

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**1851st  
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 28 September 1970,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

	Page
Speech by Mr. Chalmers (Haiti) .....	1
Speech by Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) .....	5
Speech by Mr. Nase (Albania) .....	8
Speech by Mr. Eban (Israel) .....	16
Statement by the representative of the United Arab Republic .....	24
Statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia ....	26

people and the Government of His Excellency Dr. François Duvalier, Life President of Haiti.

4. I shall now read out a declaration of His Excellency the Life President of the Republic of Haiti on the occasion of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

“Twenty-five years ago, on 26 June 1945, in San Francisco, nations differing both in race and culture, but animated by a spirit without frontiers which restored them to their original vocation, which was so noble, of peoples united for the well-being of man, resolved ‘to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind’.

“Twice in the space of one lifetime! How can we fail to see the tremendous impact it has had and the confusion it has generated in the world, which is always looking for conditions of survival for humanity? How many times have the crises and the audacity of temperament increased man’s anxiety as he is confronted with the problems of his destiny?

“How much suffering, how many refusals multiplied by the risk of bloody confrontations which simply serve to increase universal distress and always bring home to man the extent of his frailty?

“To these confused appeals, thrown out in the endless night of suffering and misery, full of horror and terror, to these appeals which have become so urgent, the Charter of the United Nations brought and will continue to bring the reply—that of the aspirations, the principles, the truths which make man greater in stature, which liberate him from all the constraints and all the prejudices which he has, and make him a citizen of the world devoted to seeking peace, justice and progress.

“Thus, the Charter of the United Nations, by proclaiming the imperative necessity for achieving these objectives as prerequisite for international equilibrium, has left on all geographical areas the mark of an organization of planet-wide dimensions.

“It is precisely the facility of communications which is making the world smaller and smaller, all frontiers now touching each other, and making it a place where disturbances, wherever they occur, necessarily concern all communities.

“The fact is that man, by exploring all space, has become the giant of civilization and, by reason of

*President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).*

**AGENDA ITEM 9**

**General debate (*continued*)**

1. Mr. CHALMERS (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I hardly need to emphasize the unanimity surrounding your election to preside over these meetings. Impartiality, competence, clear-sightedness and discernment—these are the master qualities which my colleagues and I believe to be essential for a President of the United Nations General Assembly, and we are convinced that you have the outstanding privilege of possessing them in large measure. It was easy for you, therefore, to promise to work dispassionately, with maximum objectivity and to adopt a working method that would enable us to reach both concrete and valid results.

2. I would be failing in my duty were I not to congratulate the outgoing President, Mrs. Angie Brooks-Randolph, Under-Secretary of State of the Government of Liberia, an old hand in the United Nations where she has been militant for a number of years, interested in all questions, including social and women’s problems. The second representative of black Africa—Ambassador Alex Quaison-Sackey of Ghana was the first—to have presided over the General Assembly of the United Nations, she was a credit to her country, to the race and to the sex which she so worthily represents. Her qualities as a diplomat and her sense of authority, as well as her respect for the opinions of others, her direct and smiling frankness, have made their mark in the annals of the Presidency of the General Assembly. She can withdraw satisfied at having brilliantly accomplished the mandate that was entrusted to her by Governments and her colleagues. Glory and honour be to her.

3. And, to you, Mr. President, my best wishes for success in your task, as well as those of the Haitian

his great stature and mental powers, by dominating the physical universe he can glimpse in the error and paralysing fatality of the spirit of hatred and division the tragic prospect of disintegration. And today no one who is truly committed to universal association, now more closely knit than ever, can believe that he is not involved in the success and the failure of what it does.

“What responsibility can override that for peace?”

“For some time now the peoples have believed that the risk of war could be removed only by intensive rearmament and by effective alliances consisting of a leadership whose existence would involve heavy dependence, when it is not dearly bought by the slaughter of human life and the loss of wealth.

“Enumerating the apocalyptic scourges involving the massive production of arms and modern engines of destruction, which are only waiting for the right moment to sow death and destruction, has not removed the desire for power on all fronts where the diplomacy of presence, far from strengthening the conditions of coexistence among States, rather run over a spirit of division and competition, which are so favourable to the war industries.

“Thus polarization has hardened spheres of influence which are maintained in a continual state of potential confrontation, aggravated by local conflicts, by aggression, by occupations, by brutal interventions and all other forms of interference. The column of peace, to this extent, has been shaken; international security has thus been threatened.

“Thus, when will peoples learn from the luminous thoughts traced in the Charter of the United Nations, and when will they be able to preserve the international community from the scourge of war, which has been defined in all the conscience of man as the breakup of the immutable order of the world, the order of peace, which is the necessary fulcrum for the realization of man’s ideals.

“It is equally striking that in the hours of major crisis, in those hours where folly reigns and the least false step would cast humanity to the bottom of the abyss, all eyes are turned towards this world Organization.

“Whether it be the powder barrel of the Middle East, whether it be the unfortunate war of Viet-Nam, the threats of thermonuclear, chemical or bacteriological warfare, men of goodwill, and those peoples who are wedded to peace, expect from the United Nations a solution to their anguish.

“One is astonished, one is irritated at its slowness, at its spirit of caution. These are undeniable signs of its moral prestige and its vocation as a guardian of our ultimate hopes of peace.

“But will the unhappy years of the cold war, during which the United Nations served as a platform for

recriminations among the great Powers, only remain a bad memory, and will the Organization resolutely turn itself towards those decisions which have been taken in the light of the principles of its Charter, and will it succeed in realizing them?”

“Seen from this angle, the indirect talks—which have been marked by a number of vicissitudes—which have been undertaken by the parties involved in the conflict in the Middle East, constitute the touchstone of the effectiveness of the new direction taken by the Organization. Will it be able victoriously to emerge from this test?”

“In the matter of building for peace, the blue helmets of the United Nations have also played an important part in a number of difficult parts of the world, where their actions prevented major confrontations. The United Nations has to its credit also the elaboration of peace treaties designed to ensure that peace reigns more than ever indivisibly. One example from many could be quoted: a timid step has been taken towards disarmament. The Moscow Treaty prohibiting tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water<sup>1</sup> was signed and ratified by more than 100 States.

“My Government, for its part, will never cease, in the case of racial and international conflicts, to launch appeals for conciliation and understanding. For how much more love and brotherhood will be needed to build a world based on peace and also a more just world?”

“Faith in the fundamental rights of man, faith in the dignity and value of the human personality, and the equality of rights of men and women, as well as those of large and small nations, all this would bring about a new era if the authority of the Organization were to become more luminous, stronger and better-defined at every succeeding step it takes as it continually draws its inspiration from the actions and legislation of peoples and their governments.

“The monument of the new form of international law, the so-called United Nations law, is being enriched by the work of the bodies and the commissions of the world parliament, which are of inestimable value for the international community.

“The membership of the Organization has been swelled by new Members, the number of which has tripled in less than a quarter of a century. Could we seek a better illustration of the principle of equality of men and peoples, whatever be their colour, whatever be their race or their religion.

“Should we not also here recall, for the benefit of those who preach inequality of races, a certain number of important conclusions which were formulated on 26 September 1965 in a declaration devised by experts in social science and the humanities, working under the auspices of UNESCO:

<sup>1</sup> Signed on 5 August 1963.

“(a) All men living today belong to the same species and descend from the same stock;

“(b) The division of the human species into ‘races’ is partly conventional and partly arbitrary and does not imply any hierarchy whatsoever...;

“(c) Current biological knowledge does not permit us to impute cultural achievements to differences in genetic potential ... The peoples of the world today appear to possess equal biological potentialities for attaining any level of civilization.<sup>2</sup>

“The world Organization, of course, has not succeeded in eradicating certain scourges, such as *apartheid*. But it has been able to mobilize, against these scourges, the universal awareness of the world and victoriously to combat the most grievous forms of discrimination, and to prevent the continuation of age-old injustices, and it has contributed to the downfall of colonialism, which was based on the false concept of the inequality of the races and assertion that people had unequal aptitudes for self-government.

“Regarding the progress of the United Nations, an Organization which is essentially political in its purposes, we have seen its vigorous promotion in a number of specialized agencies: FAO, with its green revolution, has been able to remove the spectre of famine, which is a corollary of the extraordinary demographic explosion which is seen in our days; WHO, always anxious about the health of populations, always ready to undertake action to combat the least threat of an epidemic, does not neglect combating those endemic diseases which are the formidable legacy of a less fortunate past; UNESCO, equally, is working in the field of culture and education.

“Furthermore, can we overlook the work which has been done by financial organizations for aid and development and the economic and commercial groups: the Economic Commission for Latin America, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the International Finance Corporation and the laudable efforts made by the Economic and Social Council, one of the Councils enjoying most prestige in the Organization and which is in charge of development planning and the economic and social well-being of Member States?

“Much more than this, the United Nations, by acting in a constructive and dynamic way, has already decreed a first Development Decade, that of the sixties, the objectives which have not yet been completely achieved, unfortunately.

“The Second Decade, that of the seventies, drawing impetus from the first one, will, we hope, meet with fewer set-backs, provided that it encounters international co-operation which is devoid of sordid self-interest, and fixed goals may be achieved: an

annual development of a minimum of 6 per cent for the gross national products of the developing countries, an increase of 3.5 per cent in the gross national product per inhabitant and fixed development targets in agriculture, savings, imports, exports and the various social sectors.

“After its 25 years of life as an institution, compared with the life of a people, or that of certain human institutions, this may seem little, but it counts for a lot at the level of international organization which is caught in the cross-fire of antagonistic forces. The United Nations can consider with some pride what has already been accomplished.

“With remarkable constancy it has applied itself to achieving the noble goals which it assigned itself, and we cannot blame it for the fact that it has been feeling its way sometimes and has not finished all it has started. Man is imperfect and is drawn towards the heights, but sometimes he is kept at the lower reaches of the foot-hill of the mountain because of the heavy past heritage of selfishness, violence and ill-controlled compulsions.

“Haiti, the first independent black republic in the world, the second independent State of the continent, and elder daughter of the French revolution, entered into history with the noble influx of the ideals of 1789. Never in its existence has it ceased to proclaim its attachment to the freedom, brotherhood and equality which, during the strife-torn epoch of 1804, galvanized the suffering classes of Santa Domingo, slaves who had been taken out of Africa and those who knew that freedom from slavery existed. Eloquent proof of this is Savannah, in the state of Georgia, where 600 Haitians, among them Henri Christophe, future king of Haiti, paid in blood for the cause of the liberation of the thirteen British colonies in America, and the generous assistance given to Simón Bolívar, the immortal liberator, by the fathers of our independence, Jean Jacques Desalines and Alexandre Pétion, during the great adventure of becoming emancipated from the Spanish yoke of the so-called Bolivarian peoples.

“Haiti is proud of belonging to the United Nations and to the Organization of American States, which in their different spheres are working towards the emancipation of man from fear and constraint. It has endorsed their principles, norms and noble objectives and unreservedly co-operates in their achievement.

“Regarding public and individual freedoms, they have, during an evolution covering 166 years of history, been written into a legislation which completely guarantees essential rights in all areas. It is embodied in the administration of social justice of the immortal Dumardais Estimé and it reached full maturity under the present Government. Both those Governments were installed in power by the social revolutions, of 1946 and 1957, carried out for the benefit of the majority.

<sup>2</sup> UNESCO, *Four Statements on the Race Question*, 1969, p. 50.

“The conquests of these two revolutions were crystallized in the labour code of François Duvalier, which is a genuine monument of labour legislation, the rural code of François Duvalier, and in a number of advanced social institutions such as the Institute of Social Insurance, the Institute of Old Age Pensions, a number of re-education institutions, and the Organization for National Literacy and Community Action—all enshrined in the Constitution of 1964.

“This Constitution defines the State of Haiti as an indivisible republic, sovereign, independent and social. It guarantees, under Title II, the rights of all classes of citizens; under Title III, the duties corresponding to those rights; under Titles IX and XIII, the economic and social system; and it organizes the harmonious functioning of the chief authorities of the State and their respective prerogatives.

“Briefly, that is the state of social legislation and human rights legislation in a country whose enemies, egged on by political exiles, genuine exiled princes, have tried to depict as a country of arbitrariness erected into a system, so true is it that underlying their iniquitous actions one can see some—and perhaps a lot—of the latent racism that prevents people from attributing the least merit, the last virtue, to coloured or black people.

“The Duvalier revolution, which has constantly been carried on by the people and by its leader, became anchored during the first decade on indestructible administrative and socio-political bases, and the great leader of the nation, in profound concord with the popular conscience, decided to dedicate the second decade to the promotion of the Haitian economy in order to ensure that economic independence without which political independence is just a fantasy.

“In his welcoming speech to the members of the International Development Bank, when it visited Haiti from 20 to 24 July 1970, the lifetime President of the Republic declared:

“ ‘In your search for investment opportunities I recommend that you follow the main guidelines of the strategy for economic development of my Government, based on the climate and natural beauty of the country, its proximity to the large American centres and its abundant and cheap labour.’

“That strategy’s aim is to create an infrastructure—electric power, roads and agricultural programmes—which will serve as a basis for private enterprise in those fields favoured by the above mentioned comparative advantages: tourism, processing and assembling industries for re-export, the export of fruits, vegetables and other products.

“Some of these projects, thanks to the vigour of the Head of State and the sacrifices gladly made by Haiti, have already begun to take root in the soil of our land. I quote with pleasure:

“ ‘Your revolution has given rise to every hope for the rural and urban masses and also for the middle classes deriving from these masses. The great awakening continues. The Haitian masses and middle classes are in process of psychological change. I have considered that fact pertaining to our revolution, and have continued to organize it. The great awakening continues, accompanied by a desire for development and a desire for change.’

“And, later in the same message:

“ ‘If, when peace is sought, it were to be found and strengthened and not jeopardized either by the deeds of men or acts of God, then I shall undertake with the Haitian people this tremendous new work of development, building the infrastructure of the Gonaïves plain and its development.’

“Prophetic words, as it turned out. A military traitor, in his unbridled ambition for power, took to the sea on the morning of 24 April 1970 with three Haitian naval units, and from the roadstead of Port-au-Prince bombarded the capital.

“In an ultimatum, he had already demanded that the Head of State put the reins of power into unqualified hands. What were the targets of this bombardment? The national palace, markets, public buildings and schools. There were a number of victims among the civilian population; houses were destroyed, and there were direct hits on the left wing of the national palace.

“The treacherous soldier was only a link in the chain of conspirators who, being outside, had tried to seize command posts simply in order to re-establish their caste privileges to the detriment of the interests of the real country.

“They had forgotten that true revolutions are irreversible and that it is impossible to turn back the course of history or to shake the faith of a people in its destiny.

“There was in the enemy camp none of those good souls, so easily moved to indignation, to condemn the criminal actions of rebels and mourn the civilians and schoolchildren who were victims. No commission of human rights asked them to account for their acts.

