

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



COMMEMORATIVE SESSION  
14 to 24 October 1970\*

1870th  
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 16 October 1970,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

### Agenda item 21 :

Page

Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations ( <i>continued</i> )	
Speech by the Honourable Gehendra Bahadur Rajbhandary, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Palace Affairs of Nepal	1
Speech by Mr. Mansur Rashid Kikhia, Under-Secretary of State of the Ministry of Unity and Foreign Affairs and Special Envoy of the President of the Revolutionary Command Council of the Libyan Arab Republic	3
Speech by Mr. Evariste Loliki, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation and Special Envoy of the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo	6
Statement by the representative of the United States of America	9
Statement by the representative of Israel	10
Statement by the representative of the United Arab Republic	12
Statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia	13

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

## AGENDA ITEM 21

### Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Palace Affairs of Nepal, His Excellency the Honourable Gehendra Bahadur Rajbhandary.

2. Mr. RAJBHANDARY: I should like to convey the greetings and best wishes of my Sovereign, His Majesty King Mahendra, for the success of the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly.

3. Allow me to extend to you, Mr. President, the warm congratulations of the Nepalese delegation on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly. We honour you as the representative of a country which gave the United Nations its first Secretary-General, and as a scholar-diplomat who has personally contributed so much to our knowledge and understanding of the Charter. In this anniversary session the General Assembly could not have elected a President with better qualifications.

4. I wish also to pay our tribute to Secretary-General Thant. His constant search for world peace and devotion to the principles and purposes of the United Nations have been an unfailing source of inspiration to my Government.

\* The 1865th to 1870th, 1872nd to 1879th and 1881st to 1883rd meetings contain the speeches made during the twenty-fifth anniversary commemorative session.

5. Five weeks ago, in Lusaka,<sup>1</sup> His Majesty King Mahendra made a very comprehensive statement defining our policies on various world problems and calling for the promotion of a just relationship among nations based on a spirit of understanding and co-operation. It is our belief that the Declaration of Lusaka on world peace and security and development and co-operation has been a contribution to the cause that the United Nations upholds.

6. As we in Nepal see it, the total purpose of the United Nations is the survival of mankind. In these twenty-five years mankind has been spared the fatal catastrophe of a nuclear holocaust. But there have been conflicts and wars, which have taken their toll of human life. Rivalry, suspicions and hatred among nations have haunted the horizon of international relations, breeding instability and insecurity in the world. Many disputes, old and new, have stood in the way of friendly relations and co-operation between nations.

7. But, given a minimum of understanding and sense of mutual accommodation on the part of nations, there can be no situation that is insurmountable nor any dispute or question that is insoluble.

8. A recent example of this is the conclusion of a non-aggression Treaty between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany.<sup>2</sup> In significance and far-reaching consequence, this event stands far above others which occurred during the year. The far-sighted, bold and imaginative statesmanship shown by the Soviet and German leaders has paved the way for a lasting *détente* in Europe.

9. My delegation hopes that the improvement in the European situation which will flow from the Treaty will be increasingly reflected in the relations between the major Powers in particular and in East-West relations in general. This Treaty could be a prelude to a more equitable relationship between the United Nations and the divided nations.

10. Another significant development concerns the Middle East, a region which has not known a single moment of real peace in two decades. The Middle East is a truly United Nations question: it has been so since 1948. The recent peace initiative by the United States has resulted in the re-establishment of the cease-fire for a specified period of time. It has restored and revitalized the role of the United Nations in the Middle

<sup>1</sup> Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka, Zambia, from 8 to 10 September 1970.

<sup>2</sup> Signed in Moscow on 12 August 1970.

East settlement. And, above all, it has brought the parties together for talks.

11. Despite the substantial charges and counter-charges of violations of the cease-fire, the disorder and the violence in Jordan and the unfortunate and untimely death of President Nasser—all of which have introduced an element of uncertainty into the situation—the value of the peace proposals has not decreased. We note with satisfaction that the parties concerned have indicated their willingness to abide by their commitment and, if necessary, to agree to the extension of the cease-fire in order to facilitate the talks. The basis and framework for a negotiated settlement have been laid down by resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council adopted in November 1967.

