which we are excluded while our adversaries command the scene. Our policy is to seek peace and security. If the Israeli mind is intensely preoccupied with the problem of security, it is because of the particular memories that converge upon us. On one level of recollection we come face to face with a recent experience that no other family of the human race has ever undergone. The fires are out in the gas chambers, and the ashes are silent in European fields. But the memory of our 6 million kinsmen, brutally wiped off the slate of life, and the terrible agony of the million Jewish children butchered in the year of martyrdom abide with us, vivid, stark, unforgotten. And on the other level of memory there is the experience of 25 years in which our nation's progress has been secured only at a heavy price of suffering and death.

74. A people that has undergone such affliction and borne such loss is bound by historic duty to insist on a very precise craftsmanship in the construction of peace. It will not do simply to reproduce the vulnerable and explosive situation which threatened world peace six years ago. Israel's statehood, its Jewish vocation, its name and flag and tongue are a part of the international reality now and for all time. They are axiomatic, and it is our business to maintain them in growing security.

75. We are asked whether we seek peace. The answer is, Yes, that is our central aim, the destination of all our policies and hopes. Peace does not only involve a documentary acknowledgement of rights. It signifies the permanent end of conflict, and the proof of its authenticity must be sought in human terms. Peace means open frontiers across which peoples can seek commerce and contact with each other in mutual accessibility and thus give depth and meaning to formal governmental engagements.

76. Should we not look hard and long at the European example? The aim should be a community of sovereign States in the Middle East, as in Benelux and the European communities. With our eastern neighbour, once the bound-

ary is determined, we should seek a system of relations based on separate sovereignties but with a high measure of social and economic integration. The remarkable ease and cordiality of access between Israelis and the mass of Palestinian Arabs today should be preserved and consolidated in a peace settlement. The squalid conspiracies of Arafat and Habash, with their grenades, daggers, bombs and guns, do not represent the views or interests of the million non-Israeli Arabs west of the Jordan living in peaceful interaction with Israelis today. That is why terrorist violence has no expression there.

77. We are asked if we accept negotiation. The answer is, Yes, by any procedure mutually agreed upon. The negotiation is between the sovereign States of the area. We must be concerned to insulate our region from the rivalries and competitions of the Powers. The Middle East, after generations of servitude, is now free. It should not seek new hegemonies and new servitudes at the expense of its newly won independence.

78. What about Security Council resolution 242 (1967)? The answer is, Yes, we accept it as the basis for negotiation with Egypt and Jordan, and our memorandum of 4 August 1970 remains in force. It is vital to understand what the resolution says and what it does not say. The resolution rules out withdrawal except in the context of a "just and lasting peace". It does not require any unconditional Israeli action without balancing actions on the Arab side. And it specifically makes provision for the establishment of secure and recognized boundaries by agreement between Member States. When Arab Governments persuade international conferences to say that resolution 242 (1967) requires immediate and unconditional withdrawal from all the territories, they commit a triple forgery within a single sentence and put our documentary consensus in jeopardy. But as it stands and as it is written it is a documentary basis for negotiation.

79. Do we accept the principle of withdrawal? Yes. In the context of a permanent peace Israeli forces would withdraw to the positions and boundaries determined mutually by the peace agreements. Our policy is not unilateral annexation but the negotiation of agreements on the final boundary. That position is in full accord with the intentions of those who drafted and sponsored Security Council resolution 242 (1967). One of them, Assistant Secretary Sisco, said publicly in 1970:

"That resolution did not say withdrawal to the pre-June 5 line. The resolution said the parties must negotiate to achieve agreement on the so-called final, secure and recognized borders. In other words the question of the final borders is a matter of negotiation between the parties."

80. We are asked about the Palestinian Arabs. If the idea is Palestine instead of Israel, our answer, of course, is, No. There is nothing "instead" of Israel either in universal history or in modern political reality. The question whether the Arabs have 18 or 19 States does not stand on an equal plane with Israel's solitary domain of nationhood and existence. But if the issue is Palestine side by side with Israel, the answer is that in peace negotiations with Jordan Israel's permanent boundary would be determined. It is not our governmental consensus to seek such boundary changes as would bring all or most of the Arabs of the West Bank and

their populated territories under Israeli sovereignty or citizenship. The majority of Jordan's population are Palestinians, and most of the Palestinians are Jordanian citizens. Thus an Israel-Jordan peace settlement would enable most of the Palestine Arabs east and west of the Jordan to affirm their identity and citizenship within an Arab framework. It is for Arabs and not Israelis to determine the precise constitutional structure of our eastern neighbour. In a peace settlement the area of the former Palestine Mandate on both sides of the Jordan between the desert and the sea would have two States—Israel and an Arab State which would be a Palestinian Arab State in its composition whatever its name or constitutional structure. It would be normal for Palestinian Arabs to be included in the Jordanian delegation that would negotiate peace with Israel.

81. The principles I have outlined today would, of course, have to be submitted to negotiation with the other side. Here I seek only to emphasize that our positions are legitimate, normal and conducive to a wide range of peaceful solutions. Indeed, they are identical with the principles adopted by many States which have been praised here for their contribution to the new détente. It is possible to agree with those positions or to differ from them. But we see a moral and intellectual affront in any tendency to portray them as eccentric, as immoderate and, more grotesquely, as intransigent, when they are quite clearly nothing of the kind.

82. Least of all is there any justification for making them the basis for abusive or punitive formulations in obedience to the pressures of Arab States which decline negotiation, refuse peace, encourage international terrorism and seek to impose their own hostilities on other States in a manner prejudicial to the sovereignty and dignity of newly emerging nations.

83. Whatever has divided them in the past, the Israeli and Arab nations cannot escape their common destiny. History and geography ensure their proximity. Experience teaches us that there are no irreconcilable conflicts. If the Arab Governments will take example and inspiration from the prevailing spirit of détente, they will find in Israel a willing partner for regional development and co-operation. There would be more benefit and, above all, more honour and dignity for them and for us in the exploration of a peaceful future than in the pursuit of an ineffective and sterile rancour, which has achieved and will achieve none of its objectives but which degrades our region's name and obstructs its better visions.

84. We shall respond affirmatively to any efforts, such as those indicated by the United States, to assist in the search for just solutions and to generate a spirit of accommodation.

85. Israel's relations with the European community will enter a new phase with the conclusion this year of an agreement constituting a free trade area within the Mediterranean context. If the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe succeeds in its task, the Mediterranean and Middle East will benefit from the resultant growth of continental harmony. We welcome the decision of the Conference to invite Israel to present its views on matters inscribed on the Conference agenda.

86. A central theme of the dialogue on détente in Europe, in the European Security Conference and elsewhere is liberty of movement and freedom of intellectual expression. Unless some success is registered here, there will be scepticism about the authenticity and depth of the change in the international climate. Our concern for détente should not lead us to ignore the desperate bid for freedom by men such as Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, Levich and other scientists and thinkers who fall under governmental harassment and oppression.

87. The saga of Soviet Jewry belongs to this theme.

88. During his visit to the United States this summer, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Leonid Brezhnev, made a number of declarations implying that there are almost no rejections of requests by Soviet Jews to be permitted to leave for Israel. To our regret, we cannot confirm such statements at a time when so many Jews in the Soviet Union are held against their will and call out to us daily in despair. They face powerful authorities in a struggle to exercise the right, granted fortunately to many thousands of others, to join their people and their families in Israel. Applicants for emigration have in some instances been dismissed from work and left without any means of livelihood. Media of information have incited against them. Administrative molestation has made their life unbearable. Dozens of Jews, amongst them a young woman, have been condemned to long years of suffering behind barbed wire. The penalties inflicted on these people are especially surprising in view of the fact that the right to leave for Israel has been recognized in principle and that other Jews have exercised it. It is difficult to understand or condone a policy granting exit permits to some Jews while at the same time creating cruel obstacles for many others.

89. Nor can we pass in silence over the anti-Jewish incitement conducted openly or under the cover of propaganda directed against religion or against zionism. This campaign is still carried on through governmental media of information and by means of propaganda publications and pseudo-scientific literature. In this manner anti-Semitic ideas are disseminated and injected into the masses of the Soviet Union's population.

90. On 26 March this year a tribunal in the French capital determined that information material distributed by the Soviet Embassy contained slanders on the Jewish faith and incitement to racial discrimination, and found those responsible guilty. But the Soviet authorities have not applied the Soviet law against the disseminators of anti-Semitic propaganda.

91. At the same time, the Jews of Syria and the remnant still left in Iraq are living in constant torment. Israel again appeals to world opinion which has already alleviated the plight of these helpless small minorities whose only salvation lies in emigration and the pursuit of a new life.

92. This season of the year was darkened for us in 1972 by the fearful affliction and murder of our sportsmen who went to Munich in the shelter of the Olympic flag. This year the horizon is clouded again. The kidnapping of Jewish refugees by terrorists in Austria is a reproach to interna-

tional institutions whose sterile discussion of international terrorism must have given more encouragement to terrorists than they would have derived even from the absence of discussion. The decision to close the camp at Schoenau defied our belief. I recall an unforgettable day there a few months ago. In a world convulsed by nihilism and violence, it was moving to see this oasis of humane values, dedicated to the impulses of compassion and solidarity which have so often become submerged in the torrent of twentieth-century life. The very name Schoenau was recited with pride by every Austrian whom I was privileged to encounter. Those who have passed through its gates have known great suffering and torment in the tempests which have shaken Europe in this generation. To abandon such an enterprise in deference to a pair of brutal gangsters has a terrifying meaning. It raises the question where the final human victory belongs. Can law and civility triumph if they are not strongly defended? Can a decent and rational public order take root in the world if indulgence beyond their own expectation is shown to those who put a pistol to the head of unarmed wayfarers? What will be the effect of the constant suspension of European legal systems in favour of early release and impunity for those who come to kill and maim and leave their trail of innocent blood behind?

93. The issue is not only how the safe transit of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel will be arranged, once the emigration has been authorized and the immigration approved. This is an acutely grave question, but it arises in an even graver context. What is the future of a world in which two pirates and criminals can bring a proud nation, can bring sovereign governments to the acceptance of their terms? What are the implications of transactions and engagements between civilized governments and violent extortionists? Who is going to rule our world, governments or gunmen?

94. The Council of Europe in its resolution entitled "Report on the responsibility of the Member States of the Council of Europe regarding the free movement of people in Europe", adopted on 1 October 1973, rightly expressed the hope that no government will regard itself as bound by a promise secured by extortion to terminate facilities for the transit of emigrants from the Soviet Union. All these human predicaments emerge from the developments in Vienna this week. When the civilized world stands with bowed head, along comes President El-Sadat to celebrate joyfully the triumph of the young gunmen over a few aging, weary Jews and over the sovereignty and law of an enlightened European State.

95. Once it was an international offence to aid pirates. They were defined as *humani generis hostis*, enemies of the human race. Are we approaching a time when it will be an offence to resist them?

96. Chancellor Brandt called from this platform [2128th meeting, para. 80] for an effective convention against terrorism. But experience shows that if in this matter we aim at universality we shall not have the necessary parliamentary success. There is—let us face it—no effective anti-terrorist majority in the United Nations. That is an ominous truth, but nothing is gained by ignoring it.

97. I ask myself therefore whether it would be more effective to follow the general traditions of international law by

convening like-minded interested States to discuss and formulate a convention against terrorism. The law of the seas and other instruments of international law and international co-operation evolved from the common action of a few States to which others came to adhere. Most of the historic international conventions were constructed in this way. Formulated by the few, they became the consensus of the many. The 43 States whose votes indicated their dissatisfaction with the results of last year's debate on terrorism might well consider meeting for common action, which would in the first place engage themselves and later attract a gradual but broad consensus.

98. For it becomes more evident each day that the United Nations, frustrated in its activity in regional disputes, should concentrate more of its efforts on matters of planetary concern which require a unitary framework. Mankind has a long past and an uncertain future. Revolutions in science, in technology, in the use of energy, in industrial productivity, in demographic growth have moved forward at a rhythm too quick for the mind to absorb. Man is not at ease with his environment. The intellectual and spiritual consequences are deep. Our culture is dominated by a sense of fragmentation and instability. It expresses the special pathos of the twentieth century condition—the confidence of power and yet the sharp premonition of vulnerability both living within us, together, side by side.