“The development and economic progress of the nation may have been thwarted but it has not been compromised. The results of the present financial year, from the financial and economic points of view, far exceed those of previous financial years and make it possible to enter with some optimism upon the battle of the future.

“In this year, which commemorates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, a year which has been darkened by so many international as well as national tragedies, should we not at this time ask humanity to scrutinize its

own conscience? Should it not be hoped that, by abandoning the road to death and moving towards progress, it will be able to increase love and reason according to the principles of the Charter and to revitalize the Organization by hearing a continuous dialogue about the objectives of peace and progress; a dialogue which would presuppose a better approach to these problems and would generate solutions safeguarding the progress of man as a whole and help to satisfy his material needs, to enrich his faculties, and make available to him a continuous dialogue replacing the unjust notion of co-operation imposed by that of an enlarged and liberated co-operation in order to preserve essential values, the originality of cultures and ways of life, and respect for the political structures appropriate to the various peoples; a necessary dialogue for the evolution of societies which are only seeking for an improvement of physical and human resources by enriching the infrastructure and the quality of those persons who are called upon to use them?

“A citizen of the world, which is close to my heart, a man of the present, who participates in the destinies of all peoples, I have always proclaimed the strength and transcendental value of the noble principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which the first black republic of the world together with other nations which met at San Francisco, held up to the baptismal fonts of the cathedral of hope.

“Thus I hope that all Member States, thanks to the virtues of participation, understanding and concerted action, will help to bring about an era of universal solidarity and will re-establish for the United Nations the ever urgent task of bringing about a better future for men wherever they may be.

“*Dr. François Duvalier*  
“*President for Life of Haiti*”

*Mr. Boye (Senegal), Vice-President, took the chair.*

5. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Our delegation has more than one reason to be pleased with the election of Mr. Hambro as President of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations: first of all, because his people and mine for more than a hundred years have had the best of relations based on understanding, generosity and disinterested co-operation; and then because we have long known his human warmth as well as his qualities as a diplomat and a human being, and, finally, because his devotion to the goals of our Organization guarantees the success which this commemorative session so richly deserves.

6. Our very special feelings of fraternal gratitude go to Mrs. Angie Brooks-Randolph, President of the last session, who so skilfully and gracefully conducted the work of that session, in frequently difficult circumstances.

7. It is also fitting to pay a tribute to our esteemed Secretary-General, whose perseverance and exem-

plary equanimity, equalled only by his desire to see the international community resolutely respect the principles and norms of our Charter.

8. Only a few days ago, Madagascar celebrated the tenth anniversary of its admission to the United Nations under the sponsorship of France and Tunisia, two countries whose friendship and esteem are particularly dear to us. Ten years in the life of a nation is not much, and yet, on behalf of my Government, I can testify that these 10 years of contact with the United Nations have been rewarding indeed and have awakened in us an awareness of our responsibilities and obligations towards the international community.

9. It is with this awareness of our responsibilities and obligations that I shall review briefly the outline of the policies which we have pursued and intend to continue to pursue in this Organization. For us, equality among States requires that there be strict respect for their sovereignty, thereby ruling out any interventionism and *a fortiori* anything resembling political imperialism which might serve to encourage the unbridled cult of power. In our opinion, relations between nations should be based on defined and accepted principles freely agreed upon and on the idea of interdependence while protecting national interests and putting down any attempt at economic or ideological neo-colonialism.

10. We would hope that the right to a free existence compatible with dignity would be assured for all people in all communities. We prefer negotiations to violence. Instead of sterile and always dangerous and frequently uncontrollable confrontations, we would choose an objective and realist dialogue, because our philosophy has taught us in Madagascar that we must always work for negotiated compromise without sacrificing our basic principles.

11. Our policies are based on justice, order and objectivity, and we refuse to base ourselves on emotional choices, which may at times be generous but of doubtful effectiveness.

12. Analyzing the international situation just before the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization, the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report [A/8001/Add.1 and Corr.1], conveys to us his cautious optimism. This opinion, which is in sharp contrast with the feelings of frustration expressed in recent years, is one that we share, although all aspirations are far from having been satisfied. But this is not the time for recriminations or claims and as we approach this decade which we hope will be fertile in the fields of disarmament, decolonization and economic and social progress, we must analyse with complete objectivity the contribution which each of our States can make to help our Organization to play a foremost role in preparing a future which will be not ours but that of youth and generations to come.

13. We have reason to be optimistic because, in spite of slowness, obstacles of all kinds and divergent inter-

ests, it really seems that we have emerged at last from the nightmare of the cold war and the unbridled armaments race, an early end to which did not seem to be in the offing. Little by little we can see the outline of a new order which could not exist if there were not concessions on all sides. The spectre of total and universal war also seems to be receding into the distance, even if the aggressive aspects of certain ideologies justify some apprehension.

14. But the human mind, whose nature it is to hope and believe as well as doubt, boggles at the thought that \$200,000 million is still being devoted annually to military budgets, and apparently no initiative has been taken by those most concerned—the super-Powers—to reduce expenditures in a reasonable but considerable way in the interests of social or economic expenditures. In the explanatory memorandum accompanying the request to place on the agenda the item entitled “Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security”, we find the following sentence:

“The Romanian Government believes that the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and the grave threat which it poses to international peace and security are questions which merit the attention of the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session” [A/7994, para.7].

My Government, which at the past two sessions requested that consideration be given to assigning part of the sums released by disarmament to the campaign against poverty, sickness and ignorance, cannot but fully support that opinion.

15. The hopes which have been kindled after the reconciliation in Nigeria, the inauguration of the strategic arms limitation talks, the signing of the non-aggression Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union,<sup>3</sup> the agreement arrived at by three interested parties on a cease-fire in the Middle East and the plan for the demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor<sup>4</sup> unfortunately cannot make us forget that our world still remains strife-torn and divided and that destiny seems to contrive to give and to hold back at the same time. On two continents—Africa and Asia—war continues to wreak havoc, taking away from those who have the greatest need the little hope that they still hold for a free and independent existence. Legitimate aspirations, such as those of a people to regain their identity, regrettably are repressed by force and arbitrariness in the name of a morality and a logic that are very difficult for us to understand. It is regrettable indeed that, in this international society where everyone claims to be acting in good faith, interests are still represented by proxy.

16. The maintenance of international peace and security—as it has been often stressed—is one of the

fundamental goals of our Organization. But in order that international peace and security may be maintained, they must first exist, and in the words of the Secretary-General, States must “accept compromises and even assume what they believe to be risks to their vital interests”.

17. That, we believe, is one of the contributions which Member States could make to our Organization to help put an end to all conflicts and crises by peaceful means within the spirit of the Charter, and specifically Chapter VI. We might then be able to enter into the disarmament decade in a calmer and more confident spirit and in a more objective way because we must realize that as long as there exists in this world a feeling of insecurity it will be impossible to achieve anything but slow and uncertain progress towards disarmament.

18. That is why Member States should endeavour not only to reduce existing conflicts and crises but prevent those that could at any time be caused by a lack of understanding, narrow nationalism or obstinacy in advocating far-fetched theories. It is certain that if each State were to act strictly in accordance with the Charter, the risk of conflicts and unnecessary confrontations would be greatly reduced. But in its twenty-five years of existence the Charter has often been disregarded and its principles frequently violated. We would hope that this is due to differing interpretations and concepts although it is difficult entirely to accept this argument.

19. Indeed, we have all declared our support for the preamble of the Charter and Articles 1 and 2, and yet it took more than eight years for agreement to come about on the seven principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States. I said “for an agreement to come about”, in spite of the existence of the draft declaration [A/8018, para. 83] submitted by the Special Committee,<sup>5</sup> because profound and appreciable differences of opinion continue to exist.

20. Many conflicts could have been prevented if these principles, which are of equal importance and set forth in the Charter, had been wholly respected and put into effect. I am thinking particularly of the principle of renunciation of the threat or use of force; that of non-intervention in the national affairs of States; and also that of equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination.

21. In this way a further contribution which Member States could make in the building of peace and the strengthening of the authority of the United Nations might be to carry out the solemn commitment which we are confident we shall all subscribe to in a few weeks and which is founded on this draft declaration, by positive acts which, by their very nature, may contribute to the progressive development and the codification of these principles.

22. We certainly understand the reasons for a certain reluctance; we realize that it is necessary that there

<sup>3</sup> Signed in Moscow on 12 August 1970.

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1970*, document DC/233, annex A.

<sup>5</sup> Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States.

be juridical stringency. But in order to act in a manner consistent with our profound convictions and our declarations of intent, and the spirit of the Charter, might it not be appropriate here and now that all States, great and small, renounce provocations, subversion and war; that we respect the sovereignty of Member States and their free choice of political, economic and social systems; that, in the interest of peace and just co-operation among States, as well as that of understanding among peoples, wrongful practices such as *apartheid*, which we combat with equal firmness and determination, be abandoned; that there be respect for the integrity and dignity of all human beings, of all communities and all ethnic groups in order to arrive at a true international Charter of human rights; that those who are concerned agree "that forcing people to submit to subjugation, domination or foreign exploitation or any form of colonialism constitutes a violation of the principle of the equal rights of peoples and their right to independence and consequently a denial of fundamental human rights and international law".

23. I have intentionally placed in the same context disarmament, friendly relations, the rights of peoples and human rights which have in common the fact that an appeal must be made to collective responsibility to solve the problems which they pose—first for our conscience and then for our political wisdom. Another equally important point to which I referred when speaking of disarmament is that of development.

24. I do not believe that it is necessary to go back to the Algiers Charter<sup>6</sup> prepared by the third world, then moved by illusions and hopes, nor to revert to the frustrations of the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,<sup>7</sup> nor to insist unduly on the difficulties which we encountered in order to secure support for the principle of a declaration on a global strategy for development.

25. We must, however, recognize that economic and social progress is a common responsibility shared by the international community as a whole. In other words, the developing countries must first realize that they must count on themselves first and foremost and on a better use of their material and human resources, whereas the developed countries, because of their privileged position, should adopt economic, commercial and financial policies that would be more favourable to the under-developed countries. If we succeed in this undertaking, the coming decade may herald a more just and rational economic order.

26. We must realize, albeit reluctantly and regardless of the reasons put forward by those who do not wish to support the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade, that the third world is determined to win the race towards development. That is perhaps a naïve but no less fervent expression by us of a concerted and coherent determination that nothing will be able to change. We remain aware that the way ahead will be long and difficult, that many interdepen-

dent forces affect development and that the relationships between these forces and their degree vary from country to country to such an extent that our cohesiveness may be placed in jeopardy.

27. We hope that in a spirit of association and participation the industrialized countries will support and encourage this irreversible determination on the part of the third world because after all we are not calling for an automatic redistribution of the resources of the world. Paraphrasing the theme of the Economic Commission for Africa for the next decade, we hope that, on the contrary, in this interdependent world we shall be encouraged to have more confidence in ourselves.

28. Interdependence, self-confidence, commitment, political determination and collective responsibility are all familiar concepts which will once again come up for discussion whenever we deal with decolonization, human rights, development or disarmament. My delegation is convinced that the United Nations has an essential and primary role to play to make those concepts a reality and to act in such a way that they will not be drowned in rhetoric.

29. For the United Nations to assume its responsibilities, we must set aside overly narrow concepts of nationalism and agree that it is a matter of urgency that the authority of the Organization be strengthened. It is in this way and in this way alone that we will stand a good chance of establishing an international community existing in an orderly fashion, and a new order based on peace, justice, progress and well-being.

30. Peace, justice, freedom and progress are all themes of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and of the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In this year when there are two anniversaries, let us be courageous enough to recognize the fact that we have missed a number of opportunities; let us be sincere and ask how frequently we have forgotten or pretended that we have forgotten the principles of international charity in the original sense of the word. But let us realize at the same time that the Charter is our best hope and our best guarantee, and that our Organization, in spite of its ups and downs, has not always failed to meet our expectations.

31. We are living in a constantly changing world, where priorities change even if values remain the same. To say that our Charter and our Organization have fully met the needs of the present would be to disregard the profound changes which have taken place ever since the end of the Second World War. We, for our part, will constantly reaffirm our devotion to the principles which were set forth in familiar historical circumstances and we shall advocate a new framework in which a new approach can be taken to relations between countries and peoples.

32. For twenty-five years we have endeavoured to safeguard our institutions and to protect them from our own contradictions and weaknesses. Now that we have been successful, it is time, we believe, to take

<sup>6</sup> Adopted on 24 October 1967 by the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of Seventy-seven.

<sup>7</sup> Held at New Delhi from 1 February to 29 March 1968.

the initiative and demonstrate imagination so that no one can say that we have abdicated responsibility in the face of the challenges of our times or that we have been unable in the interests of the common good, to transcend our differences, to put down our selfish interests and to reaffirm with increasing conviction and vigour the belief of the founders of our Organization in a more civilized, freer, more just and more united world.

33. Mr. NASE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): May I first convey to our President the congratulations of the Albanian delegation on his election to the Presidency of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly?

34. In taking up the work on the agenda of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, which is being held on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the coming into force of the Charter of the United Nations, the peace-loving Member States would have wished to be in a position to present on this occasion some picture of positive and satisfactory activity on the part of the United Nations. The Albanian delegation, for its part, would have taken great pleasure in drawing up such a balance sheet of activities covering a quarter of a century, which is certainly no short period in the life of an international organization. Unfortunately, this is not the situation. Created on the day after victory had been achieved over the Powers of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis and conceived in the spirit of the principles which predominated in the war of the anti-Fascist coalition, the Organization awakened in the whole of progressive humanity the hope that it would serve as an important factor in creating better international conditions in order to favour the cause of freedom, peace and world security. But its activities and a number of events which occurred in the world arena during that period disappointed the hopes of peoples. The United Nations, far from having contributed, as required by the fundamental provisions of the Charter, to the consolidation of international peace and security and the liberation struggle of peoples, has on the contrary, under the *diktat* of the imperialist powers, the United States of America foremost among them, embarked on a path diametrically opposed to those principles, and has served as an instrument favouring their policy of pillage, oppression and aggression against peace-loving peoples and countries.

35. The utilization of the United Nations to serve this policy has resulted in the Organization not only not having been able to stay the hand of those committing aggression in many parts of the world, but having frequently helped the aggressors, its activity in this direction going so far, moreover, that under the flag of the United Nations there have been perpetrated some of the most barbarous aggressions experienced since the end of the Second World War, such as, among others, the armed aggressions in Korea and in the Congo.