12. While those developments encourage us to be optimistic, we are still highly disturbed by the continuing war situation in Viet-Nam. The Paris peace talks have not shown any sign of progress, though we are hopeful that the specific proposals recently made by the two sides will provide a better frame of reference for the talks.

13. We are extremely disheartened to witness the extension of the Viet-Nam war onto the soil of Cambodia. It has been difficult for us to comprehend the arguments justifying military intervention. The Cambodian episode has proved once again the vulnerability and the insecurity of a small country in the context of power politics. The fate of a small country was determined by the opposing interests of more powerful States. The right of a country to live in peace and shape its own destiny is one of the cardinal principles inherent in the Charter.

14. When we think about preserving and strengthening the United Nations, all of us here realize that the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the Organization is essential. We know that, in the absence of that Power, the United Nations cannot be as strong, purposeful and universal an organization as we all desire it to be.

15. That common feeling is being increasingly reflected in the policies and the actions of many Governments. The establishment of diplomatic relations between Canada and the People's Republic of China is a most encouraging example of this. The Foreign Ministers of France and the United Kingdom were absolutely right when, in their policy statements last month [*1842nd and 1848th meetings*], they attributed the greatest disappointment for the hopes of 1945 to the absence of the People's Republic of China from the United Nations.

16. Last month six Nobel Peace Prize laureates joined together in issuing a most stirring appeal for peace and disarmament. Nepal believes that the reduction of armaments and the destruction of arms is the only real foundation for a lasting peace; that alone will ensure human survival and welfare. The armaments race is being pursued for the sake of security, but the lesson of history is that more arms only bring more

insecurity. The strategic arms limitation talks between the United States and the Soviet Union are a welcome indication of the realization on the part of those Powers that further refinement of their weapon systems will no longer alter the existing balance of terror. Those two Powers hold the key to real disarmament. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and on the eve of the Disarmament Decade, they can take the first necessary step towards general and complete disarmament by agreeing on an immediate moratorium on the development and the deployment of new offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapon systems.

17. This year the United Nations is celebrating the tenth anniversary of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Indeed, the accomplishments of the Organization in the process of decolonization have been most encouraging. Only the other day the Assembly had the pleasure of welcoming Fiji, a former colonial Territory, as the newest State Member of the United Nations.

18. In southern Africa, however, the most critical problems still prevail. The efforts of the United Nations and the peoples' movements for the achievement of their inalienable rights are met with stubborn resistance and violent reactions on the part of the colonial and the racist régimes. The Secretary-General, in referring to the situation now existing in southern Africa, has characterized it as one constituting a threat to international peace and security. That situation is more real than apparent, and the warning sounded by the Secretary-General should not be dismissed lightly. The situation evidently calls for more determined action by the United Nations to achieve our common objective. Most of the world's leading military and industrial Powers which have the means and the capacity to influence the course of events in southern Africa have not, up till now, seen fit to associate themselves actively and positively with United Nations efforts aimed at alleviating that dangerous situation. It is high time they did so, because the drift towards a race war is unmistakable.

19. The closing year of the First United Nations Development Decade was a year of mixed fortunes for the developing countries. While national economies registered generally satisfactory growth rates, the uncertainties in the flow of external assistance compounded the difficulties of planning for economic development in those countries. Now, as before, we have set the target for the over-all growth rate as a broad indication of the scope for international co-operation within the framework of the world development strategy for the 1970s. We feel strongly, however, that such a global international target can hardly be realized without firm commitments on other related quantitative targets, especially for trade and aid, in a manner consistent with the over-all growth target.

20. While the developing countries in general are faced with the problem of gaining access to the market, the land-locked countries among them are facing an additional problem of exercising their right of free

access to the sea. In this area we, on our part, feel that existing international conventions and practices should serve as a basis for bilateral arrangements between the land-locked countries and their transit neighbours.

21. We are passing through a phase in history in which our feelings of insecurity and frustration prevail over a sense of full satisfaction. The development of science and technology in these 25 years has opened unlimited possibilities of benefit to mankind; yet, at the same time, it has unleashed powerful forces of destruction which threaten us now. In our view, this is the most compelling reason why, instead of losing interest and faith in the United Nations, the peoples and the nations of the world have to work with far more determination than ever to master those forces and to harness them for the benefit of mankind as a whole. Whatever the shortcomings of the United Nations, we believe that our future lies in preserving and strengthening the system established by the Charter.