99. The United Nations may recapture some of its lost prestige and resonance if it gives first priority to those issues which have a planetary dimension. The law of the air and of the seas, the defence of air and water against pollution, the stimulation of economic growth in developing countries, the conservation of resources, the fight against famine, the establishment of a reserve of cereals in years of abundance for use in years of scarcity (following may I say, the thrifty example of our Israeli ancestor Joseph in ancient Egypt), the response to the call of hunger south of the Sahara, the response to the important initiative of President Echeverría of Mexico calling for a charter of economic rights and duties of States—those are some problems which can only be discussed and solved on a global scale. Too much of the time of the United Nations may have been spent on the regional disputes in which individual Governments have the last say—for the simple reason that they have the ultimate responsibility. In the meantime, problems have collected which because they belong equally to all nations, end up by belonging to none. Each of our national societies has its custodians and spokesmen. The question is who except the United Nations can speak for the City of Man? Who speaks in responsible tutelage of the atmosphere, the soil, the oceans, the unique life-supporting Earth?

100. Perhaps mankind's dilemma is the United Nations opportunity. Let us, therefore, tread this ground firmly but with precision for this is the only planet that we have.

101. Mr. RATSIRAKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): *O tempora! O mores!* We could not have found a better place than this nor could we have selected a better occasion than this to take up again this cry of alarm, more than 20 centuries after Cicero, in view of the present way social, political and economic world *mores* are developing.

102. By your leave, may I first recall here, by way of explaining our attitude, a text which is well known and reads as follows:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

and for these ends

to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and

to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims".

Thus our elders express themselves in the Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, which was signed on 26 June 1945.

103. It is true that there is many a slip 'twixt cup and lip. And this may continue to be so as long as nations remain what they are.

104. It is true also that the history of mankind has always been that of a permanent struggle between the wisdom and the folly of men. But more than at any other time in history, we consider that today it is essential that one day man brings his wisdom up to the level of his power if he wishes to save the world.

105. *O tempora! O mores!* That cry alarm is amply justified by the lowering of morals in the present-day world. The mind of any thinking man is completely disturbed at the present time. It would seem, as has been frequently said, that the origin of this unusual mental crisis should be seen as the giddy, almost anarchic, development of technology and science, which enslave the men they were designed to serve. And they have engendered a consumer society which makes man more selfish, which reinforces the egocentricity of nations and exacerbates the excessive cult of material wealth and the desperate search for profit.

106. Man is disoriented by so much immoderation and has sought evasion in many ways. Hence, we have a exces-

sive consumption of all sorts of stimulants such as alcohol, drugs, erotic films and pornography, sexual perversion, excess of speed, bright lights and noise. All these are factors which favour the decline of morality and the increase of criminality.

107. Man, now appears, because of the progress of science, to be capable of a number of technological achievements and of responding to all the technical problems that exist; but he is so lamentably disarmed in the face of purely human problems such as racism, hunger, the environment, social justice, peace. Our technical civilization seems even to have further complicated these problems without having been able to give human wisdom new means of resolving them.

108. *O tempora! O mores!* That cry is also amply justified in the face of our incapacity to resolve international political problems.

109. Let us take a look together at the situation of our Organization, without flattering ourselves. Theoretically, the United Nations should be resorted to whenever any serious crisis appears on the international scene. Unfortunately, we must painfully recognize that the role of the United Nations and of international organizations remains a desperately secondary one.

110. Just as it was between the two world wars, when major conflicts such as the war in Spain, the Japanese attack against China, the aggressions of Nazi Germany, were not submitted to the League of Nations, similarly no decisive role was played by the United Nations in settling the two Viet-Nam wars, the conflicts in Nigeria and in Pakistan, or even the Cuban crisis. But even worse, the resolutions of the United Nations on the Middle East, particularly the well-known resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council, have remained a dead letter.

111. Israel spurns the decisions of our Organization—this very Organization which gave birth to it—emboldened by the support which it invariably finds from certain great Powers.

112. Resolution 242 (1967), once we supported it with the ultimate degree of verbal vehemence, allayed our consciences. It is not even put into effect! And even if it were put into effect, it would not solve the fundamental problem, which it completely overlooks, namely, the inalienable right of the Palestine people to existence and self-determination.

113. In the course of a television programme, two French broadcasters imagined a tourist poster for Israel for the year 2000, which would read:

"Visit Israel and its pyramids."

114. What appears to us as an artists' joke is perhaps already a definite plan in the minds of the international Zionists if we are not careful, as would seem to be suggested by the present gradual annexation of the West Bank through the confiscation of land by the Israeli Government, the purchase of lands by para-State organizations, such as the KKL (Jewish National Fund) and other private land speculations and transactions.

115. This is also suggested by the geometric progression of the area covered by Israel since its creation in 1948.

116. In fact, the evanescence of the responsibilities of the international community, the notorious impotence of the United Nations, the arrogance of power, State terrorism or preventive reprisals—which are, by the way, a concept inadmissible in international law—the occupation of foreign territories and the colonization of those territories, repression of civilian populations, denial of the rights of the disinherited Palestinian people, whose only choice is to resort to violence in the face of a self-satisfied and intransigent power, the impatience of the Arab peoples who have been despoiled and who object to the fait accompli of the occupation of their territories by force—all the conditions exist for a new armed confrontation, with incalculable consequences for international peace and security.

117. Are we finally going to react in the proper way to prevent a conflagration which might well involve our planet's catching fire?

118. At the risk of disappointing some and shocking others—because sometimes things have to be said if we really wish to get out of an impasse—this is how we have tried to grasp the complex problem of the Middle East.

119. The Larousse dictionary gives the following definition of Palestine:

“A country in the Middle East between Lebanon in the north, the Dead Sea in the south, the Mediterranean in the west and the Syrian desert in the east. It is a narrow strip of land between Lebanon and the sea, and the Jordan River runs through it.”

The same Larousse gives the following definition of Israel—of course, it depends on the edition one reads:

“Israel comprises that part of Palestine where the Jewish population is predominant, but its frontiers, which are the result of an armistice, are arbitrary”.

Thus, at first blush, juridically speaking, the State of Israel is without frontiers and does not exist.

120. We said last year, and repeat today, that we have nothing against the Jews. The sufferings that they endured are sufficiently repellent for them still to be fresh in our memories.

121. However, we are trying objectively to analyse the facts and to arrange them logically and consistently.

122. Representatives are aware of the *Projekt Madagaskar* of Hitler that Theo Denneker addressed to Rademacher in August of 1940. It was a question, no more and no less, of deporting 4 million Jews to Madagascar. At that time there were 3.8 million Malagasies, and this would have turned our island into a vast concentration camp, an enormous Jewish homeland.

123. I do not think I am mistaken when I affirm that the Malagasy people—which has never accepted colonialism since the time of the Menalamba and the Vy Vato Sakelika, in 1947 and 1971-1972 to actual independence in 1973—would have had any different reactions from those of the Palestinians today. We therefore understand their plight.

124. As Mr. Pinhas Sapir himself said, “Israel today occupies Arab territories not by force of law, but by the law of force”, and that is something that we could never accept and that prompts us to support the cause of the Arab countries.

125. But we must go further in our analysis of this puzzle.

126. By what absurd logic, by what stange aberration, did Balfour and Britian imagine that this strip of land, this narrow strip between Lebanon and the sea, could welcome millions of Jews previously scattered throughout the world, without subsequent expansion? How could they have conceived *mutatis mutandis*, that England could receive all Americans of British origin as well as all Europeans, Australians, New Zealanders, Rhodesians and Canadians of English lineage? How could they have imagined that a State like Israel, surrounded on all sides by hostile States, could live in any degree of stability or peace?

127. In fact, the reply is simple. The imperialists did not want peace in that region. And the reason is this: there are in that area of the Middle East vast supplies of oil.

128. But in this case would the Israelis, Palestinians and Arabs be only pawns in the hands of the great Powers? Would they be simply the tools of an underhanded struggle for economic domination of the area?

129. If that is so, the necessary conclusions must be drawn.

130. The situation is even more complicated because the Israeli population also grows according to a geometric progression; from the few tens of thousands which they were originally, they have now grown to several million, thanks to Jewish emigration from the four corners of the world. Thus we are simply witnessing a new form of settler colonization.

131. May we dare to carry our analysis to its logical conclusion by asking a simple question. What if the underlying reason for the creation of the State of Israel was simply the anti-Semitism of the great Powers? In that case we might risk the following reasoning: Europeans do not like Jews; Hitler was not able to carry out his “final solution”; but since the Jewish question remains extant, the former anti-Nazi Powers found it more elegant and more useful for their long-term global strategy to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

132. That is why we say the Israelis must cease to be only an international problem. They should cease to be the simple tools of zionism and customers of arms dealers; they must look reality squarely in the face and try to understand the Palestinian people.

133. Turning now to the situation in southern Africa, we know as well as anybody that the resolutions of our Organization have changed nothing in the area. In point of fact, in that quarter of the world where it would be really indecent to speak of peace, security or justice—because they are conspicuous by their absence or, if they do exist, they are interpreted in a distorting mirror, unilaterally, in favour of

usurping minorities and of their near or distant allies—the situation remains the same.

134. The joint and archaic alliance of illegality, of usurpation, of *apartheid* and imperialism continues to oppress and dominate the peoples of that area, in scorn or ignorance of the black man and with a pathological taste for half truth. It continues to give social, political, economic and cultural relations the same hollow justification directly inherited from the nineteenth century, according to the notorious theory of “continuity in evolution”, which could be called more accurately “continuity in stagnation”.

135. Undo the increasingly threadbare cover of “the defence of the free world”, this neo-colonialist, paternalistic, traditional or doctrinaire policy, though condemned in words, is in fact supported by the NATO Powers and the forces of capitalist imperialism.

136. It is in fact quite evident that southern Africa remains one of the last bastions of lost causes and of minorities who call themselves the torch-bearers of a “civilizing mission”. And it is in the name of that mission that we see perpetrated every day outrages, summary executions, massacres such as the one at Wiriyaumu, genocide in Mozambique—all with the silent complicity of some and the material assistance of others, and all against the background of United Nations paralysis.

137. We reject this alleged policy of appeasement consisting of an uninterrupted series of evasions based on a so-called differentiation among cases. In fact, such a policy could be justified only if we were to recognize the primacy of the inalienable rights of peoples over the dubious and uncertain right of States. On the basis of this last hypothesis, all is possible. Unfortunately, we are confronted with bad faith and inertia, which leads us to demand that an end be put to the sterile negotiations with South Africa concerning Namibia.

138. In South-East Asia, just as similar causes produce similar effects, the setting is different but the substance of the problem is the same.

139. In Indo-China we find ourselves faced with a striking example of a situation which some believed on the way to settlement following the Agreement of 27 January 1973,⁷ but one which carries within itself the seeds of a third war in Indo-China. The reasons for this precarious and ambiguous situation are varied: They are inherent in the very nature of the Agreement—this is an agreement which is fundamentally political but which has been thwarted by reservations that have served to encourage contractual agreements. They are inherent in the foreign interventions that continue in subtle forms, in the form, for instance, of “civilian advisers” to assist in the war effort in Viet-Nam and in the unjustifiable raids and bombardments and the scarcely disguised invasion of Cambodia, in support of régimes hardly to be called representative. These direct foreign interferences demonstrate in fact an unquenchable thirst for the maintenance of political and economic bastions, and thus the urge to dominate and the selfishness of certain Powers that still dream nostalgically of influence.

⁷ Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Viet-Nam, signed at Paris on 27 January 1973.

140. The solutions proposed in this context can be at best improvised and unrealistic.

141. The fundamental principles underlying a peaceful, just and lasting solution remain: equality of rights among peoples, as recognized by the Charter; the right of those same peoples to self-determination, and full respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity.

142. Hence we hold it to be indispensable, first, that there be complete and genuine withdrawal of all forces of foreign intervention, whether in Indo-China, in Korea or in Cambodia; that the task of determining the conditions for participation in national and international political life be left to the peoples of those areas themselves, according to their own standards and not according to models imposed from outside; that the desire of those peoples to live in peace in accord with their own genius be recognized, so that they may live in a coherent society, not a society artificially held together or divided by any insincere allegiance to the sullied values of a foreign civilization; that an end be put to the chauvinism that has been elevated by some to a political principle, international in application but completely untenable because it runs contrary to the sovereignty of peoples.

143. Unless these conditions are achieved and respected, security in the Indo-Chinese peninsula and in South-East Asia will remain precarious and illusory.