36. The whole of progressive mankind recalls with admiration the heroic struggle which, under the direc-

tion of the great Stalin, the Soviet Union waged, in co-operation with the Anglo-American coalition, to defend the peaceful peoples and countries against Hitlerite Germany. The historic and decisive victories of the Red Army over the Nazi hordes and the great role played by the Soviet Union during the Second World War aroused great enthusiasm among peoples and awakened in them the hope for a better future. They followed with great interest and with particular joy the unflinching struggle which was waged by the Leninist Soviet Union in the world arena, as well as by its authentic representatives here in this Organization, in order to defend their vital interests and to sustain their legitimate struggle for liberation from the imperialist, colonialist and racist yoke. But following the usurpation of power in that country by the Khrushchev clique, the situation changed completely, and the struggle of the Soviet Union against American imperialism and its allies was replaced by the holy alliance between the Soviet Union and the United States against the peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples and countries. It is thus that, so far as the United Nations is concerned, it has become a centre of bargaining, manoeuvring and underhand manipulations on the part of the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists, designed to lull the vigilance of peoples and to disguise as best they can their policy of world hegemony.

37. All this has had well known consequences for the United Nations, which have been particularly damaging to its authority and its ability to play the part which is incumbent upon it under the Charter. But, at the same time, this negative activity has helped peoples to realize better the nature of the two imperialist Powers and what can be expected from the United Nations in the present circumstances where it is being manipulated by those two Powers. It has, in particular, become obvious to them that all the initiatives and proposals of American governing circles and of Moscow revisionists in connexion with disarmament and all the agreements which they seek to impose on other States in this field, with respect to both conventional armaments and nuclear armaments, are designed solely to disarm peace-loving countries and to ensure for themselves the nuclear monopoly and the largest possible quantity of armaments of all sorts in order to subjugate peoples and to enslave the world which they wish to divide between them. Peoples are becoming more aware than ever that the only way for them to break free from every imperialist, colonialist and racist yoke is through armed struggle and trust in their own strength, while at the same time enjoying the solidarity and the support of all other freedom-loving peoples and countries.

38. One of the undeniable proofs that the United Nations has embarked on the road of violating the principles and spirit of the Charter is the withholding for 21 years of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in this Organization, a circumstance which not only has brought about an abnormal situation without precedent in this Organization and constituted a severe blow to its prestige, but also has at the same time affected its capacity regarding the contribution

which it should make to the settlement of the important problems of our time, none of which, as we well know, can be given a real solution without the participation of the great socialist China of 700 million people.

39. Undoubtedly, such a state of affairs in this Organization does not discourage the Member States who espouse the fundamental principles of the Charter. On the contrary, trusting in their own strength and their own possibilities and encouraged by the development and the victories of the liberation struggle waged by peoples in all continents, they will redouble their efforts and co-operate more closely in order to wage a more effective battle against the policy of *diktat* and force which has been practised by the two great imperialist Powers here in the United Nations or elsewhere in the world.

40. The liberation movement at the world level against the imperialist and colonialist Powers is at present making new strides. The peoples have reacted to the policy of oppression and domination practised by the imperialist Powers and their aggressions and plots, by strengthening their just struggle for independence and freedom and joining the ranks of the armed struggle against the aggressors. This is shown by the struggle of the heroic peoples of Viet-Nam, Laos, Cambodia and other countries of Indo-China, the struggle of the people of Korea and other peoples of the Far East against the United States imperialists, their allies and their tools, the struggle of the valiant Palestinians and other Arab peoples against imperialist-Zionist aggression, the struggle of the peoples of Oman and Dhofar and the peoples of the Arabian Gulf to free themselves from the colonial yoke, the resistance of the peoples of Eastern Europe against the domination of the new imperialists of the Kremlin, the struggle of the African peoples of Mozambique, Angola, Guinea (Bissau), Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa against the colonial Powers, the settlers and their racist tools, the struggle of the people of Puerto Rico to free themselves from the imperialist yoke of the United States, as well as all those struggles that are being waged by peoples in various parts of the world, including that of the American people in the very citadel of imperialism. The imperialist Powers and their allies are suffering defeat after defeat. Powerful blows have been struck against them everywhere by the peoples that are struggling for their national independence, for their freedom and for their sacred and inalienable right to be masters of their own destiny.

41. Panic-stricken at the impetuous growth of the revolutionary struggle for the liberation of peoples and assailed by multiple internal and external difficulties, the two so-called super-Powers, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, which are at the head of all reactionary forces, are striving by all means in their power to face up to this desperate situation and to accelerate the implementation of their aggressive and warlike plans against peace-loving peoples and countries. These two Powers have during this period intensified their collusion and their criminal activities, using deceit and demagoguery as well as various forms of pressure, force and armed aggression.

42. Although split by numerous contradictions deriving from their imperialist nature, each trying to undermine the other and to evict the other from its political, economic and strategic positions, these two super-Powers have a common hatred for the freedom of peoples and the socialist revolution. It is on that basis that rest their co-operation and their aggressive activities, their plans and their plots, which extend to all continents in conformity with their global counter-revolutionary strategy, which is designed to divide and dominate the world. The Glasborough policy is pursued uninterruptedly, and American-Soviet collusion has taken fresh steps forward. Under the guise of peaceful slogans for the "peaceful settlement" of conflicts which have been brought about precisely by the aggressions which they themselves have perpetrated or directed, for European, Asian or international "security"—which is in fact nothing but the security of the imperialist order—for disarmament, for "internationalism" which presupposes "limited sovereignty", or more exactly the subjugation of peoples and nations, as well as other slogans, they plot and they co-ordinate their positions and their activities regarding various problems which affect the interests of mankind as a whole. Using such slogans, they are hatching plans and trying to impose so-called peaceful settlements by means of which they are trying to repress the liberation struggle waged by peoples; they are concluding treaties which are both fraudulent and enslaving and they are trying to conclude new aggressive pacts which will be added to the pacts, blocs and military bases that are now in existence; they are exerting pressure of all sorts on the freedom-loving peoples and countries that dare to resist them; they are carrying on the arms race and the preparations for a new war; they indulge in nuclear blackmail and fresh acts of aggression.

43. In that connexion we can cite, simultaneously with the secret negotiations of the two Powers through diplomatic channels, the long meetings of their representatives in Helsinki and later in Vienna, meetings which certainly are not limited to the question of the "limitation of strategic arms", the so-called Rogers plan for a "peaceful settlement" of the Middle East problem, a plan which is the result of the American-Soviet plot designed to stifle the legitimate liberation struggle of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples, which is at the origin of the bloody events which have taken place recently in Jordan. Of a similar nature are the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on Indo-China and the meetings organized in Moscow and elsewhere with representatives of the reactionary régimes in Asia to bring about a "peaceful settlement" of that problem—a settlement which they believe will lead to the capitulation of the peoples of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia—the travels of high emissaries of those two Powers in Asia and their efforts to create there new aggressive pacts in accordance with the Brezhnev plan for the "collective security of Asia" and the Nixon plan to pit Asiatics against Asiatics, plans which have been concerted between those two Powers and are designed first and foremost to create a circle of fire around the People's Republic of China. In the same category we should

mention the enslaving Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty as well as the Moscow-Bonn treaty, which among other things tramples under foot the sovereign rights of the German people of the Democratic Republic of Germany and which, together with the Soviet-American project on so-called European security, relates to the spheres of influence of the two Powers in Europe and their rear-guard activities on that continent in order to implement their counter-revolutionary plans in Asia, Africa and elsewhere.

44. In order to bring about this great anti-popular conspiracy, the American and Soviet imperialists are applying a series of political, economic and military measures, such as intensifying the imperialist American aggression in Laos and the new aggression against Cambodia, plots and wiles designed to divide the Arab peoples and countries and plunge them into bloody and fratricidal conflict and to repress by all means possible, including armed force, the legitimate struggle of the heroic people of Palestine. Of a similar nature also are the threats and the measures taken by the Soviet revisionists against the peoples of Eastern European countries, including the military manoeuvres of Soviet occupation forces in Czechoslovakia, carried out last August to intimidate the people on the eve of the second anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

45. Thus the two Powers stop at nothing to realize their imperialist plans to stifle the revolutionary struggle of peace-loving peoples and countries, to establish their domination of the world and to arrogate to themselves the role of international police in order to decide in their own good time the fate of humanity.

46. However, those are castles in the air. The wheel of history cannot be turned backwards. The era when the fate of peoples and of small countries was decided by the great imperialist Powers has gone for ever. The more the imperialists intensify their aggressive activities, the more the peoples strengthen their own struggle and the more closely they become united in the vast front of the armed struggle against the common enemy. Never will the peoples renounce their legitimate struggle to win back their vital rights. Despite temporary vicissitudes, their struggle is on the whole increasing and being strengthened and it appears now more than ever before that a storm of liberation is breaking throughout Asia, Africa and elsewhere, a storm which will completely annihilate, in spite of underhanded manoeuvres and repressions, imperialist and colonialist domination in whatever form it may exist.

47. A recent example which is the best illustration of what awaits the American imperialists and their policy of intervention and war is the armed aggression they perpetrated against Cambodia last March, immediately after the coup d'état which they plotted in that country. Faced with an impasse because of the blows meted out in the struggle of the Viet-Nameese people, the American aggressors sent their troops to Cambodia in order to implement there the "Nixon doctrine", which is designed to pit Indo-Chinese

against Indo-Chinese. But this aggression, far from leading to the expected results, immediately met with the armed resistance of the people of Cambodia and the military solidarity of their Viet-Nameese and Laotian brothers, powerfully supported by the great Chinese people as well as by the other peoples of Asia. It aroused energetic opposition on the part of peoples throughout the world, including the American people. Instead of stifling the liberation struggle of the Viet-Nameese people, the aggression against Cambodia has spread throughout Indo-China the fire of the liberation and revolutionary struggle and has opened an even wider and deeper abyss, where American imperialism will finally be engulfed without any hope of being rescued.

48. The success gained by the Cambodian people, under the leadership of the United Front of Cambodia, presided over by the Head of State, Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, in liberating a large part of the national territory from the aggressors and their lackeys, and the solidarity and new consolidation of the unity of the peoples of Cambodia, Viet-Nam, Laos, the People's Republic of China, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as of other revolutionary peoples in Asia, constitute a harsh blow to American imperialism, its collaborators and its lackeys.

49. The American aggression against Cambodia is at the same time further proof of the collusion, at the expense of the people, of American imperialism with the revisionists of Moscow, the latter having adopted for this occasion an attitude similar to that of the American Government towards their aggression in Czechoslovakia. In particular, their refusal to recognize the Government of the United Front of Cambodia and the fact that they maintain normal diplomatic relations with the Lon Nol clique, an instrument of American imperialism supported by the puppets in Saigon and Seoul and even by the riff-raff of Chiang Kai-shek, as well as by international reaction as a whole, have once again revealed to world public opinion the true face of the Soviet revisionists, aligned in a consistent way with the camp of imperialism and reaction.

50. The events of the current year in Cambodia and throughout Indo-China are of great importance for the Indo-Chinese peoples, which not only now have fresh proof of the obstinacy of American imperialism in carrying out acts of aggression and extending the war, but also now are in a better position to decide who is sincerely against the Yankee invader and who is with him, what the Soviet social-imperialists are and what great socialist China represents for them. Thus they realize once again that armed struggle is the only way to become free of the American aggressors.

51. Despite the intensification of the efforts of the American imperialists, backed up by the Soviet revisionists, the valiant people of Viet-Nam has thwarted all the plans and dangerous subterfuges designed to bring about its capitulation. Throughout South Viet-Nam the people and its popular liberation army have taken up arms and struck crushing blows against the American aggressors, without giving them

a moment of respite even in their military camps and bases, such as Da Nang, Ben Tre, Hué, the outskirts of Saigon and other parts of the country. The Viet-Nameese people and its armed forces have, through their brilliant victories, tied down the American imperialists and their Saigon tools on the battlefield. These victories have shown undeniably that the efforts of the Yankee aggressors to escape inevitable defeat by extending the war have brought them only further irreparable reversals. The long revolutionary struggle has tempered the Viet-Nameese people and has made it invincible, and by its determined and heroic struggle it will undoubtedly deal ever more crushing blows at American imperialism until it is completely defeated.

52. The armed struggle for the national well-being of the peoples of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia is constantly developing and being reinforced; it is now in a new stage. All the criminal plots which the American and Soviet imperialists have hatched in order to bring about a so-called peaceful settlement in Indo-China are doomed to complete failure. American imperialism is surrounded and defeated on all fronts. It is bound to be beaten.

53. A typical case which shows the ferocity of the great American-Soviet conspiracy and the method of combining the most diverse means of action on the part of these imperialist Powers in order to carry out their policy of aggression and hegemony is the tragic and serious situation which prevails at the present time in the Near East. Concerned with implementing at all costs their common plan of sad repute—baptized the Rogers plan—designed to liquidate the Palestinian question and to divide the Arab peoples, to legalize and to reward the imperialist-Israeli aggression and to assure their imperialist interests in that area, the United States and the revisionist Soviet Union have plotted and put into effect the criminal collusion designed to stifle the Palestinian liberation movement through the reactionary régime of Jordan, thus trying to implement in the Near East the Nixon doctrine aimed at pitting Asians against Asians. Thus Jordanian reaction, serving American imperialism and Zionism, has used fire and sword, cannons, tanks and aviation against the heroic Palestinian fighters. Barbarous mass massacres have been perpetrated against the Palestinian population in Amman and elsewhere. At the same time, American imperialism, by statements from Nixon, Laird and other leaders, threatens to intervene in the internal affairs of the Arab countries and also threatens intervention by its Sixth Fleet, thus trying, as always, to play the role of international policeman to oppress peoples and suppress liberation struggles, to defend those cliques which are in their pockets, to defend their rapacious interests and to enslave peoples.

54. American imperialism and world reaction consider as unfair the fraternal assistance given by Syria and Iraq to their Arab brothers who are struggling for a just cause, for their common cause. According to their logic they have the right and the freedom to intervene in all countries, everywhere; they can utilize tanks, cannons, and their war fleets to oppress and

exploit the peoples of other countries, whereas Syria and Iraq are not entitled to come to the aid of their brothers.

55. A wave of indignation and resentment has been unleashed throughout the progressive world. Quite rightly, the conscience of the Arab peoples has revolted against the treachery of the ruling clique in Jordan. And the world wonders: Why are tanks and bullets being used against the Palestinians? Is it because they are struggling for their liberty, for independence and for their sacred land?

56. The peoples of all continents, profoundly indignant, are raising their voices in protest against the American imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists; they are crying: "Hands off the Palestinian people, Jordan, Syria and the other Arab countries."

57. It is quite clear that the Palestinians are not obeying the "Rogers plan". They know full well that the American plan which is based on the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)]—which, as we know, is itself the result of bargaining in the corridors between the Americans and the Soviets—is designed, *inter alia*, to impose the elimination of the Palestinian question and the recognition of Israel's right to annex part of the territories which it invaded following its aggression of 5 June 1967. This plan is also designed to reward the Zionist aggression by guaranteeing the existence of the State of Israel, which has taken over Arab territories which were also conquered by aggression, and also by recognizing other rights. Still worse, the two "super-Powers" want to use the new cease-fire to continue the manoeuvres and machinations which they have engaged in for the past three years in order once again to apply the tactics used by the imperialist powers after the Israeli aggression of 1948, with the aim of putting off for ever the fulfilment of the sacred cause of the Arabs and thus making a fait accompli out of Israel's new occupation of their territories.