22. That belief is the corner-stone of our national policy. As His Majesty King Mahendra of Nepal said in his address to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session:

"My country has come to the United Nations with as much faith in its organization as in its Charter, with as much faith in its effectiveness as in its ideal . . . the United Nations has more than ordinary significance for us because it provides, first, a feeling of collective security against encroachment and interference from others, and, secondly, a climate of peace so necessary for our development . . . we have come to the United Nations with a trust that is total and complete." [1595th meeting, para. 4.]

23. The theme for this twenty-fifth anniversary is "Peace, justice and progress". This theme very brilliantly underlines the sum total of the principles and purposes of the United Nations and the principal hope of mankind today.

24. In pursuing the economic development of our country and evolving its political institutions under the panchayat system, my Government has taken particular care to speed up the pace of progress in a manner consistent with the concept of justice and ensuring the complete social harmony of all our people. The relevance of old values and concepts is being constantly tested against the attitude and aspiration of the people.

25. We are met here to rededicate ourselves to the principles and purposes of the United Nations. We believe that this dedication will be more meaningful if all the nations of the world so shape their policies as to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to the developing situations and fully responsive to meet the ever-changing needs and aspirations of all our peoples.

26. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Under-Secretary of State of the Ministry of Unity and Foreign Affairs and Special Envoy of the President of the Revolutionary Command Council of the Libyan Arab Republic, His Excellency Mr. Mansur Rashid Kikhia.

27. Mr. KIKHIA: I should like to express, on behalf of the people and the Government of the Libyan Arab Republic, our great satisfaction in joining the celebrations marking the twenty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations.

28. Brother Muammar Al-Qaddafi, Chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council and Prime Minister of Libya, wanted very much to attend this commemorative session. However, because of his engagements, he is unable to attend, and has given me the honour of representing him as his special envoy.

29. The motto of this historic session is "Peace, justice and progress"—three guiding principles for the work of this Organization. However, it is most disappointing to note that numerous decisions have neither been guided by, nor formulated according to, those noble principles. Instead, many States oppose measures based on those principles, particularly if they happen to conflict with their own national interests. Moreover, we witness big Powers exploiting the United Nations to their own ends in order to strengthen their grip over the weaker States.

30. We call for peace. However, peace should be based on justice, for justice is the prime condition for the establishment of a genuine peace and a necessary ingredient for the realization of progress and prosperity.

31. The Libyan Arab Republic wishes to reiterate its faith in the United Nations as an indispensable organ in our contemporary world, whose tasks are to maintain peace based on justice, to bolster co-operation among nations and peoples, to strive for the progress of humanity, and to solve problems common to human society. Despite the many shortcomings of the United Nations, we cannot deny the active role it has played in the course of the last 25 years.

32. My country, Libya, was the first State to achieve independence through the United Nations. Libya's independence through the United Nations was a landmark in the history of this Organization. It was the beginning of the process of decolonization in the post-war world, and it was the first victory achieved by the nations of the third world against imperialism.

33. It is indeed due to our painful experience with colonialism and our unshakable faith in the necessity to eliminate it in all its forms and manifestations that the Libyan people have consistently supported national liberation movements and all peoples struggling for the right of self-determination, and have upheld the cause of peoples who have been deprived of their legitimate rights. Those same experiences have likewise taught us to pursue a policy of non-alignment and to continue to seek the friendship of all peace-loving peoples and States on the basis of mutual respect.

34. We believe that the failure of the Organization to solve numerous international problems is basically due to the weakness of some of the provisions of the Charter, as well as to the fact that big Powers resort

to seeking the solutions of some sensitive issues, closely related to the maintenance of international peace and security, outside the framework of the United Nations, and attempt, even through the United Nations, to impose their solutions upon the international community.

35. In our humble opinion, this is one of the most important factors that have weakened our Organization. Many have come to regard this Organization as a vehicle in the hands of some of the big Powers, used to dictate their terms, and have come to view it as merely a forum for oratory and a platform for the exchange of accusations and verbal attacks.

36. The insane race in conventional and atomic armaments and the allotment of vast funds for that purpose on the part of the big Powers have gradually increased the fears of the smaller nations concerning the motives behind that race which may flare up and annihilate the world. How is it possible to maintain international peace and security and reduce world tension when we witness this race among nations and blocs which try to widen their zones of influence and dictate their terms to the weaker nations?