144. *O tempora! O mores!* This feeling is further justified by our inability to ensure security throughout the world. The development and progress that have been achieved in weapons of mass destruction and the perfection of their means of delivery are such, in our time, that a generalized nuclear war seems, unless there is a miscalculation, highly improbable. The unleashing of a nuclear war by one or other of the super-Powers would inevitably end in genocide and collective suicide. All the great Powers can do now is engage in so-called “conventional” warfare. It is curious that the term “conventional” is used to describe a war that is so unconventional. In any case, a limited, classic type of war among great Powers, despite all the theories of “flexible response” or other theories, run the risk, in accordance with the “domino theory”, of rapidly developing into a generalized nuclear war. We all know that no interest from now on is sufficiently great to justify such a holocaust. Consequently, the great Powers are forced to reach agreement. It is the end of the cold war and the beginning of détente.

145. Thus the great Powers have become aware of the absurdity of their struggle and the sterility of their direct military confrontation. And thus we see yesterday's enemies renouncing what divided them, looking for things they have in common so that they may join forces and collaborate. This is true of Germany and Italy, which come into the Common Market beside Great Britain, Belgium, France and the Netherlands. This is the case of the United States of America, of Japan and of the Soviet Union, which are already beginning to co-operate beyond their ideological divisions. But since the political interests of the great Powers are not yet entirely identical, they wage war by proxy, with the third world in between. At any rate, they have to sell their armaments and keep their arms factories going.

146. This is why we welcome, as we should, the efforts made by the Europeans in the field of organizing their

security, for this approach to the problem is in fact in accordance with the aims and principles of the Charter. It responds, furthermore, to European concerns and, where their interests are identical with those of others, to the concerns of all peoples.

147. But in spite of all, we cannot refrain from a certain scepticism in more general terms. In point of fact, the tendency of the great Powers and the super-Powers to negotiate among themselves has not improved or guaranteed in any absolute way the security of small and medium-sized nations. The organization of co-operation, as we see it now in its exploratory and preliminary stages, may be carried out without the third world, at the latter's expense or even against its interests. The great Powers and the super-Powers seem to be turning toward a consolidation of their positions and their respective advantages. Is it not, furthermore, symbolic and is it not one of the great paradoxes of our times, that the same small countries that previously were so noisily demanding the end of the cold war are today beginning to denounce the Russian-American rapprochement, which they regard as collusion? In the face of this contradiction between intentions and interpretations—a completely normal and healthy reaction on the part of a world disabused because often abused—it will be necessary, we believe, as the Preamble to the Charter tells us, to reaffirm and make real the equality of the rights of States through collective steps in connexion with security and international co-operation, and to create a new, more egalitarian order among peoples, large, medium-sized, or small, which would be tantamount to internationalizing social justice.

148. Let us now turn to disarmament. We are, of course, gratified that a bipartite agreement has been reached between the Soviet Union and the United States on the prevention of nuclear war.⁸ But here again we cannot give way to unqualified jubilation. That agreement does not in particular solve, in a global way and with respect for the sovereignty and equality of all States, large, medium-sized or small, the problem of the diversification of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction or their stockpiling, nor does it solve the problem of nuclear testing. In this connexion, we expect the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks to produce more positive results; otherwise security may well turn out to be an illusion. Military disengagement, the withdrawal of foreign troops and the liquidation of bases on foreign soil remain very much on the agenda, and progress achieved in these areas remains marginal.

149. The small and medium-sized Powers, particularly those that are peripheral and belong to no alliance or military pact, feel rather frustrated by the role of mere spectators to which they have been relegated. Since disarmament is something that concerns us all, and not only the super-Powers and the military blocs, we are more than ever convinced of the need to create conditions that will be propitious for the achievement of complete and immediate disarmament.

150. The creation of zones of peace similar to that which is planned for the Indian Ocean would undoubtedly be one of

the instruments which we could use to achieve our goals of disarmament, peace and security. Actually, in the case of the Indian Ocean, the creation of a zone of peace will make it possible: for the countries concerned to get together in order to establish co-operation based on genuine mutual trust; to outlaw the present race, which in fact draws heavily on the theory of spheres of influence; to utilize the human and material resources of the countries in that area for purely peaceful purposes; to guarantee independence and the genuine sovereignty for those countries without risk of direct or indirect interference.

151. But, again, there is many a slip 'twixt cup and lip, because the great Powers are putting forward the following objections to this generous and peaceful project: first, that the zone of peace might impede freedom of navigation on the high seas, and secondly that this liberty is generally recognized and will be defined at the forthcoming Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

152. That is why certain great Powers advocate, purely and simply, that the creation of zones of peace should await the convening of the Conference of the Law of the Sea—as if the freedom of the high seas and its exercise were incompatible with the desire for peace of the peoples of that area, and as if they did not know that the conclusions of that Conference will be legal and economic in nature and thus will not in any way take precedence over the collective political will of the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean.

153. As far as we are concerned, last year we announced that the emergence of Madagascar to full sovereignty and to completely national and international responsibility make it imperative henceforth that it play fully the role which belongs to it in that part of the Indian Ocean where it is located.

154. How has the Malagasy Government tried to live up to this role? First, by creating conditions for genuine national independence in all areas: the creation of an autonomous currency and central bank; the adoption of an outward-looking policy of friendship with all; the severance of alienating links with foreign countries, particularly with South Africa; and the evacuation of foreign troops and bases from its territory.

155. The last two points should be particularly emphasized and analysed. In point of fact, by eliminating foreign bases and troops from its soil and by refusing to join the Southern Defence Pact, Madagascar has contributed in a significant way to creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean area, a position which is in accordance with the desires of non-aligned countries.

156. The Malagasy Government has taken its place on the world scene particularly by being more active in international affairs—with the non-aligned countries, in OAU, in the United Nations and so on. Thus the Malagasy Government is helping liberation movements in Africa and elsewhere. It welcomes the proclamation of the independence of the former Portuguese colony of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands. It considers that that new State is juridically and morally entitled to international recognition and to participate in our work, if our Organization intends

⁸ Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War, signed at Washington on 22 June 1973.

to remain faithful to its ideals of freedom, progress and justice.

157. The Malagasy Government considers that the solution of the Korean problem depends on the determination of the Korean people itself to diminish tension and internal friction, to promote co-operation in all areas, to forge awareness of a common destiny, as set forth in the proposals of the North Korean Government, which we entirely support.

158. The Malagasy Government also recognizes the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia as the only legitimate and legal Government, and supports the idea of the urgent need to restore in the United Nations and its system the rights of the Cambodian people to be represented by a Government free from any form of dependence or foreign allegiance.

159. It also recognizes, with some 40 other States, that the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Viet-Nam is the authentic representative of the South Viet-Nameese people. The Government and the people of Madagascar can never forget that they in fact owe their present independence to the heroic struggle of the Viet-Nameese people; to the historic "No" of the fraternal people of Guinea; and to the brave combat waged by the dauntless people of Algeria.

160. The Malagasy Government has followed with some sympathy the experience of the Government of Popular Unity of Chile. The policies of Salvador Allende were in accordance with the aspirations of the people, which has long been enslaved and frustrated by the alliance of reactionaries and monopolists. We pay a tribute to Mr. Allende, his courage, his honest and universal vision, and his universalism in the defence of genuinely independent nations and completely liberated peoples.

161. Finally, the Malagasy Government is making its voice heard in international bodies on questions of monetary reform and in the Economic and Social Council, particularly on questions relating to the environment and the law of the sea.

162. Thus we consider that the concept of the continental shelf and the definition which has been suggested are valid only for the great Powers. In point of fact, the criterion of the 200-metre isobath for the delimitation of the continental shelf is not applicable to a number of countries of the third world. The hydrography of that area has either not been carried out at all or has been done in summary fashion. Furthermore, there are a number of countries which have no or very little continental shelf. For example, a few miles from our coast one frequently finds the abyssal depths. Consequently, we would prefer the idea of an exclusive economic zone based on a distance, rather than a depth, criterion.

163. With regard to the idea of the territorial sea, here again our position has been dictated by our desire to adapt everything to the realities instead of submitting to decisions imposed from outside. Up to now, the great Powers have determined the breadth of this territorial sea on the basis of cannon range. Thus, they adopted three nautical miles; and then—we do not know why or how—they decided to

increase that distance to 6 and then 12 miles—perhaps because the range of their ordnance grew accordingly. Nevertheless, at a time of intercontinental ballistic missiles and rockets, the criterion of the range of armaments for the delimitation of territorial waters no longer makes any sense.

164. For a small island country such as ours, we prefer to choose another criterion in delimiting that area. Since we wish to protect, in so far as possible, our island from any possible intrusion, landing or invasion, we chose the concept of the time it takes for us to summon our coastal or air forces. That is why the Madagascar Government decided to increase the breadth of its territorial waters to 50 nautical miles, starting from the baseline, and the exclusive economic zone to 150 miles, starting from the same point.

165. *O tempora! O mores!* Our pessimism is finally justified by the iniquitous organization of present international economic relations. The political liberation of all continents is being achieved. But this political liberation could only be a delusion if it were bereft of any economic content.

166. All delegations here stress as a *Leitmotiv* that the growing gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" may seriously compromise international peace and security.

167. We feel it is our duty to reaffirm that under-development is not backwardness in development. It is, more or less, the result of an historical process—colonial and then neo-colonial exploitation by means of which developed countries empty the economies of the poor peripheral countries of their substance.

168. Some euphemistically describe this colonial depredation as "deterioration in the terms of trade". It remains true that pillage of the resources of the third world continues in ever-more subtle forms. That is why these so-called developing countries are actually under-developing countries. They are in a state of perpetual under-development because the conditions which brought about this situation are continually recurring.

169. An eminent person said that development is now the new name of peace.

170. But we refuse categorically to follow those who support development by incantation, as if it were sufficient to speak about development for it to materialize. "Disarmed laws", said Cardinal de Retz, "are not to be respected". To overcome under-development we have to dismantle the whole machinery and bring about a drastic transformation in relations between the "haves" and the "have-nots" and also in the social relationships existing in our countries.

171. To decolonize, to democratize, to make more moral international relations and trade is, of course, excellent; but we know that States never willingly renounce their interests. It is up to us, the countries of the third world, to force the rich countries to accept our points of view. We have the material ways and means of imposing the ideas which we believe are fair, since our countries contain in their soil and sub-soil the main natural resources of our planet, resources which are indispensable to the economic growth of the industrialized countries.

172. We have the opportunity to organize ourselves and to adopt clear options on the basis of our common interests, despite our differences in civilization, language, ideology, religion or political systems.

173. Furthermore, the developed countries themselves can set aside their differences and they do not hesitate to decide to sacrifice us to their strategies.

174. As far as we are concerned, we henceforth refuse to entertain that dichotomy; that Manichaean division of the earth into rival East and West blocs. That is no longer in accordance with reality.

175. As long as the developed countries have a common interest and a common goal—to assure their economic development, to the detriment of the poor countries—the world is naturally divided into two camps: the imperialist exploiters on the one hand and the exploited on the other. But as long as we are content to demand, to exhort, to make pressing appeals and to beg the great Powers to do certain things, we will not achieve results.

176. As long as the richer countries continue to freeze their assets in London, Paris, Bonn, New York and Tokyo, the sums which the imperialists then lend to us at very high rates, or use to finance and arm Zionist armies, although they could be used to hasten the development of the third world; as long as we are content to mouth words such as "the freedom of peoples to determine their own destiny"—which is only, after all, the freedom granted by imperialism to Governments which dispose of our peoples as they will, Governments which are docile—without giving any genuine economic and cultural content to that liberty; as long as we former colonized peoples remain in the wake of Europe, by clinging to the Commonwealth, by following the French or the European Community, by joining regional organizations dominated by a particular great Power; as long as we have not understood, as the Europeans have, that our strength comes from organized unity; as long as we, the peoples of the third world, are content simply to ask the rich countries to stabilize the prices of primary commodities, whereas we have the means to get together to impose and fix ourselves the sale price of our commodities; as long as we do not assist each other in our struggle for economic liberation as we did in our struggle for political liberation, we, the countries of the third world, will always remain peoples who are mere objects, because the rich countries, the self-styled democracies, have not hesitated and will not hesitate to send colonial expeditions, such as those sent into Indo-China, Algeria, Suez, Mozambique and Angola. They will not balk at aggression and economic exploitation and they will let us have, at best, the crumbs of their unprecedented development.