58. No, the Arab people will never accept the United States-Soviet *diktat*, which is designed to bring about their recapitulation. The Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples have rejected this plot. The efforts of the United States imperialists and the Soviet revisionists are in vain. The Arab peoples have a long experience, and they well know the Israeli aggressors and their masters. Never will they allow the two foreign Powers to decide their fate, whatever be their machinations and their sharing of roles, one presenting itself as the author of the criminal plan and the other giving that plan its support.

59. The Arab peoples know full well that any proposal by the United States of America, which incited and assisted Israel to unleash aggression three years ago and which continues to provide Israel with armaments and encourages it to pursue its aggression and provocation, is designed simply to serve the imperialist interests of that Power in the area of the Near East, which is of great strategic importance and is rich in

petroleum deposits, as well as the interests of Israel, its instrument. It is obvious—and no one could deny it—that without the assistance and support of the United States Israel would never have been in a position to initiate the aggression of June 1967, and even less to continue to occupy the Arab territories.

60. With regard to the Soviet revisionists, whatever mask they may put on, the Arab peoples know their faces, especially since the American-Israeli aggression, and they are convinced that what they are interested in is penetrating into the Near East and the Mediterranean Basin and creating conditions favourable for their expansion in that area.

61. The leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, referring to this problem in his statement of 18 September to the electors of Tirana, said, among other things:

“In the final analysis, the glorious revolutionary Arab peoples will not have the wool pulled over their eyes by the false friendship of Soviet social-imperialism, which has taken advantage of their temporary difficulties to occupy their ports and their seas and to stifle their just liberation struggle against the Fascist Zionists and the United States imperialists. The two aggressive imperialist Powers are interested in planting their roots deep in the Near East and in ensuring that they have economic, political and military bases in the countries of the area; they want to oppress the peoples of those countries, lulling them with words, demoralizing them and corrupting them in order, finally, by the use of those bases, to go even further and invade Africa, Asia and other regions, starting colonial wars and plundering various continents.

“The Albanian people love the Arab peoples, because they are their brothers and their friends in good times and in bad. At this time of revolutionary and liberation struggles, we are at their side constantly; we have supported them and will continue to support them with all the means at our disposal. We have confidence in the triumph of the just cause for which they are fighting. But, in order to win an early victory over the common enemy, a unity that is hard as steel must be forged among all the Arab peoples in the armed struggle. The Zionists, the United States imperialists and the Soviet revisionists are seeking to divide the Arab peoples, to disarm them, to impose on them a peace that will be not theirs but their enemies'. The arms that have been supplied to them are controlled by the Soviets. They have not been made available for the sacred Arab cause, but they are being used precisely to deceive the Arabs, to tie their hands and send them to the slaughterhouse. The 'Rogers plan' of ill repute could more accurately be called the 'Rogers-Gromyko plan'. The Arab peoples will certainly never fall into the terrible trap of that plan. The Soviet-United States armies can, by recourse to various insidious means, succeed in establishing themselves on both sides of the Suez Canal, in which case one may wonder what purpose the hardware

supplied to the Arabs by the Soviets would serve. They have not heroically driven one imperialist from the Canal only to see it occupied now by two others.

“The clamourings of Dayan are in harmony with the secret manoeuvres of the Soviet revisionists, but the crackling of the heroic guns of the Arab Palestinian brothers is the most glorious reply, which will put down this great conspiracy of their enemies. Therefore, by all possible means, we must resolutely assist the partisan struggle of the Palestinians, a struggle that is now in the forefront of the more general battle which must be waged by Arab peoples on all fronts. Our Arab brothers will succeed in raising high the banner of the liberation struggle against the imperialists and Zionists. They will reduce to nothing the plans of the Soviet revisionists and all the provocations organized by the agencies of the CIA which are conspiring against the liberation struggle of the people of Palestine and all the Arab peoples.”

62. The Arab peoples have great revolutionary traditions and are known for their bravery and their liberation struggles. They know that they are not fighting against the Israeli aggressors only, but also against the two imperialist Powers which are mainly responsible for the situation in the Near East and, therefore, they will not allow themselves to fall into the traps of those Powers.

63. The events of recent days in Jordan have confirmed that, as the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, indicated in his statement of 18 September, Soviet social-imperialism is pursuing aims that have nothing in common with the interests of the Arab peoples. As on other occasions, they are not at all concerned with the fate of the Arab peoples; their sole aim is to consolidate their imperialist positions. In this particular case, the Soviet revisionist leaders, replying to Nixon's appeal to bring in Moscow's fire brigade to snuff out the revolutionary struggle of the Palestinians and other Arab peoples, to subjugate and enslave them, hastened to assume the role of firemen. Through their official declarations and propaganda organs, they came to the defence of the clique in power in Jordan, threatening the Palestinians with the slogan “Violence leads to violence”, and addressing appeals to them and other Arab peoples asking them to give up their struggle. All those facts have served to make even more obvious to the Arab peoples the perfidious role being played by the social-imperialists of Moscow and the real aims of the United States-Soviet plan for the Near East.

64. The Palestinians consider Jordan as their second homeland. They are not the cause of disruption in Jordan; rather, the fault lies with the reactionary régime in Jordan and King Hussein, who is in the service of United States imperialism and the “Rogers plan”. On the contrary, the Palestinians in Jordan are the healthiest element in the common struggle to annihilate the common enemy.

65. The Albanian people is profoundly indignant, strongly condemns those criminal acts and supports

the heroic struggle of the Palestinians who are fighting for their sacred rights. We are convinced that, thanks to their resolute struggle and the strengthening of their unity in combat, and enjoying the support of their true friends, of all freedom-loving peoples, they will expose the plots of their enemies and gain final victory over the aggressors.

66. In the dealings between the United States and the Soviet Union, an important place is held also by the so-called question of the European security conference, proposed last year by the Kremlin leaders through their instrument of aggression, the Warsaw Treaty. There have been signs of intense activity this year, at the instigation of the two Powers. In accordance with their strategy to consolidate and subsequently extend their domination in Europe and carrying out their aggressive plans in other areas, United States and Soviet imperialists are particularly concerned with ensuring the success of that project. The Soviet revisionists in particular are showing special haste, which can be explained by their internal difficulties, the ever-growing resistance of the countries of Eastern Europe to their policy of intervention and domination, by their plans and preparations for aggression directed towards Asia against the People's Republic of China. Of course the United States and its Western allies, particularly the Federal Republic of Germany, have not failed to do everything in their power to exploit this haste displayed by the Soviet revisionist leadership, in order to obtain the largest possible number of concessions on the German problem and that of West Berlin, as well as to ensure their economic, political and cultural penetration into the countries of Eastern Europe.

*Mr. Hambro (Norway) resumed the Chair.*

67. Confronted by the insurmountable difficulties relating to the contradictions existing on many problems between the United States imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists as well as between them and the other European States, the two so-called super-Powers, in order to find a way out and mislead public opinion, have hit on the following formula to serve as a guiding principle for any agreement to be concluded in this framework: "renunciation of the use of force in relations among the States of Europe". That misleading formula is designed in fact to give them something to cling to as they conclude these agreements. It was on the basis of that formula that the negotiations took place between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and Poland, as well as the long negotiations, of paramount importance, between the Soviet Union and West Germany.

68. In all those activities the step which has had the greatest impact is the Soviet-West German Treaty signed on 12 August last in Moscow. Intense propaganda attended the signing of that Treaty which was designed to present it as a historic event that would—so they said—bring peace to Europe and the integrity of its borders. Of course, such a campaign, regardless of the means used, could deceive only the naïve. The

peoples of Europe, who have had great experience, cannot be taken in by empty rhetoric. In particular, the propaganda statements of the Soviet and American leaders, and their supporters, cannot fail to recall the vast deceitful campaigns which accompanied the various stages of the plotting and compromises of the Western Powers with Hitlerian militarism, especially as regards the Munich Agreement of September 1938.

69. The Moscow Treaty is in fact no solution to the German problem. Indeed it is an open violation of the decisions on that problem adopted by the Allied Powers during the war, and of the oft-renewed promises of the Soviet revisionist leadership to conclude a peace treaty with the two German States, or simply with the German Democratic Republic, and to defend the interests and sovereign rights of the latter. The Soviet revisionists have trampled under foot their commitments and their obligations, and thus committed a serious crime against the German people, against the German Democratic Republic, against peace and security in Europe and in the entire world. They have therefore assumed a heavy responsibility.

70. The Moscow Treaty is in fact formal recognition of the entry of conquered Germany into the community of States, without their having signed a peace treaty. In the Soviet-German Treaty, apart from a few equivocal and questionable terms, there is no reference to recognition of borders between the two German States and the Oder-Neisse line dividing Poland and the German Democratic Republic as final and unchangeable borders; nor is there recognition by the Federal Republic of Germany of the German Democratic Republic as an independent, sovereign State fully enjoying all international rights. Even more important, the Chancellor of West Germany and the other leaders in Bonn have stated on more than one occasion, both before and after the signing of the Treaty, that they will never give up the idea of the reunification of the German nation, which to them means annexation of the German Democratic Republic. That position is again confirmed in the documents annexed to the Treaty. The Bonn Government thus is endeavouring to make the most out of this situation and to gain time in order to prepare to attain its expansionist objectives in the most favourable circumstances. Thus, the Soviet revisionists have considered and used the German Democratic Republic as a bargaining counter in their dealings with the revenge-seekers in Bonn, who still claim they have the right to speak and act on behalf of all of Germany, and there they are supported by the great Western Powers.

71. As for the provisions of the Treaty concerning the renunciation of the use of force or the inviolability of borders, not only does this not mean that the borders are in fact unchangeable, but the people of Europe know full well the value of such commitments on the part of the German revenge-seekers, for the memory of Hitler's non-aggression pacts with European States is still very fresh in their minds.

72. Therefore, from all points of view, the Moscow Treaty undeniably provides Bonn's leaders with some-

thing to fall back on. It encourages their expansionist and revenge-seeking plans and is at the same time a serious blow to the German Democratic Republic and all progressive peace-loving forces in Germany.

73. No one can deny that the creation of the German Democratic Republic was a great victory not only for the German people but for all the peoples of Europe, or that it is closely connected with peace and security in Europe. The strengthening of the German Democratic Republic and its recognition by all the States of Europe, on the basis of the principle of sovereign equality, are in the interest of their security, and are an essential condition for the settlement of the German problem and a sound basis for any sincere attempt to place the German people on the road to peace and democracy, co-operation, and friendship with all other European peoples. The agreement between the Soviet Union and West Germany is a dangerous step in the opposite direction. It cannot fail to be condemned by all peace and freedom-loving countries and peoples in Europe.

74. It is obvious that the Moscow Treaty is first and foremost the result of bargaining between United States and Soviet imperialists, within the framework of the plans for their global strategy in Europe and other continents. But that Treaty is at the same time an agreement between two new imperialist Powers, Soviet social-imperialism and West German militarism, and, as such, it is a serious threat not only to the European continent but also to other areas of the world which are the object of United States-Soviet plans of aggression. Thus the leaders in Moscow have joined successive Governments in Washington in raising West Germany to the level of a main shock force, a principal partner of the two Powers in putting into effect their counter-revolutionary plans and their plans to subjugate all freedom-loving peoples and countries. How can we fail on this occasion to remind the Assembly that similar plans were part of the policy of the Western Powers toward Hitler's Germany; but that proved very costly to them, for Hitler's Germany eventually turned on them.

75. The Moscow-Bonn Treaty is undeniably a new link in the series of plots between the Soviets and the Americans against the world's peoples, and the serious threat entailed in this cannot escape the attention of any Government which is sincerely concerned with the vital interests of its people, rational security and independence and world peace.

76. The Albanian Government has always been in sympathy with the justified concern of the European States which are sincerely interested in security and peace in Europe and in the search for appropriate ways and means to normalize the situation in that continent, to deliver it from the hegemony of the two major imperialist Powers and to reject the idea of spheres of influence, to eliminate the two aggressive blocs dominated by them, and to create favourable circumstances for the development of European co-operation on the basis of respect for independence and national sovereignty, sovereign equality and mutual benefit.

That is fully in line with the principles underlying our foreign policy. But, as all these States know full well, such noble objectives have nothing in common with the criminal plans of the United States and Soviet imperialists and their supporters. In all their activities, in all the pacts which they propose to conclude, in all their initiatives or proposals, including those on "European security", "collective security in Asia", or "international security"—presented once again, on the initiative of the Soviet revisionists, to the present session of the General Assembly—the two Powers are constantly motivated by their insatiable greed to dominate and exploit the peoples of the world, by their desire to maintain and consolidate their spheres of influence in Europe and elsewhere and to have a free hand in those areas, to ensure tranquillity to their rear the better to carry out all their various expansionist plans in Asia, Africa and elsewhere, using whatever means are necessary, even to the extent of threatening or using armed force.

77. There is really no need to prove that this is the true state of affairs. It is amply borne out by all international realities and by the hot-beds of imperialist war in many areas of the world—aggression in Indo-China, the Middle East, the Far East, Europe and elsewhere; the military bases of the United States and Soviet imperialists in Europe and other continents; their occupation of foreign territories; nuclear blackmail; the arms race; their fleets of warships which cruise in the Mediterranean, the Pacific and other seas and oceans and threaten peace-loving peoples and countries in those areas. It is all borne out, *inter alia*, by their criminal plans in Europe, where a particular role is assigned by them to revenge-seeking Germany, their plans for Asia aimed particularly at the encirclement of the People's Republic of China and at preparation for war against that country with the co-operation of other aggressive Powers, in particular Japanese militarism. How can one claim to guarantee peace in Europe in such conditions under the aegis and protection of the two imperialist Powers, American and Soviet?

78. One wonders against whom peace has to be guaranteed. Who is threatening the peace and security of the peoples of Europe? Can it be those of us from small, peace-loving countries? In our opinion, to be caught in such Soviet-American traps as "European security" or "collective security in Asia" is tantamount to serving their aggressive plans or, rather, to throwing oneself to the wolves. Today more than ever before peace is indivisible, and we cannot have peace in Europe and war in Asia and elsewhere.

79. Comrade Enver Hoxha, in his statement on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the liberation of Albania, stated in this connexion:

"First, the question is who should be assured and by whom. The 'European security' which is sought by the Soviet revisionists and supported by the United States imperialists means security for their spheres of influence in Europe, security for their military bases and the right for their squadrons to

patrol European coasts. This means that the peoples of Europe must legally and officially recognize the right of Moscow and Washington to conserve the special privileges of an imperialist and colonialist nature which they have in various countries of Europe. Such security boils down to the permanent maintenance in Europe of the *status quo* of Soviet-American domination, to having calm ensured on that continent so that the Soviet revisionists and American imperialists have some freedom of movement and act freely in Asia, Africa and everywhere else in order to subjugate and enslave peoples, to reinforce their capitalistic system of exploitation, both at home and in their empires.”