37. The subject of the arms race and its repercussions on international tension leads us to mention the instances where certain States have employed a show of force and resorted to veiled threats by staging military moves coupled with statements which entail evil intentions vis-à-vis the small nations. An example of this is the recent fleet movement in the Mediterranean accompanied by threatening statements, all of which were bound to increase international tension and generate a loss of faith on the part of the small nations in the motives of the big Powers. In this regard, we reiterate our demand that the Mediterranean basin, for long the cradle of many civilizations, should not be abused by any big Power, nor turned into an arena of power struggles or a battleground to expand zones of influence.

38. International conditions have developed since the Second World War to a degree that could not have been foreseen by the original drafters of the United Nations Charter. International relations have entered a new and important phase in the history of mankind. Consequently, the United Nations has become an important forum to strengthen and develop these relations and a place where nations have the opportunity to meet and exchange views as well as acquaint themselves with their respective problems. Moreover, the United Nations is a vehicle for reaching decisions and establishing necessary institutions where bilateral and multilateral relations are promoted. Yet, some provisions of the Charter no longer correspond to the demands of the times, and have instead become stumbling blocks hampering the strengthening of international co-operation and the realization of the principles and objectives of this Organization. This commemorative celebration is a golden opportunity for us to review these provisions so as to accommodate the requirements of the new realities of the world today.

39. It is indeed a source of great pride for us to see that a large number of States have joined the United Nations since its inception, which demonstrates the faith peoples have in this august body and their belief that it is still the only possible instrument at the disposal of the world community to strengthen relations, to promote mutual co-operation and to solve differences by peaceful means.

40. I take this opportunity to express my gratification at seeing the State of Fiji join the family of the United Nations. We are confident that its membership will add support to and will further the principles of the Charter.

41. In this connexion we note with a sense of deep concern that the People's Republic of China still does not occupy its rightful place among us. The prolonged absence of that great nation from the United Nations should be considered one of the main obstacles towards any meaningful co-operation. The universality of the United Nations and the enhancement of its effectiveness cannot be accomplished unless the People's Republic of China regains its lawful right through the re-establishment of its membership of this Organization.

42. The world events we are witnessing and the disregard by certain States of the principles and resolutions of the United Nations make it incumbent upon us to rectify these abnormal conditions by punishing the aggressor, prohibiting the use of force in solving international disputes, condemning the acquisition of territories by force, and preventing the aggressor from reaping the fruits of his deeds. Unfortunately, these measures, which should have been taken by the United Nations in the course of the last 25 years, have been neither adopted nor implemented. The forces of evil and aggression are still pursuing their despicable march. Under the guise of protecting freedom and justice those same forces are bringing death and destruction to Indo-China, Africa and Palestine, where heroic peoples valiantly struggle for independence and the right to self-determination.

43. The people of Palestine have been victimized by a collusion of the forces of colonialism and imperialism and the interests of some big Powers. Despite the passing of more than twenty years, it appears that the world conscience has not awakened to the Palestinian tragedy.

44. The Palestine question has been one of the outstanding issues which the United Nations has taken up at every session for the past 23 years, but a just and lasting solution in accordance with United Nations principles has yet to be found. Zionism has managed to impose its expansionist aims on the international community and to pursue the policy of *fait accompli*, thus threatening world peace and security. Twice within a period of slightly more than 10 years Israel has almost succeeded in bringing the world to the brink of a third global war.

45. The United Nations has enacted resolutions to allow the Palestinians to return to their homes or to

be compensated accordingly. All efforts to implement those resolutions have failed. Israel with its arrogance has blocked all those efforts by systematic campaigns of aggression in order to achieve its expansionist goals.

46. In fact, Israel has been faced with a choice: either to accede to United Nations resolutions, forgoing its dreams of expansion and thus allowing the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the area, or to continue its policy of aggression and expansion. The first alternative meant allowing the indigenous population to return to their homes. That would have created a new society where Moslem, Christian and Jew could live in peace. The second meant war, suffering and aggression, but allowed for expansion. Israel chose the second to satisfy its greedy appetite for conquest, resorting to criminal acts that shocked the world: the destruction of civil aircraft of one of the Member States in the area; extending the boundaries of war by strafing civilian institutions, killing helpless children in schools and uninvolved factory workers; the destruction of irrigation development projects; preying on peaceful villages and farms and murdering inhabitants by the use of napalm; colonizing occupied territories; imposing collective punishment; and setting holy shrines afire.