177. Finally, it is obvious that our salvation will come from ourselves. We have to count on ourselves, rely on ourselves. We must not shuffle off our responsibilities onto others. We have to overcome our own weaknesses. It is a question of political will and determination.

178. Those were the anxieties and preoccupations contained in our cry, "*O tempora! O mores!*" I think, Mr. President, you will understand why we pay a heartfelt tribute to the competence, skill and devotion of your predeces-

sor, Mr. Stanisław Trepczyński, a citizen of a great country which suffered particularly from war, racism and man's folly, who was able in such a masterly way to conduct the work of the twenty-seventh session.

179. It is also fitting that we should wish the Secretary-General and all his co-workers to continue to serve with devotion the noble causes of our Organization, which, according to the words of the Secretary-General, should be "a reliable instrument of world order and co-operation, accepted and respected by all Governments" [A/9001/Add.1, p. 8].

180. But we are particularly happy to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your well-deserved election to preside over this twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. That, following the Fourth Conference of Heads of States and Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Algiers, the representative of Ecuador, a developing country, should be elected to the presidency of the General Assembly—you, Mr. Benites, with your experience of international affairs and the aptitude and objectivity which we know are part of your character—is for us small countries full of significance. We see it as an earnest of the fact that the problems of the developing countries, which have been left outside the deliberations of mankind, will be examined with all the attention they deserve, because those countries represent the overwhelming majority of our planet.

181. We are pleased to offer you our entire co-operation, so that the work of this session will lead not only to a few more resolutions but also to concrete and significant results, so that the world may one day see wisdom victorious over man's folly.

182. Mr. THORN (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Mr. President, I should like on behalf of my delegation to congratulate you most warmly on your accession to the Presidency of the Assembly. We all know how wide is your experience and authority and we know we shall need those two qualities in order to complete our difficult discussions on the many subjects before us at the present session.

183. In accordance with well-established tradition, the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, has made things easier for us by the submission of his clear, objective and realistic report on the work of the Organization [A/9001 and Add.1].

184. I should like to join the many speakers who have preceded me in greeting the admission to the United Nations of the two German States and the Bahamas. That brings our Organization closer to the ideal situation, which is the participation of all nations of the world in our work. We are particularly happy at the admission to our Organization of the Federal Republic of Germany, a neighbour and friend with which we enjoy close ties of friendship and fruitful co-operation in a number of international organizations, particularly within the framework of the European communities. I wish to express the conviction that the arrival among us of new Member States represents an appreciable strengthening of the United Nations and I trust that the very few countries which have not yet joined us will be able to do so in the very near future.

185. If one glances at the international situation today, one is able to see certain reasons for satisfaction. Is it not true that for the moment there is no major source of war, causing considerable loss of human life? I believe that fact should be stressed and Sir Alec Douglas-Home was quite correct when he quoted the Secretary-General and stated that we could consider with a certain optimism the fact that the United Nations had in the last few years contributed to defusing a number of conflicts [2128th meeting, para. 122]. Thanks to the wisdom of enlightened statesmen, satisfactory compromises have recently been achieved that have led to a considerable reduction of hostilities in Indo-China. I trust that the agreements recently reached between India and Pakistan will allow a definitive settlement of the difficulties that still persist on that subcontinent.

186. Unfortunately, the world is not safe from new sources of violence and illegality.

187. It is with the deepest feelings of sadness and regret that we heard of the tragic death of President Allende and the overthrow by force of a democratically elected régime, regardless of the merits or deficiencies it might have had. For the Chilean people and in the interest of all nations here assembled, I trust that democratic freedoms will promptly be re-established, and we ask above all that, there as everywhere else in the world, respect for human rights be guaranteed to all men irrespective of their political opinions.

188. To turn to the European continent, the second phase of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe has just started in Geneva and the negotiations on mutual and balanced reductions of forces in Central Europe will soon enter an active stage.

189. A continent which for many decades has been disturbed will thus be able to make progress on the road of co-operation among countries with different social régimes, on the road to better mutual understanding and, hence, to increased security. I express the hope and the profound conviction that the negotiations under way will serve to ensure not only material exchanges but also, and primarily, better mutual information and a freer exchange of men and ideas, as well as full respect for human rights and intellectual freedoms. Together with my colleague Mr. van der Stoep, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, I should like to stress that, in saying this, our concern is not to intervene in the domestic affairs of certain States but rather to address an appeal to them to prove by tangible deeds that détente and rapprochement between peoples are much more than a vague slogan and have become an everyday reality.

190. In the Middle East, there has been no progress for a very long time. Although a certain détente is enjoyed all over the world and countries of very different ideologies are in the process of establishing relations that could hardly have been dreamed of only a few years ago, that region is still in a situation which is neither war nor peace and which may at any moment degenerate into a new confrontation. That situation is—we must unfortunately repeat it—contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter, to the rules of international law, to the resolutions of the United Nations and also to the interests even of the parties and all the countries of the region.

191. The need for a settlement is manifest. The principles on which such a settlement should be based are set forth in the Charter as well as in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). I need not reaffirm the importance of that resolution, which has the twofold advantage of having been adopted unanimously and of defining the respective obligations of the parties. Furthermore, it has acquired particular value since it was accepted by three of the parties concerned, namely, Egypt, Jordan and Israel.

192. The provision on withdrawal from the territories occupied by Israel must, however, be considered in conjunction with the right of Israel to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. These two elements cannot be considered each as a prior condition for the other, since that would lead to never being able to change the situation. Only the parties concerned, either through direct or indirect contacts, whether these are termed negotiations rather than soundings or preparatory talks, can decide by common agreement what in the end will be secure and recognized boundaries and, consequently, what will be the so-called minor changes to be made to these same boundaries.

193. May I be allowed sincerely to regret the fact that such negotiations have not yet been possible and also that Israel is in the process of creating *faits accomplis* in certain parts of the occupied territories, which might jeopardize the very objective of such negotiations.

194. It is naturally also true, and experience has proved this very often in the past, that it is difficult to maintain for a long period of time a status of strict occupation. That is not an accusation against any of the parties, nor is it an excuse; but it is merely a statement of the regrettable fact that, the more time passes, the more the search for a solution becomes difficult. May I express, contrary to what certain other speakers have said, my conviction that in this specific case time is on no one's side but against all, and my hope that all the countries concerned will realize this and act accordingly before it is too late.

195. For five years from this rostrum I have drawn the attention of the Assembly to the fact that we must never underestimate the importance of the Palestinian phenomenon within the framework of the Middle East conflict. The inexcusable acts of terrorism and political blackmail exercised through innocent victims should finally prove to the most recalcitrant observers that no final settlement can be arrived at if they overlook this burning question.

196. I come now to the question of colonialism and connected phenomena. Although the situation in this connexion has greatly improved throughout the years, it is nevertheless a fact that millions of human beings are still deprived of their fundamental rights to self-determination, freedom and independence.

197. Despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on this subject, we must unfortunately note that colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* continue to prevail particularly in southern Africa.

198. I should like to make the position of my Government very clear on this matter. We are firmly opposed to any

policy which an objective examination of the facts allows us to consider as colonialist or subject to convictions of racial discrimination, and we consider the action of Governments following such a policy as reprehensible. My Government gives neither military nor economic assistance to such Governments and fully complies with the mandatory decisions of the Security Council in this respect. However, we do not consider the exclusion of colonialist Governments from international organizations, or even the breaking off of diplomatic relations, as constituting the most effective means of forcing them to change their policies.

199. I should like to add here that I profoundly regret a certain confusion which seems to have been created in the Assembly between the notion of struggling against terrorism and that of opposition to colonial or national liberation movements. The legitimacy of the objectives of the latter can but suffer from that confusion.

200. We are convinced that it is necessary unreservedly to condemn any terrorist activity endangering the lives of innocent persons. The taking of hostages, the hijacking of aircraft and the resulting blackmail are particularly repugnant crimes which cannot be justified nor excused by any motive and in any circumstances. It is truly deplorable that a series of political motives—albeit valid but nevertheless secondary when compared to the objective sought—has prevented the conference recently held in Rome from adopting any concrete decision. It is certainly necessary that this Assembly adopt quick and efficient measures on this matter and that the highest political gatherings of the world thus reaffirm the great moral principle that the end does not justify the means.

201. I come now to another important question, which deals with economic development and social improvements in the world in order to achieve a more equitable distribution of wealth among all peoples. Three years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*], and certain doubts have appeared regarding the possibility of achieving the targets set by the Strategy, because of the absence of sufficient funds. That does not necessarily prove that we should give up the Strategy here and now and lose confidence in the results to be expected from the Second Development Decade. Indeed, the Strategy was conceived from the outset as a dynamic instrument which had to be adapted to changing circumstances. Therefore, its contents can be expanded to take into account certain new elements, while the general philosophy and the basic objectives are maintained.

202. Thus the interdependence of monetary problems and those raised by economic development and the structure of international trade has been brought to light. Another important element is the poverty of the masses in the developing countries, with all the attendant scourges such as under-employment, malnutrition, lack of decent housing, lack of education and crying inequalities in standards of living. It is urgent that valid solutions be found to these complex problems. In order to do so, we have to replace the old statistical approach of measuring economic growth on a *per capita* basis by a new concept placing human welfare in all its aspects at the centre of development policy.

203. I should also like to mention the world-wide problem of finding a sufficient supply of food-stuffs and the necessity for an increased international effort to contain the expansion of desert zones and to improve the yield of arid lands. The tragic drought that has devastated a number of Sudano-Sahelian countries in western and central Africa has suddenly brought these two problems to the attention of the world. Very significant assistance has been given following that catastrophe, both on a bilateral basis and through the machinery established by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. However, since it is quite possible that the drought may persist in the region, outside assistance is still indispensable. And for that assistance to be effective, it is imperative that the international community, and the organs of the United Nations in particular, tackle these problems in a co-ordinated fashion.

204. I believe that the proposal made [*2124th meeting, para. 71*] by the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Kissinger, for the holding next year of a world food conference is a wise one and that preparations should immediately be undertaken for it.

205. I am happy to state, within this general context, that my Government has just decided considerably to increase, within the limits of its possibilities, the assistance we give to the developing countries. This increase will start with the 1974 budget.

206. With regard to the world population problem, it is encouraging to note that the United Nations Special Fund has increased its activities. It is to be hoped that the World Population Conference to be held in Bucharest in 1974 will produce ideas concerning all aspects of this very delicate problem.

207. All over the world, efforts are being made to create concrete programmes based on the results obtained at the United Nations Conference on the Environment, held at Stockholm in June, 1972. We know that our natural resources are not unlimited and that the search for growth at any price can have extremely grave long-term consequences. In asking nations to protect and improve the common heritage, we must endeavour to seek genuine growth but also to protect the human element. It is therefore urgent to find a way of reconciling the immediate legitimate interests of mankind with the protection of the interests of succeeding generations.

208. In recent years, the United Nations and its affiliated international organizations have assumed new tasks which the authors of the Charter of San Francisco could not foresee, and thus the very structure of the Organization and the co-ordination among the various organs have become more and more complex. I therefore believe that the time has come to re-examine this evolution as a whole in order to make the necessary improvements while maintaining the central and co-ordinating role which the Charter has entrusted to the Economic and Social Council.

209. I have very briefly tried to express the views of my Government about some of the problems now confronting the United Nations. The achievement of a better world community is an extremely difficult task which

calls for the full co-operation of all nations. I trust that the efforts of the present session will bring us closer, under your guidance, Mr. President, to that noble goal.

210. Mr. VIGNES (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, your unanimous election to preside over this new session of the General Assembly is a token of recognition of your qualities as a diplomat, your competence in international affairs, and of the zeal and interest that you have always shown in your participation in dealing with the complex problems that confront our Organization. Thus, I wish my first words before this General Assembly to go beyond the mere ritualistic dictates of the usual courtesy, and serve to pay the tribute of my delegation to one who for so long has been an honour to his country, to Latin America and to the United Nations itself.

211. This election, furthermore, fills us with personal satisfaction, since we know of the great affection that Mr. Benites—the man of the Pacific—feels for the land of the River Plate, where he served for so long and left the indelible mark of his friendship and his brilliant work. I whole-heartedly trust that success will continue to crown your endeavours in the delicate duties that you have assumed, and I am happy to assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation in your important task.