80. We believe that international peace and security can be assured only by a resolute opposition and struggle against the two imperialist Powers, against their policy of *diktat*, aggression and war. Any other way would only be grist to the mill of those two Powers, which envisage the enslavement of Europe and the world.

81. We are convinced that no matter what efforts are made by the American and Soviet imperialists and their collaborators, they will never have the tranquillity they seek in Europe. They will run more and more into their own contradictions, and the peoples of Europe will not accept their hegemony in any guise. They will never allow them to pit Europe against Asia, and they will never allow themselves to be cannon fodder for the realization of the criminal plans of the two Powers.

82. We are well aware that peace-loving Member States condemn the aggressive policies of the two imperialist Powers, their collusion at the expense of the cause of peace-loving peoples and countries, their monstrous plans to redivide and dominate the world. We have constantly admired the courageous and just struggle being waged by many countries, here in the United Nations and outside it, against this grand conspiracy of the two Powers. But the present international situation requires of all Member States faithful to the principles of the independence and equality of States great and small and respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity that they intensify their struggle still further and unite their efforts against American-Soviet imperialism and collusion and their desire to impose their *diktat* here. That is in the higher interests of international peace and security, which are seriously threatened by the aggressive policy of the American-Soviet coalition. That is what is required for the lofty interests of the peoples who are fighting against imperialism, colonialism and reaction.

83. Many States have fought unceasingly to do away with the unprecedented anomaly which exists in this Organization as a result of the violation of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and the usurpation of its place here by a clique of renegades in the service of American imperialism. Nevertheless, that scandalous and intolerable situation continues today because of the hostile and aggressive policy of the United States against great socialist China and its manipulation of the United Nations.

84. At this session Albania and fourteen other countries have once again placed on the Assembly's agenda the question of restoring the lawful rights of the Peoples's Republic of China in the United Nations [A/8043 and Add.1 and 2]. We have done so not only because there is a flagrant and gross violation of the Charter, which affects the sovereign rights of a founding Member State of the United Nations and permanent member of the Security Council, but also because the elimination of this abnormal, unprecedented situation is an urgent necessity for the United Nations if it is desired to take steps towards its recovery and to put it in a position to accomplish its tasks under the Charter. It is quite clear that without the People's Republic of China, given its authority, its great international role and its tremendous potential, this Organization cannot be in a position to make an effective contribution to the settlement of the important problems of our time.

85. The People's Republic of China is a great and powerful socialist State that has had tremendous success in all areas and enjoys incomparable international prestige and authority. The dazzling victory of the great proletarian cultural revolution which thwarted the plots of the imperialists and revisionists and took control inside the Chinese citadel is a living testimony of the invincible force of the great Chinese people and guaranteed the great role which powerful socialist China now undeniably plays in the destinies of the peoples of the world.

86. The People's Republic of China has become today a great and impregnable fortress in the liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism, colonialism and reaction. It is the unshakable rampart of all progressive mankind.

87. We consider that the position taken by the General Assembly on this question will prove its determination both to reject the *diktat* which the two great imperialist Powers seek to exercise in the United Nations and to embark on a course in conformity with the aspirations of the peoples and the fundamental provisions of the Charter. We express the hope that the Governments of peace-loving States which constitute the majority here, aware of the serious situation in the United Nations, will have the courage to adopt the attitudes dictated by their convictions and the true interests of their countries and of the Organization itself.

88. The People's Republic of Albania has constantly pursued an independent revolutionary foreign policy in accordance with the higher interests of the building and defense of our socialist homeland as well as those of the great cause of the peoples who are fighting for their freedom, their independence and their sacred right freely to determine their own future.

89. The Albanian people have been able to defend their socialist homeland in every circumstance against all plots, threats and provocations of imperialists and revisionists. It is ever watchful and prepared at any moment to respond to anyone who dares to raise a hand against it.

90. The Albanian people, its party and its Government, have supported and will continue strongly to support the legitimate struggle of peace-loving peoples and countries against the aggressive policy of the two imperialist Powers, their colonialist collaborators and their lackeys of all kinds. We have always stood by and shall always stand by the brother peoples of Viet-Nam, Laos, Cambodia and the other peoples of Indo-China and Asia in their heroic struggle against the American aggressors and their allies of all kinds. We have supported and we shall continue unreservedly to support the legitimate fight of the fraternal Arab peoples against the Zionist aggressors and American and Soviet imperialists, who are mainly responsible for the present situation in the Middle East. We have vigorously supported the struggle of the peoples of European countries—the peoples of Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the other peoples of that continent as well as the peoples of other continents—against the policy of domination, oppression and exploitation of the two imperialist Powers and against their counter-revolutionary “holy alliance”.

91. We are firmly convinced that the peoples of the entire world, who are fighting for a just cause on the vast anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist front, in ever more resolute combat solidarity, will put down all plots, aggressive plans and aggressions, no matter who may be responsible for them, and will win their final victory over their common enemies.

92. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania, at this session of the General Assembly, guided by the Marxist-Leninist principles of our Socialist State, will continue, as in the past, together with other freedom-loving peoples to make its modest contribution to the cause of freedom, independence and genuine co-operation in friendship among all the people of the world.

93. Mr. EBAN (Israel): Mr. President, your country, Norway, has a warm place in Israel's heart. Our common sacrifice drew our peoples together in the darkness of the Nazi age, and friendship has lit up every road that we have trodden ever since. Your erudition and integrity enlarge the respect which your country's name evokes across the world. In carrying out your charge you have before you the recent example of your predecessor, Mrs. Angie Brooks-Randolph, who graced her Presidency with charm, originality and deep international convictions.

94. The twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly has been chosen as a commemorative occasion. What we need most is not a festive celebration but a lucid exercise in self-criticism. The United Nations has fallen on hard days. Its resonance is diminished and its flame is burning low. It exerts no more than a marginal influence on the main issues of conflict in our times, and the central currents of international thought and action flow outside its walls. There is a sharp paradox in that turn of fortune, for there has never been a greater objective need for a unitary framework of international relations to express the common interest of mankind. For the first time in history distance has become irrele-

vant, and all peoples are bound together in danger and opportunity. Thus, international institutions seem to be declining in the very conditions which logically favour their success. The United Nations should be asking itself with implacable candour: “what went wrong?”.

95. The trouble lies, of course, mainly in the discordant policies of the States which compose international society. But this does not absolve the Organization from the duty to analyse its own experience and to take a rational and effective view of its priorities and procedures in the coming years. This Organization is young in relation to the immensity of the vision which it serves. Yet the rhythm of change has been so intense that the world in which the United Nations was born now belongs to receding memory. There is urgent need for Governments to determine the place which the United Nations occupies in their policies, and for the United Nations itself to modernize its concepts, structures, and its methods of operation. Only thus will the gap between the brilliant hope and the harsh reality be reduced.

96. The main international preoccupation is now focussed on the region where the Arab and Israeli nations were born and in which they must forever live side by side. In the summer of 1967 the Security Council and the General Assembly were the inactive spectators of a war that they did nothing to prevent. In recent weeks, they have watched a Member State in the Middle East pass through its most destructive and agonizing ordeal. It may be that in its present strength and condition our Organization is unable to restrain violence and ensure security as its Charter envisaged. But it need not renounce its role as the central forum from which the policies of its Members may be communicated to the opinion of the world. In that spirit I come to this rostrum to state Israel's views on the tensions which convulse our region and hang heavy on the conscience and concern of all mankind.

97. The point of reference is still the unforgotten drama of 1967. Forty months have passed since a resolute attempt was made to bring about the destruction of Israel's peace, sovereignty and very life through the strangling grip of belligerency, blockade, encirclement and aggressive assault. Israel's policy is still dominated by the recollection of the brief moment when its extinction was a real and vivid prospect. The defeat of that attempt by its solitary effort and independent sacrifice is inscribed on Israel's unfailing memory. Beyond its place in Israel's history, that victory was a landmark in the human journey towards justice, law and peace. We still recall the relief and consolation which gripped the enlightened world when Israel tore the strangling fingers from its throat.

98. Israel remembers. It cannot forget; it cannot forget the horror from which it barely escaped or the sense of salvation which came from its successful resistance. From then until now our national policy has been inspired by two central purposes: to build a structure of permanent peace with the neighbouring States, if their policy makes that possible, and, in any case,

to avoid a return to the conditions of anarchy and vulnerability out of which the war exploded.

99. In its tense debates during 1967, the United Nations developed the contours of an international policy designed to meet the new conditions created by the 1967 war. It rejected all proposals for reproducing the situation which had led to one war and which, if renewed, would lead inevitably to another. It voted down five proposals for a return to the old armistice lines, and in November 1967 it called for the establishment of a just and lasting peace, based on the total renunciation of belligerency and war, the liquidation of maritime blockade and hostile acts, and the explicit recognition by the Arab States and Israel of each other's sovereignty, independence and national identity. It also called for the establishment of "secure and recognized boundaries". These have never existed in our region; they must be established by agreement for the first time.

100. The simple theme of this international policy was that the structure of peace should be built by agreement between the States of the Middle East. An international representative, held in universal trust, was appointed to assist the parties in the promotion of that agreement. Moreover, a cease-fire had been proposed by the Security Council and accepted by the parties on the morrow of the war. According to its terms, the cease-fire was to be unconditional, of indefinite duration, and could not be legitimately set aside before the attainment of permanent peace.

101. In its sessions since 1967 the General Assembly has reviewed successive attempts to bring about agreement on the establishment of a final peace. Now and then a prospect has glowed briefly, only to be extinguished almost before it could be discerned. But by the summer of this year the perils were great enough to compel new thinking and new effort on many sides. In March 1969 President Nasser had unilaterally repudiated his country's agreement to maintain the cease-fire. The resultant warfare across the Suez Canal was henceforward constant, destructive and of growing intensity. And it was achieving no purpose whatever. Attempts to bring about Israel's collapse through attrition had totally failed. Israel was aware of the loss and waste inflicted on it and, still more, on Egypt by the war. But neither the artillery assaults on Israel's forces from the south, nor terrorist attacks on helpless civilians from the north and east, nor the arrogant violence and piracy of Arab terrorists in countries remote from the conflict had prevented our national enterprise from going forward in swift growth. Above all, the attacks by regular armies and terrorist groups had not dislodged us from any point along the cease-fire lines which we were resolved and internationally entitled to hold until the attainment of peace. The war of attrition brought its authors neither victory nor honour. Indeed, it exposed the Arab States to tensions, frustrations and dangers far greater than those by which Israel was afflicted.

102. In this dilemma Arab policy faced two choices. It could acknowledge the futility of war, accept the

re-establishment of the cease-fire and embark on the negotiation of a final peace; or it could appeal to forces outside the region for help to continue and intensify hostilities. The first choice would have meant to work with Israel for the establishment of peace; the second meant the pursuit of Soviet aid for maintaining the war at a higher level of intensity. Alas, it is clear that in the early months of 1970 the second choice was taken.

103. Thereafter, the conflict was extended with every passing month beyond its regional context. It now took on a global dimension. A system of SAM2 missiles had been erected so that the artillery bombardment of Israeli forces could be carried out without fear of aerial response. The weapons were defensive only in the narrow tactical sense; they were geared to an offensive strategy, the elimination of the cease-fire and its replacement by a constant war of attrition. The missiles stand guard in order that the guns should be free to speak. When this strategy failed, through Israel's successful response, the more complex SAM3 missiles, this time manned by Soviet personnel, were introduced. And by early summer Soviet pilots were flying operational missions in the battle zone. Now, this was more ominous than anything that had gone on before. This aroused a world-wide concern. Nothing of the kind had happened anywhere since the end of the Second World War, apart from the unhappy participation of Soviet pilots in the bombardment of villages in Yemen in 1963. But Soviet involvement in the Suez Canal hostilities had far graver implications. It is bad enough that regional conflicts should rage unsolved through a rejection of the normal principles of cease-fire and negotiation. It is far worse when a great Power intervenes to aggravate a regional conflict, to widen its scope, to risk counteraction by other Powers and thus to extend the perils of a local war to all mankind. The Soviet intervention does not concern Israel alone. It has other aims. Its other aims are to win predominance in the Mediterranean; to outflank the European defence system from the south; to establish a large foreign army on African soil in contempt for the principle of African independence; and to bring about a general disturbance of the international equilibrium. Thus, President Nasser's repudiation of the cease-fire and the increasing scope of Soviet intervention have results which the world can ill afford.

104. It was in the light of those conditions that my Government studied the United States peace initiative in June and July 1970. We knew that some Arab States and all the Palestine terrorist organizations had rejected that proposal because it spoke of peace, to which they are in principle totally opposed. We knew that Egypt and Jordan had accompanied their acceptance of the initiative by a statement of terms and conditions incompatible with its principles and with its authors' stated intentions. There were other features of the proposal which raised difficulties for us within our parliamentary and democratic system. But we saw this initiative with all its defects and complexities as an opportunity to explore the conditions of a final peace. These considerations prevailed above all the others. And so, on 4 August, the Government of Israel determined and

formulated a policy to which it still adheres. We decided to designate a representative to discussions to be held under Ambassador Jarring's auspices with the United Arab Republic and Jordan.

105. We stated that:

“Israel's position in favour of a cease-fire on the basis of reciprocity on all fronts, including the Egyptian front, in accordance with the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions remains unchanged. On the basis of clarifications given by the United States Government in this matter, Israel is prepared to reply affirmatively to the United States proposal for a cease-fire for at least three months on the Egyptian front.”

We further agreed:

“to hold discussions under Ambassador Jarring's auspices within the framework of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) on the basis of the expression of readiness by the parties to carry out the Security Council's resolution in all its parts, in order to achieve an agreed and binding contractual peace agreement which would ensure:

“(a) Termination by Egypt and Israel of all claims or states of belligerency and respect and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of each other and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. Each of the parties to be responsible within its territory for the prevention of all hostile acts by regular military forces or paramilitary forces, including irregular forces, against the armed forces or against civilians living in the territory of the other party;

“(b) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict to secure, recognized and agreed boundaries to be determined in the peace agreements.”

That was the text to which we agreed.

106. And, finally, we made clear that:

“Israel will not claim the prior acceptance by the other party of her positions, as Israel does not accept in advance the positions of the other parties as communicated publicly or otherwise. Each party will be free to present its proposals on the matters under discussion.”

107. The cease-fire agreement, as members will see, held a central place in our response to the United States peace initiative. The United Arab Republic had limited its acceptance of the cease-fire to a period of ninety days. That restriction raised issues which would not have existed with comparable force in an unlimited cease-fire which would have brought the military phase of the conflict to a permanent end. Instead of this we now had an explicit prospect that after three months the United Arab Republic might regard the cease-fire

as having expired. And the futile but destructive war of attrition would be resumed. Since that was the United Arab Republic position, its implications had to be seriously weighed. We had to ask ourselves whether the short negotiating period would be devoted to a genuine quest for peace; or whether it would be used as a respite for the United Arab Republic, with Soviet aid, to improve its prospect for a military solution by a massive missile concentration which would be brought up without Israeli interference under cover of the cease-fire. In short, what were the ninety days designed to promote: an Egyptian-Israeli effort at peace, or a Soviet-Egyptian deployment for a more effective war?