47. The United Nations, which has recognized the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, would do well to support fully a realistic solution, which is sponsored by the Palestinian freedom fighters: a just and lasting peace for everyone in a democratic, secular State of Moslems, Christians and Jews living in harmony.

48. One of the purposes of the United Nations since its establishment has been to achieve a higher standard of living for all—to promote full employment, to fulfil economic and social development and progress and to devise common solutions to international economic, social and health problems. It has also been entrusted with the task of promoting international co-operation in the educational and cultural fields. We have pledged to carry out our obligations individually and collectively and to co-operate with the United Nations in order to attain these noble objectives.

49. It was in the light of these objectives that the United Nations designated the 1960s as the First Development Decade and vowed to intensify its efforts to escalate the economic and social development of the developing countries.

50. If we assess the results of those efforts, we shall discover that they fall short of our expectations. We are still witnessing a situation in which many developing countries are suffering from underdevelopment—which stems from long periods of colonization—despite the remarkable efforts they are making to raise the standards of their societies.

51. The experience gained from the First Development Decade has shown us many things which deserve our attention. For example, we could say that it has shown us that multilateral development co-operation

is feasible and desirable, despite many political, military and cultural obstacles that face the international community.

52. As we are on the verge of adopting the international development strategy, we hope to be able to learn from past mistakes, to avoid their negative implications and to collaborate closely to implement the objectives of the Second Development Decade in order to establish a community that enjoys the benefits of prosperity and security.

53. The success of the strategy for the Second Development Decade will depend first and foremost on the good faith of all nations; in the event of the absence of this good faith, mankind in its entirety will be the loser.

54. Scientific and technological progress have contributed to make the nations of the world interdependent. There is also a fundamental relationship between international peace and the socio-economic progress of mankind. The destiny of man depends upon his co-operation with his fellow men in exploiting the new horizons that are made available as a result of scientific advancement, in working together for the protection of the environment, in preventing a population explosion and increasing food production and in the eradication of ignorance, disease and poverty.

55. The Libyan Revolution of 1 September, now more than a year old, had as its aim the preservation of world peace and security as envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations. The elimination of foreign military bases from Libyan soil is but an illustration of our belief in this policy, which prompts us to strive to win the friendship of all peace-loving peoples, encourages us to pursue the policy of non-alignment and calls for the establishment of mutual respect among the Members of this Organization.

56. I should like to reiterate that the people of the Libyan Arab Republic love peace, need peace and aspire to establish a world blessed by peace, a world free from all forms of fear and anxiety. The Libyan people, who have withstood colonialism in its ugliest form and have learned the meaning of foreign occupation and racial discrimination, consider it a sacred duty to act in solidarity with all the struggling peoples against the powers of evil and tyranny.

57. While we are discussing the work of the United Nations and re-evaluating its role and its efficiency, on this occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary, we think that it is opportune to have a look at the position of the representatives of Member States and the Permanent Missions accredited to this international body, their problems and their security. We know that under Article 105 of the Charter, the Organization "shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members"—and particularly in the territory of the host country—"such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfilment of its purposes". Representatives of the Member States "shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exer-

cise of their functions . . .". It is legitimate and logical to assume that security is the prime condition for the enjoyment of those privileges and immunities. We believe that in order to enable the representatives accredited to the Headquarters of the United Nations to perform the functions entrusted to them by their Governments, the host country must take appropriate measures to ensure the security of those representatives and Permanent Missions and to secure the safety of their staffs. We regret to notice that some of the Permanent Missions in New York have been the object of many threats and attacks. They have received threatening letters and telephone calls. They have suffered from explosions, and bombs have been placed on their premises. They have been invaded by groups of individuals who have occupied their offices. The office of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Director of which is a member of the mission of a Member State, has been attacked three times in one year. These attacks resulted in bodily injuries and caused material damage. Representatives have also been victimized by discrimination. Hostile demonstrations have been organized against Member States in front of the Headquarters. Demonstrators have penetrated the premises of the Headquarters and have torn down the flags of some Member States. And finally, it is really distressing to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations in the atmosphere of a fortress encircled by the police and by security agents.