212. I am vested with the representation of a Government that is the result of the express will of a people that has recently, and by an overwhelming majority, endorsed the three banners of social justice, economic independence and political sovereignty. That firm determination bespeaks the irreversible commitment to eliminate for all time the socio-political systems of dependency.

213. My country is going through an unprecedented historic period whose starting point lies in the union of all Argentines around the objective of national liberation. By means of the effective exercise of representative democracy, the Government and the people of Argentina have set out, at one and together, on the road that is to lead us to the establishment of a social order in which man may fulfil himself wholly, safeguarded by law against any form of exploitation. His rights and aspirations to a happy life will thus merge with those of the community.

214. All have a place in this great undertaking, from those who resolutely embrace the cause of *justicialismo* to those who advocate other tendencies, but who, in an atmosphere of peace and legality, are ready to be partners in the common effort.

215. Argentina is fully aware that respect for the plurality of ideas and obedience to the popular will are indispensable conditions in which to build a community organized on the basis of solid and lasting values.

216. In this spirit, my Government has decided to carry out a peaceful revolution—one that will profoundly change the Argentine society in order to meet the desires for justice and liberation that imbue our people.

217. This new orientation which guides the Argentine Government within our borders is also projected beyond

them and will govern our conduct within the framework of our international relations.

218. Our foreign thoughts, when crossing our borders, must be directed first of all to our own Latin America. We are convinced that in the future, we shall have to unite our forces and our resources in order to confront the difficulties that lie in wait for any who seek to ensure their freedom of action in a world beset by new imperialist threats. That convergence of efforts must logically start with those of us that possess the most obviously similar characteristics; and despite their powerful national personalities, our countries of Latin America do, in fact, possess a significant and real highest common denominator.

219. Since the very dawn of our emancipation we have been divided by varied outside interests in order that they might more easily obtain supplies of the raw materials so necessary for the progress of more advanced societies. I am most disturbed to have to state here that that quest for profit has not been abandoned and that certain power centres—Governments and multinational corporations—still have their sights set on the vast region which our countries make up.

220. For that reason, now more than ever, union is a categorical imperative today. We must labour without flagging with one idea in mind: a single and indissoluble Latin America. We know that that cannot be achieved overnight, but we also know that if that is not our aim the end result will be an even greater splintering and thus a weakening that will render us unable to defend ourselves against any form of ambition on the part of foreign Powers.

221. Each must play his vital role in this process. It was in Latin America itself that the legal principle of the sovereign equality of States gained the fullest respect, but unfortunately that very principle has far too often been set aside. On the strength of mature awareness we can today reaffirm that all the States of Latin America must contribute to the common cause on a footing of absolute parity.

222. We share similar needs and identical hopes. Nor are the obstacles to our progress different. We are all players in the same drama: that of living with searing needs unsatisfied in a continent flowing with resources. Thus it is hard to imagine individual solutions, unless we are ready to make do with mere palliatives. Faced by common problems, our solutions must be general and for the whole and framed by the ideas of international social justice to which all the peoples meeting here aspire.

223. Very possibly some country may alone manage a beginning of liberation. But it can never secure it if it is isolated from the rest. That is why we see the process of Latin American liberation as a joint undertaking intended to benefit all.

224. No ideological barrier must be allowed to prevail over motives sprung from the very roots of our peoples. We can assume our role in world affairs only through pluralist understanding and union.

225. There can be no doubt that we are heading towards an international system possessing continental features, and

to reach our goal we must fulfil our responsibilities with faith and optimism and by bringing to bear all the energies and reserves of the Latin American people. It is only thus that we shall all together approach our target, which has been defined for us by our common origin and an inevitable historical imperative. On this road we are prepared to co-operate with those who understand our yearnings and desires and wish to make their open and sincere contribution to the building of a politically, economically and socially just continent.

Mr. Fack (Netherlands), Vice-President, took the Chair.

226. Our concern over the future of Latin America fits squarely within the wider concept of the third world.

227. We are deeply convinced that the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America are basically facing the same problems.

228. "Nations rich or poor"; "developed or developing countries"; "advanced or backward nations"; "the haves and the have-nots"—all are similar ways of disguising a single, crude and dramatic reality: domination or dependency.

229. But to shatter that alternative and obtain more just and equitable conditions the third world does possess a powerful instrument—solidarity. Numerically we are many, and we are imbued with principles that arm us with unchallengeable moral strength. But we must counteract our own lack of individual power by bringing to bear the vitality of our unity.

230. That process is already under way. It must now be extended and consolidated in all fields. But the struggle is not and will not be simple. Powerful interests will continue to fan futile divisions and to create artificial antagonisms.

231. It would be paradoxical for our countries to lose their united stand precisely at the time when the great Powers are strengthening their understandings to preserve their privileges.

232. To think exclusively in terms of individual interests would be to open the way to the designs of those who oppose our progress. It would be even worse to conspire against the common interest, preservation of which is our sole guarantee of survival as truly independent States.

233. The profound changes taking place in the political, economic and social structures of nations point to the threshold of a new stage in the development of mankind.

234. To be worthy of the evolution that is altering the concept of modern life to its very foundations, we must muster all our energies to create the kind of society that our national, regional and cultural idiosyncrasies require, rejecting the foreign patterns foisted on us from outside, which are nothing but the refurbished attempts of certain Powers to fulfil their own desires of economic or ideological domination.

235. That possibility was foreseen by the leader of *justicialismo*, Lieutenant-General Juan Perón, when, three decades ahead of today's reality, he defined the humanistic and revolutionary doctrine of the "third position", which,

apart from depicting a special plan for the organization of the Argentine community, represented the first open confrontation on an international level of the imperialisms of the left and of the right.

236. Fortunately, today, a number of nations share this viewpoint, and proof was clearly given at the historic meeting recently held in Algiers, the Fourth Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries, where the non-aligned nations reiterated their unwavering determination to continue and to strengthen that movement, based on principles that are very comparable to those of the "third position".

237. The Government of the people of Argentina did not want to remain outside that undertaking which constitutes one of the greatest joint movements for liberation, co-operation and solidarity of this century. And so it brought the Argentine Republic into the movement of the non-aligned nations as a full member, and pledged all its efforts to contribute to the triumph of its objectives.

238. This is a good opportunity to reiterate our appreciation for the warm welcome given and the many signs of friendship shown to the Argentine delegation on the occasion of its admission to the movement. We should also like to place on record our thanks for the unanimous understanding and support shown on a number of questions which my country raised for examination by that great gathering.

239. In the field of shared natural resources and the human environment, to which my country attaches special importance, that support was particularly significant. Guided by noble motives of solidarity and co-operation, while it reaffirmed the principle of sovereignty over nations' own natural resources, the Conference recognized the principle of solidarity and of co-ordinated and joint action in the exploitation and use of the natural resources shared by two or more States. Thus the Algiers Declaration [*see A/9330 and Corr.1*] sets forth the principle that co-operation between countries in the exploitation of their common resources shall be on the basis of a system of information and prior consultation, all within the framework of the normal relations existing between the States concerned.

240. The spirit of Algiers led also to the establishment of the rights of the coastal State to the exploitation of the natural resources of its seas and the protection of other related interests to a distance of 200 miles. For the first time, a group composed of the majority of the international community has proclaimed this important root of an agreement, which is in turn complemented by the recognition of the need to legislate on the régime of the continental shelf beyond the 200-mile limit in accordance with existing international law.

241. In Algiers, Argentina felt it was among brothers. But even more, it felt that it was understood, and in turn felt that it understood, in their diversity, the aspirations of all the other non-aligned nations. And yet, above even that, Argentina felt that it was a partner in an integrating current that was destined to change the future of the world.

242. But, to conclude these pleasant reminiscences, may I publicly express our thanks to the Government and the people of Algeria for the generous hospitality they showed us and for their untiring efforts to ensure the success of that outstanding Conference.

243. The bipolar world, which was the main characteristic of the last decades, ceased to exist with the appearance of new centres of power in Europe and Asia. The agreements recently concluded among the great Powers are further positive elements that have contributed greatly to clarifying the world picture. We were among the first to welcome those events that put an end once and for all to the cold war, charged as it was with so many threats to mankind, and mark the beginning of a new and constructive era in the life of peoples. Convergence and co-operation among those who until yesterday had seemed irreconcilable antagonists are doubtless an indispensable condition for the reduction of tensions in the world.

244. However, for the atmosphere of peace to be stable and to benefit all, this convergence must not be achieved behind the backs or at the expense of the other countries. World opinion today could not tolerate it if, under the guise of a sound policy of détente, the great Powers were to be hammering out an up-to-date version of Yalta—in other words, if they were readying themselves for a new distribution of spheres of influence over which to wield their respective hegemonies.

245. The third world cannot be left out when the great Powers adopt their decisions, for those decisions must, obviously, affect it either directly or indirectly. In order to clarify the doubts and disquiet felt by many Governments it is essential to allow them to play their true role in the search for solutions to various problems.

246. And this participation can best be played out within the United Nations. But it must be a United Nations that is revitalized and strengthened in order fully to carry out its noble and worthy objectives. It is an irrefutable fact that the body created in 1945 does not meet the needs of the present day. And this can be clearly understood from the excellent introduction to the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization submitted by the Secretary-General. This outstanding document also makes clear that the Organization can be improved in many of its aspects, so that it may achieve, in the words of Mr. Waldheim, “a potential unmatched by any human institution which has existed before” [A/9001/Add.1, p. 1].

247. Personally, we consider that very soon it will be necessary to make certain changes in order to achieve a true democratization that will be more consonant with its growing universality. Among others, there is the basic change of eliminating the privileges that the five great Powers assumed in San Francisco.

248. This desire to democratize and update the Organization is particularly timely when the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany have just joined our ranks—surely a significant event that is a source of satisfaction to those of us who have always advocated the universality of the United Nations.

249. We most cordially welcome the two representatives of the German people, with whom we are tied by a deep and traditional friendship. I also wish to welcome among us the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, a new independent State that is now added to our Latin American family.

250. We have asserted that we are now entering on a stage of international relations that is lit with the sign of co-operation and understanding. We are gratified at the promising atmosphere thus engendered and would hope that it might be extended to all corners of the earth. Yet we are very much afraid that the continuation of certain existing conflicts may jeopardize the encouraging prospects before us.

251. Our first concern is over the continued existence of anachronistic colonial issues that still upset world peace. The situation is particularly serious in the African continent where, in some areas, colonial oppression at its worst is still being practised. The eradication of colonialism—to use Mr. Waldheim's words again—is “painfully slow” [*ibid.*, p. 4].

252. In the Territories under Portuguese domination, the obstinacy of the colonial Power has created an arena for a harsh war—gestated over many years because of the unyielding attitude of those possessing the duty to assist those peoples to achieve their destiny of independence and sovereign integration in the community of nations.

253. This same picture is seen in Southern Rhodesia and in Namibia, where the minorities refuse to yield to the legitimate rights of the subjected peoples.

254. At a time when man is working under the sign of a spirit of liberation, the peoples of those Territories must be guaranteed the unconditional exercise of their right to self-determination in order to put an end to a cruelly anachronistic situation, whose anti-historic subsistence is an affront to the very essence of all human beings.

255. The practices of *apartheid* in southern Africa add one of the most reprehensible aspects to colonialism: that of an inhuman racism that is obsolete and yet has been raised to the level of an institution. In this way the Government of South Africa is showing utter contempt for the most basic human rights that this world Organization has advocated since its very inception.

256. The doctrine of *justicialismo* of my Government, interpreting the deepest essence of the Argentine community, most vehemently rejects any type of discrimination which, although always unacceptable, becomes inconceivable when made the official policy of the State, to the detriment of the majority of the population.

257. The Argentine Government sympathizes with all the millions of victims of *apartheid* and with those who fight to eradicate it. We shall take every appropriate opportunity to give proof of our will to co-operate actively in the international effort to put an end to such a situation.

258. Our concern ranges over the entire gamut of colonial situations that still persist in the world and overshadow relations among States. Within this context, the attention of the Argentine Republic is centred on the question of the Malvinas Islands.

259. In a note addressed to the Secretary-General by the Argentine Government on 15 August 1973 [*A/9121 and Corr. I*], we described the prevailing state of the question and the stagnation in which the matter finds itself due to the stand adopted by the British Government on the negotiations urged by General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in order that they might settle the dispute between our two countries over the sovereignty of the islands. Those negotiations, for whose renewal we have always been ready, must take into account the special nature of the problem and the unique characteristics of the issue which make it impossible for generalizations or for analogies to be invoked.