108. Decisive reassurance on this question was found for us in that part of the American peace initiative which provided for a “standstill” in an agreed area on each side of the Suez Canal cease-fire line. The purpose was to stabilize the local military balance, so that our Governments could go forward in easy mind to negotiate without fear lest their security would be undermined during the talks. And the standstill, more than any other part of the United States peace initiative, supported our cautious hope that the United Arab Republic might be ready for an authentic peace effort, and not merely for a manoeuvre designed to prepare a new phase of war.

109. In the early days of August we were informed by the United States that the United Arab Republic, with the support of the Soviet Union, had given agreement and endorsement to the following provisions. This is the text of the standstill agreement:

“(a) Israel and the United Arab Republic will observe a cease-fire effective at 2200 hours GMT Friday 7 August;

“(b) Both sides will stop all incursions and all firing on the ground and in the air across the cease-fire lines;

“(c) Both sides will refrain from changing the military status quo within the zones extending 50 kilometres to the east and to the west of the cease-fire line. Neither side will introduce or construct any new military installations in these zones. Activities within the zones will be limited to the maintenance of existing installations at their present sites and positions”—the maintenance of existing installations at their present sites and positions—“and to the rotation and supply of forces presently within the zones;

“(d) For the purpose of verifying observance of the cease-fire, each side will rely on its own national means, including reconnaissance aircraft which will be free to operate without interference up to 10 kilometres from the cease-fire line on its own side of the line;

“(e) Each side may avail itself as appropriate of all United Nations machinery in reporting alleged violations to each other of the cease-fire and of the military standstill;

“(f) Both sides will abide by the Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War and will accept the assistance of the International Committee of the Red Cross in carrying out their obligations under that Convention.”

110. It was to this that we agreed. And I draw special attention to the phrases:

“Neither side will introduce or construct any new military installations in these zones. Activities within will be limited to the maintenance of existing installations at their present sites and positions.”

111. Not a single hour passed between Egypt's acceptance of that agreement and its violation of it. Within a few days those violations had been physically ascertained not only by Israel, but by the Government which sponsored the peace initiative. At the very time when the Israeli Cabinet was hopefully formulating its approach to the forthcoming peace talks, the missile build-up became conspicuously massive and intense. It is going forward to this very day. In the “standstill” area, which is fifty kilometres west of the Canal, but mostly within an area thirty kilometres of the Canal, at least twenty SAM2 and SAM3 batteries, many of them operational, have been introduced. Tens of additional missiles have been advanced into that zone. This has been made possible by Israel's observance of the cease-fire. Rarely has there been a more perfidious violation of an international agreement through the exploitation of the good faith and pacific intention of the other side. I have circulated to delegations this morning, a graphic representation comparing the position which should exist under the 7 August agreement with that existing a few days ago, a situation created by headlong violation.

112. I now come to analyse the implications of this development.

113. First, through Israel's acceptance of the cease-fire standstill agreement the United Arab Republic has achieved a substantial and illicit change of the military situation to its advantage.

114. Secondly, in these conditions Israel would be negotiating under the intimidating effects of a growing threat to its forces along the cease-fire line, and therefore to its national security.

115. Thirdly, there has been a collapse of confidence in the validity of Egypt's pledge. The proposed peace talks, after all, would be designed to produce an agreement, on the strength of which Israel would withdraw on the establishment of peace to secure, recognized and agreed boundaries which are not yet determined, but which would be determined in the peace negotiations. The object of the talks would be agreement. But what would be the worth or weight of a new agreement negotiated and concluded while an existing agreement is being torn cynically to shreds. Thus, the violation of the standstill agreement has cast an anticipatory shadow on the validity of any peace agreement that we hope to conclude. This is, in the

last resort, the gravest result of all. The question, what binding force will a peace agreement have, overshadows every other question affecting the Middle East in future.

116. Fourthly, the standstill agreement was not only accepted by the United Arab Republic; it was also endorsed by the Soviet Union, which, as I have said, mans many of the missile bases. Therefore, the violation of that agreement with Soviet acquiescence is a major international event. Its repercussions go far beyond the Middle East; they affect the crucial issues of peace and security in other continents of the world. They shed a disturbing light on Soviet policy everywhere. Member States in all continents would do well to take this to heart and mind.

117. In making a firm stand for the integrity of agreements we defend an international interest wider than our own. It is still our desire and policy to explore the terms of a final peace by discussions under Ambassador Jarring's auspices in accordance with our statement of 4 August. In a dialogue on peace we shall have much to say and to propose for the common benefit of our region. I must add, in frankness, that even when the violations are corrected, the memory of them will not swiftly vanish from our minds and hearts. A new burden has been laid on the eventual negotiating process which, at best, will be complex, arduous and long. When we reflect on our experience with the hopes and expectations of 1957 and with this latest incident, we become fortified in our resolve to insist that all peace engagements be direct, explicit, signed and sealed in the most precise contractual form. Israel is ready to resume discussions under Ambassador Jarring's auspices as soon as the violations are rectified and the situation prevailing on the day of the cease-fire restored.

118. The Egyptian violation of the cease-fire agreement is only one of the obstacles which now impede progress towards peace. Others have come into sharp relief during the hectic events of the past few days. The Palestinian Arabs on both sides of the Jordan are in urgent need of peace. They have been the primary victims of the hostile policies whereby neighbouring Arab States have for twenty-two years sought to prevent the establishment of peaceful and constructive relations between Israel and the Arab States. Palestinian Arabs, west of the river Jordan, are at this very time creating new processes of coexistence and commerce between themselves and the Israeli people. Their situation in recent days has been in sharp contrast with the immense havoc which came upon their kinsmen east of the Jordan in the recent fighting. No constructive interests of Palestinian Arabs can be served by the small gangs commanded by Arafat, Habash and others whose ideology consists of nothing except the prevention of peace between Israel and the Arab States. As we watched the torrents of shells, grenades and bullets pouring from and into streets and homes across the river Jordan last week, we could not fail to reflect what the fate of every Israeli home would be if our nation's security were not maintained and defended with the utmost tenacity and zeal.

119. Let us have a frank understanding of what every one of the Palestine terrorist organizations portends. There is no distinction between the means they use and the aims they seek. The means and the aims are equally to be condemned. What is the aim? The aim is to fulfil an exclusivist fantasy under which Israel would have no existence in the Middle East as a State embodying its specific Jewish heritage and its particular national and social vocation. Their doctrine is based on the wild absurdity that there can ever be a Middle East without a State of Israel at its heart and centre. They turn away in flight from the central truth that Israel is organic to the past, the present and the future of the Middle East. The Arab nation has a very large place in the Middle Eastern region, but it has no monopoly on the right to statehood, independence, sovereignty and specific national identity. The Middle East is a concept which cannot be exhaustively understood in Arab terms alone. In 1970 Israel's statehood is not something to be explained, defended, or submitted to approval or dissent. It is something to be proclaimed as an absolute and inexorable reality, deep-rooted and authentic, on a level of absolute equality with the statehood, sovereignty and national identity of any nation, great or small, old or young, represented in this hall. We do not seek what is called "recognition of Israel's right to exist", for that right is independent of any recognition of it. What we seek is a reciprocal recognition by the Arab States and Israel of each other's right to peaceful life and unreserved sovereignty. In denying this axiomatic right, the terrorist organizations commit the most disruptive heresy at work in the life of our age. There are now fourteen Arab sovereign States, with a population of a hundred million, an area of four million square miles, and unlimited wealth and opportunity. Facing them alone in the scales of equity is the small State of Israel. There is, therefore, only one nation which stands or falls in history by the way in which this conflict is resolved. By its solitude and uniqueness, Israel's secure existence is the overriding moral imperative in this dispute. International peace demands an equitable distribution not only of wealth and material resources but also of sovereignty and national freedom. To suggest a distribution whereby all Arabs must be sovereign everywhere and all Jews nowhere is to fall into an abyss of paradox and discrimination.

120. So much for the aims of the terrorist groups. The aim is politicicide—the murder of a state—and the method is piracy and murder. The moral quality of the struggle is illustrated by assaults on housewives in a supermarket, on students in a cafeteria, on humble citizens, Jews and Arabs, in crowded markets and bus stations, on innocent travellers in vulnerable civil aircraft. No other political movement in our days has chosen its victims so exclusively amongst defenceless, unarmed civilians in many lands. Therefore, it is a movement not of liberation but of enslavement. Its aim is not to win freedom for the Arab nation, whose freedom is amply and lavishly assured, but to liquidate the national liberation which another nation, the most ancient of nations, has already achieved. Such honourable words as "liberation", "resistance" and "commando" have no application—and have never

before been applied—to attempts to liquidate a lawful sovereignty, to compound the Nazi assault on Jewish survival and to wage a campaign of indiscriminate attack against civilians in the Middle East and elsewhere.

121. Having failed in their assaults on Israel, the Fatah organization, the "Palestine Liberation Organization" and other kindred groups have directed their main threat against the independence and sovereignty of Arab States. Early this year they were hard at work attempting to turn Lebanon away from its peaceful vocation and to subvert its specific national personality. Last week we saw the most recent of many attempts to bring about anarchy and disintegration in Jordan in order to shatter any hope of peace between Israel and the Arabs nations.

122. Arab Governments which are the victims of these acts are, ironically, often the sponsors of them. The terrorist groups do not spring out of the empty air. They do not work in a vacuum. They could not exist, still less function, without the shelter, support, endorsement, financial aid, arms, training facilities and territorial base supplied to them by sovereign Arab States. Nor could they endanger life and limb outside the Middle East if certain Governments, especially in Europe, did not grant them excessive indulgence and immunity. Surely the time has come for the world community to turn in wrath not only against the specific outrage of aerial piracy but also against the other activities of the terrorist groups. All these activities, without exception, violate the principles which the signatories of the Charter, including its Arab signatories, have pledged themselves to defend. Any action which aims to destroy or violate a legitimate sovereignty is a form of international hijacking. Therefore it is important that these acts be resisted. They were successfully resisted ten days ago by those who foiled the hijacking of an El Al aircraft by using righteous force against an odious pair of pirates. They were resisted by Jordan, which but for that resistance would have lost title to be regarded as a sovereign authority. The main adversaries of peace suffered another setback when the invasion of Jordan by regular armoured units of the Syrian Army was repelled. The Syrian invasion of Jordan was too brief for its full implications to be seized. Here we have a member of the Security Council violating an international frontier in order to impose its will and policy upon a neighbouring State. A Syrian representative at the United Nations, attempting publicly to justify this aggression, has taken refuge in a doctrine which denies the international character of boundaries between States of kindred cultures.

123. The General Assembly will recall that after the Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia two years ago Soviet representatives asserted that the boundaries between socialist States did not have a full international character, so that the unprovoked invasion of territory across them had a kind of domestic intimacy. Something of that kind was asserted by Syria last week. The doctrine is that, if two States have a similar ideology or language or national culture, it is not the business of the world community if one of them invades the other without provocation. There are dozens of

States represented here which would be well advised to reflect deeply on the consequences for them if a doctrine of "invasion through kinship" were condoned.

124. Israel followed recent events in Jordan with vigilance, restraint and a keen sense of the developing human tragedy. We could not have been indifferent to violent changes in the regional balance which would have put Israel's security in jeopardy. But it is for Arab Governments to determine their régimes and institutional structure. Israel will never move its forces in any cause except its own legitimate security. We hope that the scars of battle will be healed in Jordan and that a concerted humanitarian effort will be made to allay the vast suffering of which we have been the close witnesses in recent days. The trucks bearing medical aid dispatched by the Israeli authorities eastward across the Jordan illustrate how humane solidarities should prevail over political and military tensions. We hope that the Jordan Government will not make the error of encouraging or condoning activity by the terror groups against Israel across the cease-fire lines. This would be contrary to Jordan's international obligations, including the cease-fire, and would of course encounter Israel's firm resistance.

125. The capacity to repeat error is revealed in the communication which the Arab Governments and the terrorist organizations signed in Cairo yesterday. There is not in that document a single, peaceful, civilized, lawful word. The talk is not of peace but of victory over an enemy and the liberation of Israel, which means of course its extinction. That document violates the engagement which the United Arab Republic and Jordan made to Ambassador Jarring, promising to establish a just and lasting peace with Israel and to acknowledge its sovereignty and independence. The question is: which document commits the policy of those two States?

126. Many Members have spoken here about the necessity for international action against the hijacking of aircraft. In Israel's view an agenda item on that subject would only be of value if international law came out reinforced. It is not enough to exhort parties to adopt the Tokyo Convention<sup>8</sup> or a new Convention expressive of existing law and morality. We should recall that the co-operation and States in the struggle against piracy preceded all other developments in the realm of international law. The pirate was regarded as the enemy of the human race, *hostis humani generis*. He was an outlaw from human society and every nation had the right and duty to apprehend and punish him with full vigour. Over a century ago, an outstanding maritime judge in Britain, Lord Stowell, expressed the current contemporary law and morality as follows:

"With professed pirates there is no state of peace. They are the enemies of every country and at all times and therefore are universally subject to the extreme rights of war."

127. It follows that aerial piracy, which involves even more horror and peril than piracy at sea, should never

<sup>8</sup> Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963.

be indulged, condoned, or, above all, rewarded. A firm attempt should be made to secure the unconditional release of all captives. Physical methods of prevention should be adopted without limitation or reserve. What a victory would have been won for international order if all the aircraft assaulted on 6 September had been defended as effectively as was the El Al airliner and if all the pirates had met a similar fate. But responsibility does not lie on the terrorists alone. Some Arab Governments have given practical and moral support to successful pirates. Thus, in July 1970, we find President Nasser of Egypt himself extending a welcome to men who had hijacked a Greek aircraft and to criminals released from a prison to which Greek law had properly consigned them. At meetings last year of the United Nations General Assembly and the Organization of African Unity, Arab delegations prevented the unanimous adoption of resolutions which would strongly have condemned hijackers and required firm measures to insure their extradition and punishment. When an Arab pirate lands in certain Arab countries, he is more likely to get fuel facilities, praise and reward than arrest and punishment. The recent experience and the present debate can only be useful if condemnation is unequivocal and even then only if it leads to practical measures. I have in mind that the General Assembly might endorse the proposition which was recently made by the United States in the International Civil Aviation Organization, calling for joint international action "to suspend all international civil air transport services to and from any State which, after the unlawful seizure of an aircraft, detains passengers, crew and aircraft contrary to the Tokyo Convention (including the destruction of such aircraft) or any State which fails to extradite or prosecute persons responsible for such acts of unlawful seizure". Since then we have seen other drafts. The point is that only measures which lead to practical and automatic action have validity.