58. It is time to consider this problem, which has become a serious matter, represents a systematic, persistent and escalated pattern of terror and constitutes harmful intimidation directed against the United Nations itself.

59. When I raised this question I had no intention of attacking the host country. On the contrary, I pay tribute to the generosity of the great American nation as a whole and to its contribution in promoting and supporting the international Organization. But my delegation raises this question because we are convinced that the General Assembly can no longer remain silent in the face of this abnormal situation; we raise it also in our capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group for this month, since our Group has been the main target of attacks and threats.

60. We have to admit, really, that the United Nations itself as well as many among us meet with great difficulties in this city of New York. I call attention to the hostile atmosphere that prevails in the city of New York, which is a stronghold of international finance and a centre of imperialist and Zionist activities, and where the news is conveyed through the monopoly of one major newspaper—a paper which is not always friendly to the causes which we are defending in this international body—and where the mass media are entirely in the hands of obscure and suspect forces. Indeed, it is no pleasure for many delegations to work in this unhealthy and unfriendly environment.

61. We might consider two steps in order to deal with this problem. First, we might ask the Secretary-General

to contact the authorities of the host country for the purpose of securing appropriate and efficient measures which will guarantee the tranquillity and security of the permanent missions and representatives of Member States in New York, as well as the protection of their offices and families, and to take practical and radical steps in this regard. Second, we could consider the possibility of a long-range and lasting solution of the problem relating to the location of the United Nations Headquarters in this city. We may discover at last that the United Nations Headquarters are located in the wrong place, and that if the Members of the United Nations community are considered as unwelcome guests by the New York population, it is time to look for another alternative and depart.

62. In conclusion, I should like to say that today, after the passing of a quarter of a century since the signing of its Charter, the United Nations is standing at a cross-roads. It has two alternatives before it. It has either to continue repeating its past errors, further weakening itself—and this means the beginning of the end for the Organization and the subjugation of the future of mankind to complete destruction; or else, with sincere efforts, to make all States Members regenerate the United Nations, reform it, strengthen it, and enable it to deal effectively with mankind's common problems. It is in the interest of all nations, despite their political, ideological, cultural, economic and social differences, to strengthen the United Nations so that it can play its role in building a better world for the present generation and those to come in the future.

63. Finally, before leaving the rostrum, I should like to pay tribute to all those who work or have been working entirely to serve the cause of peace in the United Nations, and particularly to His Excellency U Thant, the distinguished Secretary-General, and all members of the Secretariat who continue to devote themselves to serving the United Nations here and throughout the world.

64. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation and Special Envoy of the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, His Excellency Mr. Evariste Loliki.

65. Mr. LOLIKI (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I have the honour and pleasant duty as Special Envoy of the President of the Republic and as head of the delegation to this commemorative session of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations to address to you the warm congratulations of the people of the Congo, of its President Lieutenant-General Joseph Désiré Mobutu, of its party and of its Government. Never was there a better occasion to elect as President of the General Assembly a man of your experience and competence. Indeed, only a man of your burning faith in the United Nations and in its Charter could preside over the collective effort of heart-searching and recollection which we must all undertake in this hour of truth.



66. This session began with a happy event: the accession of Fiji to independence. We hail this testimony of victory over colonialism and we extend to the inhabitants of Fiji our best wishes for happiness and prosperity.

67. But why should decolonization stop at Fiji and why does it not, 25 years after the acceptance of the Charter, embrace all the territories still under colonial domination? Why, 10 years after the adoption of the declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), must the peoples of Rhodesia, Namibia, Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau) still be deprived of their right of self-determination? Why do we allow peace to continue thus to be threatened in southern Africa, although the Charter contains the imperative obligation to see that it is maintained?

68. Why, when the cries, the tears and the lamentations of the Viet-Nameese sound so loud in our ears, do they find so little echo within our Organization?

69. Why, when for almost 20 years the peoples of the Middle East have been calling on our Organization to help them live in peace and harmony, does it remain powerless to respond resolutely to those appeals?

70. Why, when the developing countries are finding it so difficult to secure sufficient financial assistance, to assure the decent social development of their people, does the United Nations not have the resources, at a time when incalculable sums are spent on armaments?