260. When a country sees its territorial integrity dismembered by an act of pure aggression typically imperialist in style, when the authorities of a Territory first, and then the population itself, are ousted and the State to which the Territory belongs has never at any moment accepted that usurpation, then it becomes impossible for anyone to tolerate the subsistence, at a time when the United Nations is in full spate, of a remnant of the nineteenth century power-politics as typical as is that of the Malvinas Islands.

261. No one is unaware of the subterfuge indulged in to pretend to consolidate the colonial aggression by evicting the original population and replacing them by others brought in by the imperialist Power. The tragic experience of the past and what is today taking place in southern Africa and the Middle East are present-day examples of those reprehensible practices.

262. It is thus paradoxical for the Government of the United Kingdom, after its criticisms of resolution 1514 (XV), which spelt the culmination of the process of the elimination of colonialism, today to invoke it in part and with ulterior motives, for no other purpose than to support one of the many episodes of colonial expansion of that country.

263. Despite the obstacles that the United Kingdom may try to place in the road to the decolonization of the Malvinas Islands, our position towards the population of the islands has not varied and is always fully consonant with the decisions of the United Nations. The interests of the persons at present inhabiting the islands will be fully taken into account, according to the spirit and the letter of General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX), as well as of the recent resolution unanimously adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples on 21 August 1973 [*see A/9023/Rev. I, chap. XXVII, sect. B*]. The Argentine Government has already given valid proof of its policy by means of a series of measures that ease the communications and contribute to the welfare of the settlers on the Islands, and reiterates, from this rostrum, its desire to give wide and adequate guarantees for the interests of those settlers once the islands have been returned to the national heritage of the Argentine Republic.

264. My country has adhered—and continues to adhere—to the path of negotiation with the occupying Power, but is forced to state that the procedure cannot be indefinitely

prolonged, thus serving as a means of maintaining the present situation. If the negative stance of the United Kingdom leads us into a stalemate, the Argentine Government will be forced to re-examine the policy which thus far has been based on goodwill and on respect for the principles of the Charter and of the resolutions of our Organization. If that be the case, it will be up to the United Nations to determine the way in which the terms of resolution 2065 (XX) have been vitiated due to the lack of real willingness on the part of one of the parties to negotiate.

265. Once again it is my duty to state that the Argentine Government and people, more at one in this than ever before, will not retreat in their determination to recover that part of our national territory that was wrested from us in an act of imperialism by the United Kingdom, an act that history has condemned. The survival of such a situation at this stage of the twentieth century, when the process of decolonization is reaching its end, is both inexplicable and indefensible. To put an end to such an intolerable anachronism is a matter that brooks no delay, and it can be achieved only through the full restoration of the islands to the land from which they were torn and of which they are and always will be an integral part.

266. Another source of concern to us is the continuation of the crisis in the Middle East, which continues to be the most serious threat to international peace and security.

267. We believe it to be indispensable that, within the next few months, and in connexion with the visit of the Secretary-General to the countries in the region, efforts should be redoubled to solve this delicate question. We have often stated before, and reiterate now, that in this case time is not the best ally for a peaceful settlement.

268. On the contrary, the lack of a solution to a conflict can at any moment generate frustration that may, in turn, light the fuse of a new armed conflict.

269. We have stated and reaffirmed our conviction that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) offers the best means of an honourable settlement for both parties. We continue to hold that same view. Yet, quite frankly and impartially, we believe that Israel must understand that the balance that that resolution advocated cannot be achieved while the Arab territories are still occupied by force.

270. Seven years after the adoption of that resolution, it is not a matter of trying further to interpret its meaning or to analyse its terms, it is a question of opting between establishing the just and lasting peace it advocates or maintaining an unyielding stand which, sooner or later, must lead to another armed confrontation.

271. We trust that common sense will prevail. And common sense clearly indicates that it is far better to achieve today an agreement acceptable to all parties than to count on indefinitely retaining the fruits of a military conquest.

272. During the debate on the important question of Korea, the Argentine delegation will make known its views in detail. However, I do feel constrained to state in advance that we shall not support any resolution of this Assembly

which, directly or indirectly, may affect the territorial integrity of that country or that may deprive the Korean people of its right to self-determination—in other words, to decide on its destiny for itself and without any form of outside interference.

273. I could not conclude my statement without reaffirming our faith in the permanent values of man, our hopes for the establishment of a just human society and our determination to work with dedication so that the United Nations will be able to play its role today on the road to the universalist world of tomorrow.

274. Mr. RAYMOND (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the people and the Government of Haiti, it is our privilege to express our sincere congratulations to Mr. Benites on his election to the presidency of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. We are gratified and extremely pleased at the choice by the members of this Assembly because he is not only a statesman who has devoted all the resources of his intelligence to the cause of peace and justice, but also one who is a worthy representative of a sister nation of South America to which the Republic of Haiti is linked by living historical ties dating back to the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

275. We refer to the decisive battle of Pichincha, fought in 1822, in which Haitian volunteers mixed their blood with the blood of the men of Gran Colombia to nourish the tree of liberty on American soil. It is thus a pact of unshakeable friendship and century-old esteem that joins the Haitian people to the people of Ecuador.

276. Is it necessary to recall that it was in the homeland of Eugenio de Santa Cruz y Espejo that the people of Haiti were rewarded for their contribution to the struggles for the emancipation of the American continent? At the time of the historic meeting between Simón Bolívar, the Liberator, and General José de San Martín in Guayaquil in 1822, these two heroes exalted the memory of the father of pan-Americanism, Haitian President Alexandre Pétion, and awarded to him the title of Precursor of American Liberty.

277. These are all memories dear to the hearts of the Haitian people, who share in the honour paid to the people of Ecuador by your election, Mr. President, to the presidency of this highest international body. All this is a manifestation of the pleasure we feel in wishing you success in guiding the work of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly with the sureness of touch, skill, impartiality and great breadth of spirit that have always marked your actions in directing the foreign policy of your country.

278. The Haitian delegation wishes also to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his tireless devotion to the service of peace. We take this opportunity to repeat to him the trust and esteem of the people and Government of Haiti.

279. May we also welcome into the great family of the United Nations the peoples of the Bahamas and the two Germanys.

280. Relations between Haiti and the Bahamas have always been marked indelibly with the most open friendship—a friendship born of an awareness of the common destiny of

the brother peoples of the Caribbean region. Thus the Haitian Government enthusiastically welcomed the unanimous decision of the Security Council to recommend to the General Assembly the admission of the Bahamas to the United Nations. The Haitian people pay a tribute to the people of the Bahamas, a people which, thanks to its maturity and lofty sense of its inalienable rights and duties, has succeeded in gaining its independence under the leadership of a man outstanding for his wisdom, his sound judgement and his courage. I hope the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Bahamas will be good enough to convey to the people and Government of his country renewed assurances of the solidarity and fraternity of the people and Government of Haiti.

281. How can we fail with equal warmth and enthusiasm to greet the admission into this Organization of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, as a symbol of the détente in Europe and throughout the world?

282. The Republic of Haiti is most gratified at the happy outcome of the negotiations conducted by the Federal Republic of Germany for the re-establishment in Central Europe of a system of relationships aimed at reducing antagonisms and opening the way to stability. We are especially pleased at the results obtained, for we ourselves have felt the anguish of a nation divided within itself, within its own borders, a nation at the same time aspiring, beyond all hope, to recover its unity and its place in the concert of nations.

283. The Republic of Haiti and the Federal Republic of Germany in recent years have shown each other an understanding and a mutual sympathy that have been recently reinforced by the signing of agreements on co-operation in technical, economic and financial matters. Thus, as the two States—the Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic—make their entry into the United Nations with a desire to contribute to the Organization the experience of their long history, their science and their technology, the Haitian people is convinced that in a spirit of mutual respect there will be a further strengthening of the ties of friendship that bind us to the German people.

284. Never in the history of the United Nations has a session of the General Assembly begun under more auspicious signs than this twenty-eighth session. The era of acute rivalry between the great Powers and of fierce ideological competition that characterized international relationships is being replaced, it would seem, by an era of progressive convergence of national interests. The discovery that conflict is irrational has been accompanied by a growing awareness of the similarity among productive forces in industrial societies, even those operating under different systems of law. A system of world equilibrium based on economic integration seems to be leading mankind towards the creation of a transideological international community.

285. The trade agreements between Washington and Moscow, the direct and frank dialogue between Washington and Peking, the end of the war in Viet-Nam, the establishment of relations between Japan and the People's Republic of China, the harmonization of relations among States of Central Europe, new concepts in relations among the American republics together with a strengthening of their economic

ties—all these mark a decisive turning-point in international relations.

286. We are in fact witnessing a genuine historic change which seems to be bringing to a close a period fraught with human suffering, with crimes beyond measure, with unkept promises, a period in which ideological conflicts darkened the international horizon, spreading anguish and fear; we see a change announcing the gestation of a genuinely planetary policy, the establishment of a community of mankind based on the unity of science, technology and economy.

287. But looking down from this peak, we must not forget the millions of human beings still suffering impoverishment, discrimination and the impossibility of guiding their own destinies, those who are a prey to poverty, hunger, ignorance and disease.

288. It is our fervent hope that this international situation that favours a collaboration making it possible for every country to safeguard its judgement and its faith will extend its beneficial effects to the countries of the third world, which, though only yesterday ideological battlefields, will become the theatre for genuine economic and social development within the context of the unity dictated by the historical destiny of humanity that is finally aware of the solidarity of all men and of all peoples.

289. It is in this context that the Government of His Excellency Mr. Jean-Claude Duvalier, President for Life of the Republic of Haiti, is taking numerous initiatives on the international level and constantly enlarging its activities on the national front to break out of the state of under-development and provide the best possible conditions for the people of Haiti to flourish.

290. In the course of a meeting of the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress, held in Port-au-Prince during the month of November 1972 and attended by representatives of a number of friendly nations and of international financial institutions such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the United Nations Development Programme, the Inter-American Development Bank, and others, the national and international experts drew up a five-year plan estimated to cost \$US 212 million, divided into annual investments of \$US 42 million. The total amount of external financing would reach \$US 154 million, and the Haitian counterpart would be \$US 58 million.

291. In accordance with expert forecasts, the Government of Haiti prepared, for the first year of the five-year plan, an investment budget of approximately \$37 million. In the budget the Haitian counterpart, which originally was to have been of the order of \$11 million, was brought up to \$14 million, whereas the annual external financing, which was to have been approximately \$30 million, is now only \$23 million.

292. Although the capital budget—which was to have been approximately \$42 million per year for satisfactory economic development, taking into account demographic growth and the infrastructural work to be carried out, has not yet achieved the desired result, it none the less represents considerable progress in comparison with what was

achieved in the previous year. In point of fact, for the financial year 1972-1973, the investment budget amounted to \$29 million and for the present financial year it has gone up to \$37 million, that is, a 30 per cent increase. The share of external financing grew from \$17 million to \$23 million, which represents an increase of 34 per cent; and the national effort has increased by 23 per cent, from \$11 million to \$14 million.

293. Consonant with the philosophy of the Haitian Government, strict austerity measures were promulgated and they have helped to strengthen the investment capacity of the public sector, because the prime objective is and remains to raise continuously the standard of living of the population. The efforts which have been carried out in the economic and financial fields have been accompanied by a number of steps designed to bring about a climate of trust and détente.

294. In order to support and to intensify economic and social development, the President for Life of the Republic has taken a number of judicious political steps. Decrees of clemency and amnesty have brought joy to a number of families and there is a growing climate which favours the return to the country of a number of Haitian experts who were giving their services throughout the world. Furthermore, the Republic of Haiti has once again adhered to the Inter-American Convention of Havana on the Right of Asylum, the Inter-American Convention of Montevideo on Political Asylum, the Inter-American Convention of Caracas on Territorial Asylum and the 1954 Inter-American Convention of Caracas on Diplomatic Asylum.

295. The Duvalier revolution has, we think, now reached a decidedly constructive stage. It calls for patriotism, devotion and intelligence on the part of all the sons of the fatherland to sow the seeds of the new life of Haitian soil, a new life for all, without any sort of distinction.

296. This national effort could not produce the desired results without the active understanding and sympathy of those peoples which have been traditional friends and also of international financial institutions. Hence, President Duvalier has set Haitian diplomacy on the path of dialogue to serve the purposes of an open foreign policy.