128. The avoidance of reward for hijackers sometimes requires the maintenance of strong nerves. At an early stage in the recent episode there was a precipitate tendency to offer the release of convicted hijackers as a recompense for the liberation of innocent hostages. This would have saved present victims but it would have endangered other travellers on whom the released hijackers would try their skill again. It is satisfactory that this course has not been followed, and that the four countries whose aircraft or citizens had been kidnapped accepted the principle advocated by the United Kingdom and the United States, according to which solidarity should be maintained and each airline and Government would be responsible for all passengers without distinction. Faced by attitudes of principle and strengthening nerves, the hijackers understood the uselessness of their victory and gave up its fruits to the Jordanian Government and the Egyptian Embassy, which we hope will act with correct promptitude.

129. But the release of hostages who were wantonly submitted to hardship and peril should not dull the edge of international vigilance. Israel proposes international action along four lines:

(a) To increase security measures at airports and in aircraft. Israel is prepared to co-operate by sharing the knowledge and experience that it has accumulated in this sphere;

(b) To call upon The Hague Conference that will convene in December 1970 to adopt the proposed convention, and to strengthen it so that the illegal capture of an aircraft, its passengers and crew will be considered an international crime calling for maximum punishment;

(c) To establish sanctions against States that aid or provide asylum to hijackers or criminals who attack aircraft. These sanctions should include: cessation of aerial communications with the States which aid hijackers, and withholding of services from the national carrier of a State that aids or provides asylum to those who hijack or attack aircraft;

(d) To call for the establishment of a special body that will deal continuously with acts of hijacking or attacks on the international level.

130. But what about the larger issue of peace? Before we fall into despair let us recall that there are no irreconcilable conflicts in history. The Arab-Israeli conflict, for all its rhetorical bitterness, has had no results comparable in absolute or relative terms with the carnage and mass suffering of many other wars.

131. But peace has too often been considered by international bodies in semantic formal terms, and too little in terms of human realities. It is not enough that Egypt, Israel, Lebanon and Jordan should agree on a form of words; such agreement may even be an illusion if it conceals a wide gap in intention and interpretation. What is needed most is that they, and all concerned with their deeper interests, should have a clear vision of what our region would look like and how its people would live once hostility was replaced by peace. The most conclusive evidence, the most conclusive hallmark of peace is the open frontier. A peaceful Middle East is a Middle East in which a man would be able to travel by road and rail from Cairo through Israel to Beirut and Amman, in which Egyptian civil aircraft could traverse Israel eastward while Israeli shipping passed unimpeded through the Suez Canal. Israeli and Arab civil aircraft would land in Cairo, Lod and Amman. Railways for the transportation of heavy goods would pass from the Suez area through Kantarah, across the Israeli coast northward. The ports of Eilat and Aqaba would plan their expansion and development in neighbourly co-ordination. This is not a dream. This summer 55,000 Arabs from neighbouring countries visited their relatives west of the Jordan. Thousands passed from Israel and the west bank across the Jordan to remote parts of the Arab world. This year nearly half a million tourists came to Israel and an approximately similar number to Egypt. Under conditions of normality and peace, the ancient splendours and the modern amenities of our countries would attract millions more, who by their very pilgrimage would join us closer to them and to each other.

132. In the last resort, a nation's strength and greatness will be measured not by the number of its missiles but by the quality of its scholars, scientists and technicians. Why should not Israeli and Arab doctors and scientists co-operate in the common quest for learning, visit each other's institutions, lecture to each other's students, meet face to face the opportunities and the ills which are common to our region? It was no credit to the Middle East in recent weeks when cholera disease broke out in many parts and when the appeal of the Israeli Minister of Health for co-operation with his colleagues in neighbouring countries went unheeded.

133. And the senselessness and tragedy of war are most vividly expressed in the inexcusable waste of resources. In twenty-two years the Arab States and Israel have spent more than \$20,000 million for military purposes. If one-tenth of that sum had been invested in a refugee solution, the problem would have been solved long ago in a way that would have promoted economic progress in all the countries in which the resettlement was made.

134. At the present time Egypt and Israel are spending \$2,000 million every year for military purposes.

135. It would be a delusion to believe that a formal peace agreement would be followed by a relaxation of vigilance or an abandonment of security; but there would certainly be a more rational distribution between the security and the economic needs of the signatory countries.

136. Every year the population of the leading Arab State grows by 1 million, that is to say, by a number greater than that of those in refugee camps. In conditions of war and conflict, neither the refugee problem nor the problems of increased populations can be solved, since there is no rational use of resources for human needs. My point is that peace is not a word, it is not a juridical phrase; it is a total revolution in the meaning, style and content of life. It is not a documentary device; it is a human condition, the like of which our generation in the Middle East has never known.

137. The question is whether Arab leadership can break loose from an obsolete routine of conflict in order to explore this prospect. It is in peace and not in violence that the Palestinian Arabs will find their true destiny. For in conditions of peace Israel's eastern neighbour would be an Arab State, a majority of whose population would be composed of Palestinian Arabs, and a majority of all the Palestinian Arabs would be citizens of that State. In other words, peace settles the problem of self-determination.

138. What I have said has always been true of the Kingdom of Jordan, whose structure, name and régime were determined not by Israel but by its Arab citizens. But most of them are Palestinian Arab citizens. Wherever the boundary is determined in the peace agreement the Palestinian Arabs on both sides of the Jordan will find a better future than that which Arafat and Habash and the hijackers can offer them.

139. There will always be a sizable Palestine Arab community in Israel. But this will have no negative significance when close co-operation across an open frontier exists between Israel and its eastern neighbour. The original former Palestine area—the Mandated area—on both sides of the Jordan will accommodate two States, Israel and an Arab State, while the area regains its natural economic unity and advances towards new forms of integration. That, at any rate, is what Israel means by peace. If we have a clear vision of our aims, it will not be difficult to work backwards from the desired result towards the process that leads towards it.

140. In the territorial negotiation, Israel's aim will be the determination of new, secure, agreed boundaries, offering a firmer security than the old armistice lines could ever provide. In short, there are no solutions without peace, and there are no problems which peace cannot resolve.

141. The deep humane issues which preoccupy Israel are not only those which revolve around the Middle Eastern conflict. Our Jewish destiny and responsibility inspire our concern for the plight of small Jewish minorities still lingering in Arab lands, held as hostages, forbidden to depart, discriminated against, humiliated, their property confiscated, their communal and cultural life paralysed. The hard facts are now well known and there has been a broad international echo in recent years. Yet the suffering and misery continue and in some countries have become more intense. We therefore welcome the recent reiteration by the Secretary-General, in his address on 15 June to the Royal Commonwealth Society in London, of his call for the evacuation of Jews from Arab countries and of the conviction, expressed in the introduction to his report to last year's session of the General Assembly,<sup>9</sup> that the United Nations has a moral obligation to act for their rescue. I hope that States Members of the United Nations will join the call to save these doomed communities.

142. Of very deep concern to enlightened world opinion is the grave situation of Jews in the Soviet Union. Year after year, the representatives of Israel and other Member States have raised their voices against the discrimination to which Soviet Jews are subjected, in particular the denial of the right of those who desire to join their kinsmen in Israel. In recent years ominous anti-Semitic propaganda in the Soviet Union has been intensified under the cloak of a campaign against Zionism, which is the Jewish people's liberation movement. Thousands of slanderous articles and documents, reminiscent of mediaeval times, have been circulated by the information media controlled by the Soviet authorities.

143. The plight of Jews in the USSR is dramatically illustrated by the appeals for permission to leave for Israel which Jews from all parts of the Soviet Union addressed to Heads of the Soviet Government, to the Government of Israel, to the Secretary-General of the

United Nations and to others. Those appeals, giving the full names and the addresses of the signatories, have been published in the international press; they speak movingly of the suffering of separated families and of their longing to unite their lot with the mainstream of the Jewish people. Some of the signatories have been arrested; their only crime is a desire to emigrate to Israel, which does not infringe any Soviet law. Indeed, Prime Minister Kosygin made a public statement in December 1966 promising that no obstacles would be placed in the way of Soviet Jews who wish to be united with their families in Israel.

144. Humanity and justice call upon the Soviet Government to recognize the human rights of its Jewish citizens and to permit them freely to exercise those rights.

145. In conclusion, let me recall that much of the work of the United Nations in its first twenty-five years has revolved around this modern encounter between the national revolutions of Israel in its small State and of the Arab nation in its expanse of multiple sovereignty. Whether the anniversary year will open a better act in the drama depends less on the General Assembly's debates than on the initiatives and decisions of Middle Eastern Governments. Israel will maintain the policy on which it decided on 4 August and reiterated on 6 September. It will fulfil its special role in the advancement of developing countries through which it has already offered training and development techniques to 12,000 future leaders of emergent societies in eighty lands. It will raise its voice and hand for the equality of nations and against discrimination and the remnants of colonialism. Above all, it will keep its mind and heart open to the prospect of a negotiated peace. Its people has the strength, the tenacity and the will to withstand the violent forces which assail its life and threaten its future. But its deepest aspiration is to deploy its energies in the service of a peaceful order of relations in the Middle East.

146. The key to that future lies in a negotiation explicitly directed to the establishment of peace, and the key is now in Arab, and particularly in Egyptian, hands. It can be opened by restoring the original cease-fire situation and by treading the road of negotiation. I am prepared to use my presence here for talks with heads of Arab delegations on the establishment of peace and on the creation of an atmosphere and conditions in which a fruitful negotiation can take place. There is no rational or defensible reason for refusing such an opportunity. We do the United Nations no service if we confine ourselves to public debate and neglect the normal contacts without which no international problem has ever been or will ever be resolved.

147. Mankind may either have a peaceful future or no future at all. Our 126 Governments will all have a share in deciding how the choice is made. If we can recapture the youthful spirit which moved the United Nations twenty-five years ago, we may yet convert past dreams into reality and present disappointments into enduring hopes.

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A.*

148. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United Arab Republic who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

149. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (United Arab Republic): Mr. President, although this is the first time my delegation has spoken from this rostrum at this session, you will understand that the expression of our pleasure at seeing you as President of the Assembly will have to be as short as possible, pending, I hope, another opportunity.

150. Mr. President, before I exercise my right of reply, I hope that you will allow me to exercise my right of approval. I do approve fully of what Mr. Eban said when he began speaking here. This Assembly should not be the occasion of a festive celebration of the passing of twenty-five years of its life. It should be an Assembly occupied with self-examination and ending, I hope, with a serious reaffirmation of the basic principles upon which the United Nations was established, and a firm rededication to the strict observance of these principles by which we have undertaken to live.

151. The principle is simply that war should not be allowed to pay, that invasion and occupation of other lands cannot be allowed to give dividends in realization of political ambitions. This Assembly, representing as it does the conscience of man, must seek to see how it can implement its resolutions and resent forcefully their flouting by States which seek, and are indeed allowed, to remain members of the Assembly. That is the point on which I agree—that we should not occupy ourselves with festivities when the real foundations of the Assembly are threatened.

152. There is a second point on which I also agree with Mr. Eban. He mentioned this point today, but he referred to it in better language and with more eloquence in an appearance on NBC television when he was speaking about the impossibility of talking of peace, of negotiating, when someone's fingers are at one's throat. "When someone has just taken my wallet", he said, "and refuses to bring it back, how can I be with him in the same room?"

153. I beg permission to borrow this beautiful language; I beg permission to ponder this beautiful, important thought and to reconsider within its meaning all positions taken. Indeed, how can any nation try to enter into any kind of an endeavour for peace when one third of its territory is occupied forcefully by an army which is not only refusing to leave the occupied lands but is seeking the freedom to invade, without hindrance, the parts yet unoccupied. That is the second point on which I am in agreement, and I am persuaded to give it further thought.

154. But there are, unfortunately, other points on which I do not agree. The first point concerns the Security Council cease-fire resolution which was explained here as a resolution of the Council expressing its will by ordering an indefinite cease-fire on the part of those who are occupying another country and on the part of those countrymen who should try, and cer-

tainly would try, by firing—not by a cease-fire—to dislodge that occupation.

155. I am sure that there is not one Member State, among the States gathered here, which would accept having the United Nations Security Council resolve that three Member States should be occupied indefinitely, without putting an end to it or connecting it to something else. I do not accept, of course, that that was the wish of the Security Council when, in June 1967, it ordered the cease-fire.

156. Anyone who does not have the short memory which Mr. Eban thinks we all have will know that that resolution was in the form of an introduction to, was really the first part of, the second resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)], by which the withdrawal of the invading forces of Israel was demanded. If not, I cannot see the United Nations or the Security Council ordering, in fact, not only condoning but ordering, the continued occupation by a Member State of the United Nations of other countries, also Members, until—and we must put in the word "until"—it desires to end the occupation by itself.

157. With regard to the second cease-fire, the one proposed by the United States Government for 90 days, of which about two thirds has now vanished, on the first day of the cease-fire, it so happened—we are not clever but it so happened—that we had 40 newspapermen in Suez.

158. It so happened that they all saw all kinds of planes coming from Israel and flying over Egyptian territory. That was the first violation of the cease-fire. Reported to the United States, it was confirmed, as indeed the United States later confirmed many violations—not only violations of our air space but violations on the ground in the so-called Bar Lev Line, which is in our territory.

159. It is interesting also to note here that in making that announcement the United States Government said that the cameras in its aeroplanes or satellites were so slanted that they covered only the land of Egypt and a very narrow strip of land of the occupied Egyptian territory. I do not want to go into this now, but I would just ask why, if you are going to be an arbiter of a cease-fire, you slant your camera and therefore, later, slant your information.

160. But what are the Israelis seeking by protesting against these missiles? These missiles are admittedly—and everyone knows this—defensive. When missiles are on guard until guns can speak, the guns can speak only to the invading aeroplanes, Phantoms from Israel flying over our territory, flying, ironically enough, from other parts of our territory occupied by Israel.

161. The freedom that I hope we are denying Israel, then, is the freedom to murder the workers in the cities of Suez, Ismailia, Port Said and other places; the freedom to carry out more murders, like those of the workers at Abujabal and the children in the school of Bahr

El-Bakar, or even to attack the all-American school at Ma'adi, near Cairo, which scarcely escaped the bombardment by Israeli Phantom planes.

162. Of course, the aim of all this is not freedom of airspace; it is not even the freedom to murder or kill. I do not think that that is the ultimate aim. It is the freedom to intimidate and dictate. It is the freedom to do away with all the principles of the United Nations Charter and to return to the time when, as a conqueror, you could make your vanquished victim accept your *diktat*. That is what is meant by freedom of the American-supplied Phantoms and other weapons of an offensive and destructive nature in the hands of the Israeli armed forces. We are sorry; we cannot allow Israeli or Zionist policy this freedom to intimidate and to dictate.