71. Why this impotence on the part of the Organization? Why this failure on the part of the Organization? Is it the principles of the Charter and its objectives which are no longer adapted to the modern development of our world? Is it the instrument that is our Organization that has ceased to be capable of attaining the objectives assigned to it by the Charter? Is it the Members who for one reason or another have lost faith in the instrument that the Charter has made available to them?

72. My Government shares with others the opinion that the Charter is still the best bible that the world has at this time. The principles contained in the Charter, the objectives set by the Charter remain as valid today as they were twenty-five years ago. They continue to correspond to the fundamental needs of the world's peoples, to their aspirations to peace and international security.

73. More than at any time since the Second World War the international community longs for peace and tranquillity. More than ever it condemns war and invites States to renounce the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes. More than ever it aspires to harmony in relations among States and to free and sovereign co-operation among its Members. More than ever it feels an urgent need to ensure decent social progress for the various peoples, particularly those of the developing countries, and to guarantee their full enjoyment of the fundamental rights recognized by the Charter.

74. All the speakers so far have unanimously recognized that peace, justice and progress, which constitute the theme of this Assembly, remain now, as they have been in the past, the essential objectives of the international community as defined by the United Nations Charter. Is it then the instrument, our Organization, which is poorly adapted?

75. Some believe that it is the structures of the Organization which no longer correspond to the present evolution of the world, in particular to the balance of forces which characterize today's world. Others feel that the Organization has become so cumbersome that it is impossible to ensure its normal functioning and regular and economic management.

76. Improvements have been proposed here and there concerning a better balance of responsibilities, a planning of programmes of activity. But no one has yet recommended that our Organization should be rejected or replaced by some other instrument. On the contrary, we have all recognized that despite its imperfections it remains the best instrument available to States to guarantee the peace of the world. Despite their deficiencies, the main structures are still those that best correspond to the basic political realities of today, even if the balance of forces is no longer what it was in 1945. We have thus, once again, all recognized that the present Organization remains the best instrument at the disposal of the international community for attaining the objectives of the Charter.

77. We can only conclude, then, that it is the States Members that are responsible for the Organization's inability to discharge its essential functions vis-à-vis the international community. For history demonstrates beyond a shadow of a doubt that States are departing further and further from the principles of the Charter, refusing to apply the recommendations of the Organization, thus by their attitude undermining its capacity to attain the objectives of the Charter.

78. For more than 20 years the events in Viet-Nam have represented a blatant violation by force of the rights of that people to self-determination. While war rages unchecked, human life is every day sacrificed; world opinion revolts; youth is in rebellion; but the Organization remains silent and, like an electronic brain, simply records the number of dead that increases from day to day. What crime has that people committed? Simply the crime of having wished and still wishing to preserve its identity. Why does the Organization remain silent? Why does the Security Council remain incapable of seeking a settlement of the Viet-Nameese question in conformity with the Charter? It is because some Member States, and not the least among them, are at odds with the principles of the Charter.

79. In southern Africa the United Kingdom refuses to fulfil its obligations towards the black majority of Southern Rhodesia, breaks its promises and commitments concerning the rights to self-determination of that majority, and leaves them at the mercy of the white racist vultures of the Territory. South Africa persists in its attempt to annex Namibia and to extend

to it its ignoble policy of *apartheid*. Portugal continues to impose the yoke of its dominion on the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), despite the most elementary principles of the right of peoples to self-determination.

80. And what does the United Nations do? The organ most competent to act against violations of the Charter is content, so far as Rhodesia is concerned, to follow docilely the emasculated measures that the United Kingdom advocates for putting an end to the rebellion, whereas any man of good faith could have foreseen that they would be without decisive effect in the circumstances in which they have been applied.

81. The Security Council finds itself today powerless to take up the challenge that a handful of white racists have proudly thrown down. Force, the only language which means anything to the rebels, is apparently distasteful to the falsely modest that are responsible for the maintenance of peace; although elsewhere, and not so long ago, they were only too pleased to mount so-called police operations to put down liberation movements. What irony! What cowardice! The fate of the blacks, unfortunately, is regarded as being of no account. Deprived of freedom, their lot is to languish under the yoke of occupation and domination by the Rhodesian racists.