297. Together with fruitful contacts with the Governments of the Americas, Western Europe and the Middle East, a new impulse has been given to relations between Haiti and the African States. During May of this year a Haitian goodwill mission visited Senegal, Liberia, the Ivory Coast, the Central African Republic and Chad. Last June, the Republic of Haiti had the privilege of welcoming President William Tolbert of Liberia on an official visit to Port-au-Prince. During those visits the foundation was laid for effective co-operation with those African peoples, to whom the people of Haiti are linked by ethnic and cultural ties and also by the identity of the problems they confront and a common desire for better living conditions.

298. Within the framework of this international policy, based on the ideals of friendship and mutual esteem, we should like particularly to refer to the new agreements which were recently concluded between the Haitian Government and the Government of France. Over and above traditional linguistic and cultural affinities which have taken the

form of a language shared in common, the relationships between Haiti and France have taken the concrete form this year of signing two diplomatic instruments of extremely far-reaching consequences, one signed in Paris and the other in Port-au-Prince. Inspired by a feeling of mutual respect, both those instruments are designed to strengthen technical, economic, financial and cultural co-operation between the peoples of Haiti and France, motivated by the same desire for peace and understanding.

299. Under the general heading of Haitian-American co-operation, a number of infrastructure projects are now being carried out as a result of improved relations between the two oldest republics on the American continent. This co-operation, largely motivated by a policy of good-neighbourliness, is part and parcel of the main priorities of the national economic and social development plan and constitutes considerable support for internal efforts.

300. On the international political scene, a number of problems are still awaiting solutions and require that every member exert himself so that primacy is constantly given to the law and priority is always attached to the well-being of mankind as a whole.

301. At the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm the peoples, through their individual Governments, pledged themselves to carrying out constant supervision of the environment, in order to restrict and to limit any damage to the environment in which man's life goes on. The age-old life cycles of plants, these "oxygen factories", and of animals have been gravely disrupted by the development of science, technology and industry. The pollution of the air, the seas and the beaches has created problems which directly affect man's life and his future. The Republic of Haiti has resolved to contribute fully to the new environment body, whose headquarters will be in Nairobi; this shows the desire of the industrialized countries to heed the claims of the third world so that their differing viewpoints can be finally harmonized.

302. The whole world has welcomed the numerous steps taken by the great Powers to create a climate of détente in international relations. However, the slowness of disarmament negotiations still remains one of the major preoccupations of the developing peoples, because control of armaments and general disarmament would be the most telling display of the desire for peace by the Governments concerned and would make available sufficient wealth to guarantee a decent standard of living for all men on earth.

303. At a time when the destructive capacity of nuclear armaments means that any generalized war is tantamount to an act of collective suicide, it is inconceivable that military force can continue to be considered as a factor in foreign policy and that fabulous sums can still be devoted to it.

304. The Haitian Government would like once again to underline the dangers involved in this race for the production of death-dealing weapons and would appeal for common sense among leaders so that a climate of mutual confidence can help to expedite negotiations on disarmament.

305. The situation in Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa is an anachronism which could be described, to say the least, as repellent at this time in history when the forces of morality and scientific progress have overturned the age-old myths of racial superiority and exalted human dignity, opening the way to co-operation among all men in a spirit of mutual respect.

306. It is unthinkable that some minorities, swimming against the tide of history, should seek to resuscitate obsolete concepts in order to dominate and exploit others.

307. The Republic of Haiti, forged in the crucible of epic battles in order to proclaim the dignity of man and his inalienable and irrefutable right to liberty, would give a brotherly accolade to the African populations who are struggling for their independence and their dignity. It is our hope that all those oppressed peoples will be heartened and encouraged by the creation of the new independent State of Guinea-Bissau.

308. While in the Middle East a precarious peace prevails which might well at any moment degenerate into armed conflict, despite the efforts and initiatives of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, the problem of international terrorism remains one of the most thorny problems at present to be tackled by the General Assembly. The political aspects of the problem, the divergences and the ideological antagonisms make it difficult for a resolution to be adopted which would win the adherence of the vast majority of Member States, but the Government of Haiti considers that efforts should be redoubled. At the same time it should not be forgotten that international terrorism, which destroys innocent human life, is also the fruit of despair, frustration and violations of fundamental human freedoms of men to whom every horizon is closed. The delegation of Haiti is prepared to support any draft resolution covering all these aspects of international terrorism.

309. One of the most important resolutions passed by the twenty-seventh session was probably that by which the General Assembly decided that the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea should be convened [*resolution 3029 (XXVII)*]. That Conference, which will be preceded by preparatory meetings at the end of this year in New York, will provide the countries of the third world with an opportunity to stress the urgent need for a major reformulation of the law of the sea, laying emphasis on the tremendous economic possibilities of the sea-bed. It will also be an opportunity for the littoral countries of the Caribbean to support the wise conclusions reached in the Declaration of Santo Domingo and to stress their rights, as well as the necessity to satisfy those needs which derive from a more fruitful exploitation of the resources of the sea.

310. During the frank and open discussions which have been initiated by the Government of Haiti with other governments in the third world, a single thread can be seen running through the negotiations—that national development efforts can only yield satisfactory results provided that international social justice, effectively respected, gives its indispensable support. International social justice implies that all peoples and nations should be able to exercise

permanent sovereignty over their wealth and their natural resources; that they are entitled to authorize, to restrict or to prohibit prospecting for, exploitation of and disposal of their resources; that they can produce sufficient quantities of the goods and services they need; and that international co-operation, in the form of either public or private investment, exchange of goods or services, of technical assistance or of scientific data should promote the independent national development of the countries of the third world.

311. However, notwithstanding the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, UNCTAD and other agencies of the United Nations family, the peoples of the third world continue to have their aspirations to progress frustrated by the growing disparities between the prices for goods and services from the industrialized countries and the prices of natural resources and exports; by tariff barriers and other restrictive trade practices; by the incompatibility of private investment with the goals and priorities of national development plans; by the dangerous intervention of multinational corporations in the political affairs of host countries.

312. Yet the developing countries' claims to international social justice fit within the context of the rules, principles and objectives of the United Nations, to which all Member States have knowingly subscribed and which they have pledged to respect.

313. It would be vain to try to exclude from the main current of history three quarters of mankind so that the super-Powers of the world might conclude among themselves agreements and treaties to bring about international equilibrium in the style of bygone ages. Humanity has irreversibly entered an age when it is essential to take account of the countries of the third world. The economic co-operation now going on between countries with different social and political systems could lead to a satisfactory world order provided that all peoples recognize their humanity and respect fundamental human rights in order to promote the economic and social progress of all nations.

314. Erstwhile subject peoples who have won their independence at the cost of great sacrifice are fully aware that their efforts will only have genuine significance to the extent that their living conditions are improved, that illiteracy is eradicated and other major obstacles which stand in the way of the effective enjoyment of human rights are removed.

315. At the present, the fundamental instruments for development are well known and can be summarized as capital investment of an adequate volume administered by economic and social institutions which have high-quality experts working for them. As long as the United Nations and international financing organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund cannot make these means available to the nations of the third world, they have not yet accomplished their mission.

316. At both the national and the international level, individual successes involve tension and friction. In order that full benefit may be fully drawn from the thaw in international relations which seems to be ushering in a new cycle in history, it is essential, to quote the terms of resolu-

tion 2993 (XXVII) adopted by the General Assembly on 15 December 1972: that all armed conflicts involving third parties should be eliminated, along with the final vestiges of colonialism and racism; that all forms of pressure which prevent peoples from exercising their sovereign rights to the free utilization of their natural resources should cease; that there should be an end to all violations of the right of peoples to self-determination; and, finally, that the economic and social rights of nations should become effective.

317. Only under these conditions can international détente lead not to a fresh period of disillusionment, stress, frustration and friction—as it so often did in the past—but rather to an age of international social prosperity. Men will at last be able, in accordance with the spirit of the Charter, to live with one another as good neighbours and to look forward to the future with hope and confidence.

318. The Haitian national revolution, which was based on the ideals of social justice and which has brought the masses out of the age-old isolation to involve them in the affairs of State, has triumphantly stood the test of time. For 16 years, through a policy of austerity and national effort, it has throughout the country carried out important work on the infrastructure, which is so vital to economic growth, while at the same time its social policies have continuously improved the standard of living of the vast majority of the people. An open diplomacy is making it possible for our country daily to strengthen its links of friendship, esteem and co-operation with the peoples and the Governments of the world that, apart from all questions of ideology, share its aspirations to peace and understanding. Now that the question of a review of the Charter of the Organization has arisen, undoubtedly it would be advisable to adapt it better to the changes which have occurred in recent years in international politics, so that it can be more responsive to this deeply-felt aspiration of the peoples of the third world to participate fully in the conquests of science and technology.

319. The Haitian delegation would express the fervent hope that this session of the General Assembly will grasp the meaning of new trends in history in order to bring them into harmony with the requirements of the peoples of the third world and to channel them towards the establishment of true peace in a spirit of solidarity and fraternity among all peoples.

320. The PRESIDENT: Four representatives have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. Before calling on them, I should like to recall that the General Assembly, at its 2123rd meeting, decided that statements in the exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes. I beg the speakers to bear that decision in mind. I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

321. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the course of the general debate this morning [2138th meeting] my illustrious friend the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Morocco, Mr. Benhima, spoke on a number of subjects. We fully agreed with a number of the points he raised in his statement. I can point to an identification of purposes and objectives as regards the Middle East. We also

agreed on the question of security in the Mediterranean, which is part and parcel of European security. And we shared views on a number of other aspects. However, my comments now will refer to our differences. In exercising my right of reply, I should like very briefly to touch on two questions affecting my country, the question of fishing and that of the Sahara, both of which were raised by the Minister.

322. In his statement there were errors of fact and notable omissions. However, we are mindful of the fact that when the General Committee met this morning, the President of the Assembly told us that if we were to conclude the general debate on the date set we could not lose a single day or prolong our remarks unduly.

323. On the question of fishing, Mr Benhima's statement was not in keeping with the facts. The head of my delegation, the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his statement to the General Assembly [2133rd meeting] has already referred amply to the events and the incidents which have occurred. Furthermore, he has put the facts before the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

324. With regard to the question of the Sahara, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Morocco fell into some inaccuracies. It is not a fact that the Spanish Government has issued laws which have modified the status of the Territory of the Sahara. Nor is it true that on 22 September last the Spanish Government promulgated another series of measures to that same end.

325. The communication of 21 September—not 22 September—issued by the Head of the Spanish State does not promulgate any laws. But, in reply to the communication addressed to him by the General Assembly of the Sahara on 20 February this year, the Head of the Spanish State again guaranteed solemnly to the population of the Sahara the free exercise of self-determination over their own future, and this self-determination will take place when the population of the Sahara freely requests it.

326. At the same time, the Head of the Spanish State proposed to the General Assembly of the Sahara certain bases for a system of greater autonomy in the Territory which, if accepted by the General Assembly of the Sahara, would serve to prepare the population for self-determination without replacing or in any way undermining the right of the population of the Sahara to self-determination, a right which Spain accepts unreservedly. That is clearly stated in document A/9176 dealing with the question of the Sahara, which was circulated today, a document which representatives will be able to study and wherein they will perhaps find interesting details.

327. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia): It has become customary for me—having lived with the Palestine question, not since 1947, but since the British were granted a Mandate over Palestine in 1923—to set the record straight. Thus I feel constrained to refute what Mr. Eban has mentioned in his speech. He seems to consider that God gave Palestine to the Zionists. I think I should repeat that God is not in the real estate business. He never gives land to any one people. It was Balfour in 1917 who paved the way for the creation of

Israel; and then the work of Balfour was finished by the late Harry Truman in 1947. I will have occasion to recapitulate the history; but being limited to 10 minutes, I will be as brief as it is humanly possible. I wish that my Spanish colleague had not spoken for 10 minutes, so that I could have borrowed a couple of minutes from him.

328. There are three arguments—the historical argument, the ethnological argument and the religious argument—that touch upon this question. Taking the first, the historical argument suffice it to say that Palestine was inhabited by the Canaanites. We refer Mr. Eban to the Bible. It was not an empty land, and the Canaanites were a Semitic people.