163. Concerning cease-fire violations there are many things to be said both on our part and on theirs. I am not saying them, however, because I am not going to be led into the trap of thinking that these cease-fire violations, or even the cease-fire itself, are of any importance in the context of the desire, or lack of it, on the part of the Zionist Israeli Government to enter into any kind of talks leading to the implementation of United Nations resolutions and, finally, to the great danger of confronting peace. This is not empty talk; these are not empty words.

164. One of the basic laws of the State of Israel is a law called, in short, the Status Law. Under this law the central task of the Zionist movement and the State of Israel in our time is to gather in all the Jews. It is, then, in the basic laws of Israel that the present population, which amounts to some 2 million, must be augmented seven-fold in order to gather in all the Jews of the world, whether or not they want to be gathered in.

165. To expand the population seven-fold it would, I think, also be necessary to expand your territory seven-fold, or something like that, or, if not, to ask for open borders so that your economic expansion could do what your soldiers would not be called upon to do. That is a fact. It stands unanswered. The real answer is to repudiate this aggressive law concerning the gathering in of all the Jews of the world.

166. As I have repeated, and I have no fear of being branded a hypocrite, we stand against this law because it amounts to actual and potential physical aggression against the Arabs and moral aggression against those Jews who are not Israelis. It is a stumbling-block because peace means ending the expansion of the borders of Israel; it means an end to the successive maps; the one showing the borders of the 1947 war, the one showing the borders of the 1949 war, the one showing the borders of the 1967 war, the one showing the borders as they are now, and the mysterious, unknown map which is somewhere, perhaps in this country, showing the borders Israel would accept as a reward for its war of 1967.

167. We have again heard loud and clear—and I think it should put a final note to all this talk about the possi-

bility of arranging any implementation of the United Nations resolution—that Israel will never go back to the lines it violated in 1967. Israel, then, is never going to implement that resolution and it is never going to uphold the principle that territories cannot be acquired as a result of force.

168. Mr. Eban says that he is willing gracefully to use his time here to enter into discussions for peace. I do not know if it is for me to tell him that, as a designated representative of his country, the way to do that is to go and see Mr. Jarring. Mr. Jarring is here, in his office. Many representatives have spoken of him with great admiration. I admire him too. My greatest reason for admiration is that here he stays alone in that room and sees me and my friend from Jordan, but he is unable to get anywhere because his path is blocked.

169. So, the graceful suggestion just made can be put into effect at once by Mr. Eban going to Mr. Jarring, who is, I think, in this building, and reasserting what they said in reply to the United States initiative without attaching the many provisos attached, even in this speech, namely, that his Government accepts and is ready to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967). His implied—and, I am sure, unacceptable, not to say insulting—suggestion that the Assembly refused repeatedly in 1967 to accept that an invading force from a country must withdraw to the line of invasion, is of course totally untrue. And I do not need to tell Members that, because they are all going to resent it of course. What the United Nations tried to do in 1967 was to find a solution to two problems: one, the invasion of 1967, and the other, the Palestine problem of 1947. This was a praiseworthy, laudable action. But where are we now?

170. After three years we find not only that the one problem has not been solved, but that the other, the more recent one, has been frozen, and people now begin to speak about the borders, or to imply that people on both sides of Jordan—the Palestinians, the people of two states—are going to live better than they are living now under Arafat, or under other so-called "terrorist groups".

171. Speaking about this terrorism, and this will be my last point, I have two words to say. In the first place, it was not long ago that Mr. Eban had among his colleagues a man who was branded a terrorist by every paper in the world—Mr. Begin. It is not long since the Irish and other people fighting for their freedom were called terrorists. At this moment, freedom fighters trying to liberate their homeland in Rhodesia are branded as terrorists. Sometimes we shy away from this word. I have no qualms about adopting it. If we cannot get our rights by law, what is wrong with terror? But I am not saying that this is the policy of these people. They are trying to get their rights which were given to them by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

172. I go back to the first point of agreement with Mr. Eban when I said that this Assembly must re-

examine itself, must see why, year after year, it has allowed a resolution drafted and supported by two permanent members of the Security Council—the United Kingdom and the United States in the beginning and in the end, I think, only the United States—to be left to gather dust on the shelves of the United Nations; we have more than 22 resolutions expressing the will of this Assembly and of the generation that has lived on this earth since the tragedy of 1947 that these Palestinians should have the choice granted to them by resolution 181(II) adopted in 1947, of returning to and regaining their homes or of receiving compensation. Nothing has been done about that. Now, if people, despairing of any solution under the law try to obtain their liberation by force, I do not know what we can tell them. The only way to dissuade anyone from violence is to show him that there is a means under the law. We are not doing this. We are not implementing our resolution. We are partly responsible for the despair generating desperate acts.

173. The Palestinians, like many of those in the countries represented here, and in whose struggle I would share, are trying to gain their statehood. Not only that; they are trying to reaffirm their status as a people, which has been denied to them by none other than the Prime Minister of Israel last year.

174. Now we want to end this situation. We have expressed our will to seek solutions to all the problems of the area. We made only one condition—which we make again—namely, that this solution must be sought under the auspices of this Organization, implementing the wishes of you, the Members of this Assembly. And we are willing to do so now, even knowing that people who go to court sometimes receive a verdict which they feel is not correct, but still think that justly it can be implemented. They must somehow bow to the will of the law because they have given this Assembly some of their sovereignty when they signed the Charter. Therefore, we have been willing, and are still willing, to seek any solution, provided it is under the umbrella of this Organization and not disloyal to the basic principles of its Charter. To be very candid, it cannot flout the principle that territories cannot be acquired by force.

175. As for the Palestinians, we ask for them what you are asking for the people of Namibia, what you are asking for the people of Rhodesia, what I hope you will ask, permanently and with tenacity, for every people of the world—their right to their status as a people and to all the rights given to them by the Charter.

176. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Saudi Arabia to exercise his right of reply.

177. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, very succinctly, I will say that we should congratulate ourselves on having you as our President.

178. Why did I take the floor for a right of reply when someone might say: "Saudi Arabia was not mentioned by Mr. Eban." It is very clear that the tiny State, the weak State of Israel—I say "weak" and

I shall explain why it is weak—is pinned in a struggle against a gigantic mass of Arab States numbering 14, with an area of 4 million square miles, with illimitable resources, natural resources, human resources. Why should they pit themselves against that small State of Israel, whose people were persecuted in Europe for generations? The latest persecution was that by Nazi Germany.

179. Why should the Arab nations object to its survival? Is it because Israel is Jewish? We, the Arabs, have the same God as the Jews, whether we be Moslem or Christian, and the same prophets. Why has this struggle lasted now for 23 years? And it may go on for another quarter of a century. God forbid that it does, because it might drag the whole world into a global conflict.

180. The answer to the question why the Arab world is against this tiny State of Israel can be found in history. Forget that we are Arabs. We are the indigenous people of the Middle East. We have witnessed many invasions. I would not go back to the time when Egypt was Hamite; the Pharaohs occupied the land; our brothers of today, their ancestors the Iranians, occupied that land. I would not talk of the Assyrians and the Babylonians, because they were Semites. Then came Alexander the Great, then the Romans, then the Byzantines, then the crusaders, then none other than our Turkish brothers—who are not Semites, then the British and the French, and now the Zionists, who are of European origin.

181. Many of the people of Palestine—not only the Jews—remaining after the Diaspora of Roman days became part and parcel of the ethnology of that country. In fact, many of the Byzantines who lived there were Arabized. Many of the Jews became Christians or Moslems, and many Christians became Moslems. But the indigenous population has been there since time immemorial. And the Zionists who occupied that land are a foreign element in our midst just as the Greeks were a foreign element, as the Romans were a foreign element, as the Byzantines were a foreign element. And none other than the Turks were a foreign element in our midst. And later the French and the British, as Mandatory Powers, were foreign elements in our midst. And now the Arab world considers European Zionism a foreign element in its midst, but not because it is Jewish. A foreign element forms an abscess; it always forms an abscess in the body politic and body social of any region, for that matter.

182. It is not because we want to fight the Jews. We are fighting a European intrusion in our midst—a modern form of colonialism.

183. Mr. Eban spoke as if the whole question would be resolved if two or three States at war with Israel were to sit down with him and talk peace. How could it be resolved? These Arab Governments will take it upon themselves either to crush the Palestinians or to persuade the Palestinians to ask for a solution that would preserve their right to self-determination. Mr.

Eban spoke of the youthful days of the Charter. As you may well know, Mr. President, I was present during the partition of Palestine. The Charter betrayed the indigenous people of Palestine. Or did it really betray them? No, the Charter did not betray. It is those who twisted the Charter the way they wanted who betrayed the people by the majority that was gathered laboriously. I am not going into details. The British were a Mandatory Power and they were supposed to prepare the Palestinians for self-rule. When the British went bankrupt after the Second World War they threw this question into the lap of the United Nations. And anything built on a false foundation is bound to topple. The Charter speaks of self-determination. Self-determination was cast by the wayside. The people, the Member States of those days, under pressure—and I shall not go into details regarding that pressure—were made to partition Palestine.

184. Therefore, the people of Palestine consider themselves betrayed by those who voted for partition, without exception. And since this Organization goes by the rule of majority, they consider that they were betrayed by the United Nations and that is why they do not care for the United Nations any more.

185. Before the war of 1967—in fact, two years before, in 1965 and also in 1966—I warned the Security Council that the Palestinians were slipping from the hands of Arab Governments and not to expect that Arab Governments could prevail on the people of Palestine. The record stands. They said Baroody was dramatizing the situation—exaggerating. But my assessment was based on my annual trips to the area and meetings with the ultra-conservative elements of the Palestine people, as well as the extremists. Perhaps they had in mind different methods for retrieving their homeland, but they were all agreed that they would fight to the finish and they were organizing inside every Arab State—not the old fogies of my generation but the young, the youth of between 15 and 25.

186. They have taken matters into their hands, and I, who have come only recently from the Arab world, want to tell Mr. Eban, or if he has gone to lunch he might be told, that the Palestinians, rightly or wrongly, would rationalize it as a patriotic act if they shot me, Mr. El-Zayyat, Mr. El-Farra, all the ambassadors here, and possibly members of our Governments, if we arrogated to ourselves the responsibility of finding a solution to which they did not consent.

187. Let this be understood once and for all by the United Nations.

188. Oh, it is a *fait accompli*; there is a State called Israel. I feel sorry for the innocent people who live in Israel, the Jews mostly—we do not feel sorry for ourselves anymore—because they are going to pay a stiff price, and I would be the first to deplore it. May I not live to see the stiff price that will be paid by the innocent, whether they are Jews or gentiles, in the area. The creation of Israel in our midst was a mistake. It introduced a foreign element which is causing an abscess, and an abscess means a fever, and

a fever will not subside unless a solution is arrived at for that abscess. Squeeze the pus—of course, this is an analogy. Far be it from me, a man who has been associated with the United Nations for a quarter of a century, to recommend force. But we have to face the facts.

189. Reference has been made by several colleagues, and also the other day by Lord Home, quoting our Secretary-General, to the law of the jungle, that certain things that were happening in the Middle East reminded one of the law of the jungle. The law of the jungle is more humane than the law of certain allegedly civilized people. When a lion in the jungle is hungry, he kills in order to eat. It could be a deer that he kills. And when the lion is satisfied, the herd of deer, through its herd instinct, will feel that there is no longer any danger since the lion has been satiated. But those self-righteous civilized people, or who at least think they are civilized, take exception to the hijacking of planes by Palestinians, but they hijack colonies. That was the civilized world. They hijacked a whole people, not by putting them in planes, but by having them driven out of their homeland. They speak of medieval barbarism. My part of the world was very enlightened in the medieval days. At least we displayed chivalry to those Europeans who made war during the time of the crusades. It is in the books of the West. When Richard the Lion Hearted was imprisoned twice by Saladin, twice, because of our tradition, Richard the Lion Hearted was released on oath that he would not make war against his captor. What happened? The war continued. The crusaders came in waves. The pledge was not worth anything at all. And those who are descended from such people speak of medieval barbarity. They were the barbarians, and they rationalize barbarism today by single acts which we all decry but which some people who have been suppressed are forced to adopt.

190. What about those who bombed the King David Hotel? Were they Arabs? What about those who hanged British soldiers during the British Mandate? What about the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Haganah that massacred Arabs, and sometimes in turn were massacred by Arab gangs? What about those who abducted and kidnapped Eichmann from a State that gave the Jews a haven, Argentina? What about those who slew Count Bernadotte? What about those who until recently stated that there was no Palestinian people? They said that the Palestinian people did not exist. Those are the “civilized” people with whom we have to contend.

191. The hour is late, but after all this is a meeting of the General Assembly and we are here to work. I might say that the rebuttal to Mr. Eban's argument, and to his suave manner, should have perhaps elicited a similar suave manner on my part. We have no malice toward anyone, including the Jews and the Zionists, if they leave us alone. But let it be noted from this rostrum, once and for all, that the solution of the Palestine question is not any longer in the hands of the Arab States. The Arab States have been confronted with an upheaval which they would have liked to chan-

nel into fields to achieve beneficial results, such as the economic and social fields. Now they have to face revolution by the people. Not accelerated evolution, not by the people of my age—I am for accelerated evolution—but by the populace. And I feel sorry for the Jews. I know many of them very well and in the Arab world my best friends were Jews. The Zionists are creating a world Jewish problem for them. Of 16 million Jews only perhaps 1 million are political Zionists. Here in the United Nations it is my duty to draw the attention of the Jews and Gentiles alike to the fact that if the Zionists do not stop, they may involve us in a global conflict.

192. Then innocent Jews outside the Holy Land of Palestine will be made to pay a stiff price. It has happened in Europe, even before Hitler; it can happen again. So let the warning from this rostrum be heeded that there is a Palestinian people that has to be satisfied. A solution to the problem does not depend on talks with Mr. Jarring or the Secretary-General or the Pope or the King of Saudi Arabia or Mr. Nasser or any other person who may perhaps be thought of as exercising a benign influence on world peace.

193. The Palestinians may suffer from a psychosis. All patriotism is a psychosis. What is Zionism but a psychosis? The Zionists think that God gave them title deed to Palestine. That is a psychosis. As I have said time and again, Judaism, which is a noble religion, has been used as a motivation for political and economic ends. Let the Jews of the world beware. If they do not restrain the Zionists, they will drag them into the pit that the gentiles—not those in my part of the world, for we still have chivalry, but the gentiles outside the Arab world—will dig for them. They will drive them into the pit. It is in our tradition to love the stranger but not to accept his domination. When we are weak we lie low, but time has always been on the side of the weak if his cause is just.

194. Mr. President, you have been a statesman for the past 25 years. I believe that perhaps I have taken advantage of your kindness in asking to be allowed to speak at such a late hour. However, if such a warning as mine were not sounded, I should be considered remiss. There will be no peace in the Middle East unless the people of Palestine, who are the core of the problem, are satisfied.

*The meeting rose at 2.25 p.m.*