329. The ethnological argument is that political Zionism is an alien ideology that was introduced in our midst; it is none other than a Central European and Eastern European incursion into our midst. The late Herzl and the torch-bearers of Zionism were of Khazar origin, not of our area; they came from the northern tier of Asia, and they were converted to Judaism in the eighth century A.D. But just as the British were converted to Christianity, a Semitic religion, by St. Augustine in the sixth century does not make the British a Semitic people, so those Central European Jews—those Khazars, those Ashkenazim—are not Semites.

330. The religious argument is that Palestine should be identified with Judaism. It is identified also with Christianity and with Islam. Why should 16 million people have Palestine, when there are a billion Christians who do not lay claim to Palestine, and there are 600 million Moslems? Jerusalem in particular is as sacred to the Christians and Moslems as it is to the Jews, if not more sacred.

331. When we tried in 1947 to refer that matter to the International Court of Justice the Zionists stood in the way and by pressure hampered our efforts to have the International Court of Justice pronounce itself on that matter. And now Mr. Eban speaks of "juridical considerations".

332. And Mr. Eban speaks of Joseph, the son of Jacob. He said: "our Israeli ancestor" [*supra*, para. 99]. Well, we people of the area can claim him to be our ancestor, too, because Abraham is the patriarch of all the peoples of the region—not of those Ashkenazi Jews who were converted to Judaism in the eighth century A.D. Did he forget that the sons of Jacob sold Joseph into slavery and that if he thrived it was because of the Pharaohs? He forgets that. And the Pharaohs gave refuge to the tribes when they were hungry as they passed, without having established themselves in the land of Palestine or in the land of Canaan.

333. Mr. Eban referred to Mr. Leonid Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Communist Party, as having made a number of declarations implying, as he said, "that there are almost no rejections of requests by Soviet Jews to be permitted to leave for Israel" [*supra*, para. 88]. Thirty-three thousand Soviet Jews have been allowed to pass through Austria, mostly to go to Israel. It seems that 33,000 or so Soviet emigrants allowed to leave for Israel are not enough for Mr. Eban, and he wonders why the Arabs should be worried. We are worried because we know that Zionism is predicated on the in-gathering of all the Jews of the world. And the mass media of information, controlled and manip-

ulated as they are in most parts of the world by Zionists, say we should not be afraid of Zionist expansionism!

334. Illegal immigration and terrorist activities were financed by the American League for a Free Palestine. I saw this League function here in this city of New York in 1945. Funds were given to an affiliate of the terrorist Irgun Z'vai Leumi; \$743,000 was collected in 1946. Another Zionist agency, the Freedom Fighters, also had a fund-raising affiliate in the United States: it was called the Political Action Committee, incorporated in February 1946. Rabbi Baruch Korf, the Executive Vice-Chairman of the group, admitted that the financing of terrorism was included in its activities. And among the supporters of that group were United States Congressmen and Senators, as is evident from an advertisement in *The New York Times*. They were Senators Meade, Young, Walsh and Langer and with two Representatives, Mr. McCormack and Mr. Capehart, as sponsors. And Mr. Eban talks about the "squalid conspiracies of Arafat and Habash, with their grenades, daggers, bombs and guns" [*supra*, para. 76]. He forgot how the Stern Gang, Irgun and several other Zionist terrorist movements or agencies—call them by whatever name—subverted the Government of the Mandate. That was "fighting for freedom"; but if the Palestinians fight for freedom they are "terrorists" and are called "gangsters". "Gangsters" is an American term; I do not know whether Mr. Eban learned it in South Africa or in the United States.

335. Let him beware—and I am talking advisedly, after having been seized of this question for 50 years and more—that the Palestinians are fighting for their freedom, for having their homes returned to them. When the *maquis* fought the Nazis they were heroes. Where are the Western Powers who will stand up and call these people heroes? Is it any wonder that the Arabs call them heroes? I am far from suggesting that we should resort to terrorism, but it was Zionist terrorism that encouraged the Palestinians to resort to such acts, thinking perhaps that the Zionists succeeded because they resorted to terrorism. They fail to comprehend—sometimes I tell them—that it was because the major Powers were behind the Zionists—that is why they succeeded.

336. Mr. Eban spoke of the verdict of history. History is still being written. I feel sorry for the Jews, because they are being brainwashed and indoctrinated into Zionism. They are living in a fortress. If Arab Governments want to make peace, the Arab people would rise against them.

337. And none other than the Chancellor of a newly admitted State—Willy Brandt—comes to this rostrum [2128th meeting, para. 63] and tells us Arabs what we should do, that we should have direct negotiations. And he referred to Mr. Kissinger. But Mr. Kissinger did not imply to us that there should be direct negotiations.

338. Let the Palestinians be the party at issue, and not the Arab States. The Palestinians are a people, like the Lebanese, like the Syrians, like the Iraqis.

339. You representatives of the United States; you speak English. Does that make you British? If the Palestinians speak Arabic that does not mean that they have not lost their identity.

340. Mr. Eban referred to the verdict of history. History is still being written. And I must say that if he heeds reason it will be better for him and his Government to realize that there can be no peace in Palestine until there is restitution of Palestinian rights.

341. These will be my concluding words. I hope I have not exceeded the time-limit too much. My concluding words are to show how Israel was created.

342. The United States ambassadors in the Middle East sent word to Mr. Truman that it was not in the best interests of the United States to establish a foreign State there in the Middle East because it might one day jeopardize United States interests. I am quoting Colonel Eddy. My good friend from the United States, do you know Colonel Eddy? He was one of your ambassadors in the Middle East. I knew him many years ago. This is what he wrote. He says they sent George Wadsworth as their spokesman for the group. Do you remember George Wadsworth? He was with Senator Austin. Perhaps you were still in short pants, but I remember him. He presented orally an agreed statement in about 20 minutes. There was little discussion, and the President—Mr. Truman—asked few questions at the meeting, whose minutes have been carefully guarded by the Department of State. The good thing about the United States is that there are no secrets; they always come out. Finally, Mr. Truman summed up the position with the utmost candour: "I am sorry gentlemen, but I have to answer to the hundreds of thousands who are anxious for the success of Zionism. I do not have hundreds of thousands of Arabs among my constituents."

343. For Balfour, the Zionists railroaded the United States into the First World War. In 1947, the Zionists were necessary for the success of the Democratic Party and Mr. Truman.

344. That is how Israel was created. It was not given by God. God does not distribute real estate among the human species.

345. Remember, Mr. Eban, what King David said in one of his psalms and is he not one of the prophets? He said, "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof."

346. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): Circumstances dictated that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Madagascar was the speaker who addressed the General Assembly immediately after the Foreign Minister of Israel had done so. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Madagascar, when dealing with the question of the Middle East, spoke some shining and convincing truths. He drew the attention of this Assembly to existing facts: to the geometrical expansion of the area of Israel since its creation, to its arrogance, to its occupation of Arab territories, to its repression of innocent civilians, to its usurpation of Palestine by disinheritance the Palestinian people of their legitimate and inherent rights.

347. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Madagascar also stressed the grave situation flowing from such facts, which have redoubled tension in the Middle East and reduced the chances of peace.

348. It was, in a way, the exercise of the right of reply to the Foreign Minister of Israel.

349. On behalf of Egypt, from this rostrum I proudly hail that voice of a true son of Africa, the voice of justice, the voice of the law and the voice of freedom.

350. When reading his statement, the Foreign Minister of Israel should have preserved his eloquence and his rhetoric for a different audience. He probably forgot what audience he was addressing. He had probably intended his statement for some sort of Zionist organization that would have welcomed it and swallowed it whole.

351. In addressing the international community from this rostrum, Mr. Eban should at least have shown a certain respect for truth. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel said, "We accepted Ambassador Jarring's proposal" [*supra*, para. 67]. But the whole world knows that through its responsible spokesmen Israel has officially replied to the Jarring aide-mémoire⁹ that it will not withdraw to the frontiers of 5 June 1967. It was Egypt that accepted the Jarring aide-mémoire.

352. The second point raised by Mr. Eban regarded the role which OAU played, or endeavoured to play, in the Middle East conflict. The "four wise men" of Africa, Presidents Senghor, Mobutu, Gowon, and Ahidjo, made most laudable efforts of which we are all fully aware. But since Israel insisted on annexing territory belonging to Arab countries, the African mission could not fulfil the duties entrusted to it—namely, to find a just solution to the problem of the Middle East.

353. And if the Israeli statement were correct, why did the African summit Conference of all the Heads of State and Government of Africa, held in May this year in Addis Ababa, have to adopt a resolution vehemently condemning Israel's negative attitude, its acts of terrorism and its obstruction of all the efforts made to come to a just and equitable solution of the problem in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967)? That same African resolution, which is too long for me to cite, once again calls for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all the Arab and African territories occupied by them. And, finally, that resolution firmly supports the initiative of Egypt in the matter.

354. In conclusion, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel once again referred to a subject which he calls "Arab terrorism". The community of nations still has not forgotten all the implications of the acts of Israeli terrorism committed in violation of international law and despite the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In the long list of violations by that inveterate violator of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the Organization, Israël, certain recent acts of State terrorism are still fresh in our

memories: On 10 August 1973, there was the diversion of a plane of the Middle East Airlines when it was flying in Lebanese air space, an act which endangered the lives of more than 90 passengers and disturbed the security and the functioning of international civil aviation. This act was condemned by the Security Council and by the International Civil Aviation Organization [ICAO] in August 1973. On 10 April 1973, Israel, with the assistance of its agents, penetrated Lebanon, with forged Belgian, British and German passports and attacked Beirut, committing acts of State terrorism that were welcomed and applauded by the Prime Minister of Israel as a glorious page in Israeli history. There was the deliberate massacre of 108 passengers on a Libyan plane which was shot down on 21 February 1973 by Israeli fighter planes over the Egyptian territory of Sinai after the pilot had lost his way. The Assembly of ICAO also condemned that act in February 1973. Furthermore, there was the perfidious attack carried out by Israeli armed forces against the Beirut international airport in December 1968. There is the war of annihilation which Israel, following its national policy of State terrorism, is carrying out against the Palestinian people, assassinating its national leaders, its intellectuals and all those who have the courage to fight for that people's nationality through the exercise of its right to self-determination—that is to say, all those who have the courage to oppose the aggressive policies of Israel. Among the terrorist acts of Israel, we also include the assassination of Hassam Kanafani in Beirut, of Mahmoud Amshari in Paris and of other Palestinians, and, recently, of a Moroccan in Oslo, Norway. That is the stand adopted by the Israeli leaders that must be denounced and condemned.

355. Mr. AL-SHAikhLY (Iraq): The Zionist representative, in an attempt to divert world attention from the abominable Israeli practices against Palestinians and Arabs living under Zionist rule and occupation, refers to internal matters in Arab States. The Zionist representative, in his self-assumed role of defender of Jews of all nationalities, does not want the world to know that it was Zionists agents who threatened and intimidated Arab Jews to make them leave their countries for Israel. But the facts keep leaking out. An Arab Jew had this to say in *Ma'ariv* on 11 April 1972:

"The Jews lived next to the Arabs in Iraq in peace and quiet until the emissaries of zionism came and threw bombs into Jewish centres in order to generate conflicts between us and the Arabs."

356. Finally, I would like to quote another Jewish, but non-Zionist, source which reveals the true face of zionism. This is from a booklet published by the Jewish-American organization known as The Guardians of the Holy City:

"In fact, zionism is most interested in undermining the position of Jews in other countries so as to make them immigrate to the State of Israel, and this plan has already been systematically carried out in a number of countries. One prime example is the burning of the synagogues in Iraq 16 years ago, not by anti-Jewish enemies, but admittedly by Zionist emissaries who actually succeeded thereby in uprooting a Jewish community that had endured literally for thousands of years".

The article concludes with the following words: "A good Jew cannot be a Zionist. A Zionist cannot be a good Jew."

⁹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10403, annex I.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/9174)

357. The PRESIDENT: I invite members' attention first to the report of the Fourth Committee in document A/9174.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Fourth Committee.

358. The PRESIDENT: I have a formal request from one delegation for a vote on this item. If there is no objection, I shall put to the vote first the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of the report of the Fourth Committee [A/9174].

The recommendation was adopted by 80 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions.

359. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the recommendation contained in paragraph 6 of the report of the Fifth Committee [A/9175].

The recommendation was adopted by 78 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 85

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly:

- (a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/9181)

360. The PRESIDENT: The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 5 of its report.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Fifth Committee.

361. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 3052 A (XXVIII)).

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.