82. The situation is still more scandalous where Namibia and the Territories under Portuguese domination are concerned. South Africa, which everyone recognizes as guilty of violating its obligations under the Mandate, is with impunity annexing a Territory which comes under the United Nations responsibility and the Security Council suffers the humiliation of this blow in the face almost without reaction. For several years, Portugal has successfully maintained an extremely heavy war effort despite the weakness of its economy.

83. Unfortunately, those two Governments receive obvious military support from outside. The fact is that some influential Member States continue, with a clear conscience, to send arms to South Africa and to Portugal in violation of the pertinent resolutions of the Organization.

84. And people believe Africa is taken in by the argument that there is a distinction between weapons intended for external defence and weapons reserved for internal defence, whereas Viet-Nam affords daily proof of the emptiness and the inconsistency of such a distinction!

85. Indeed, how can the States of Europe that were conquered by Nazism and languished under the Nazi yoke, that owed their salvation only to the intervention of United States forces that came to their assistance, today help to strengthen régimes which apply the same racist philosophy to other peoples?

86. In such circumstances, is there still any place for the Charter and for the Organization? I doubt it. And that is undoubtedly why there is a tendency today to try and solve the world's problems outside the Organization.

87. The truth—since the moment of truth has come—is that the very States that are the principal guardians of international peace are helping, through their co-operation with those that violate the Charter and through their aid to the enemies of the Organization, gravely to weaken its power to act. Those States, whose responsibility is to ensure universal respect for the interests of the international community, are unfortunately using the powers vested in them by the Charter to advance their own interests in the service of ideological competition and of popularity.

88. Some are charged with being unrealistic because they suggest to the Organization solutions which go to the root of the evil. At the same time, others consider that they have fulfilled their obligations to peace with half measures that can only palliate the crisis without resolving it.

89. Because technology has favoured them and military power smiles upon them, some States, and not the least among them, venture to take liberties with the principles of the Charter and with the fundamental aspirations of the peoples, and are surprised one day to find themselves suddenly at the edge of the abyss.

90. The military power built up by the end of the war constituted a danger that the authors of the Charter tried to avert by recommending disarmament. The danger was that force would cease to be at the service of the law, and would become the law. How right they were! Our failure in this area underlies the armed conflicts which, more or less everywhere in the world, threaten peace, impoverish the nations and make them less and less capable of helping the Organization to do its job.

91. Is it not bizarre that only \$7,000 million should be spent on financial assistance annually, while \$140,000 million are spent every year on armaments? Is it not irrational that the United Nations should decide not to extend its programme of activities, for peace and development in particular, beyond a limit which could easily be exceeded by a small extra financial sacrifice on the part of States that are spending astronomical sums on armaments?

92. It is time we realized that peace is universal and indivisible. Peace is not just the silence of arms. It is also a constant commitment to seek harmony in international relations. It is also a continuous rededication of States to the principles of the Charter, not only in declarations but above all in acts.

93. The declarations adopted by the United Nations are numerous indeed, and in a few days' time it will have an opportunity solemnly to adopt several more. These are highly praiseworthy expressions of the intentions of Member States to act in conformity with the principles they contain. But those declarations will be meaningless if they are not followed up by specific acts. It is only by positive acts that we can once again give the Organization the impetus and the resources it needs if it is to pursue the objectives laid down in its Charter.



94. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo we have faith in the Organization. I am here as the representative of a country which is the living testimony of what the Organization can do if it is given adequate means. We should like to give the Organization proof of our gratitude for what it achieved in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and take this opportunity of paying a resounding tribute to the memory of those who, in the service of peace, in my country, sacrificed their lives. That sacrifice was not in vain and the Congolese people are infinitely grateful for it. It did not think it could better honour the principles for which those men lived than by scrupulously respecting the Charter.

95. Our country has given practical expression to the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in conformity with the United Nations Charter. Whereas in 1965 our country had difficulties with its neighbours, today, thanks to the farsightedness of President Mobutu, my country maintains the most cordial relations with them. Very recently, last June to be exact, the two peoples on either side of the Congo River enthusiastically celebrated the renewal of their solidarity following the reconciliation achieved between their two Heads of State.

96. Moreover, no longer ago than last August, the President of the Republic went on a State visit to Romania and Yugoslavia, having travelled in the United States of America at the invitation of President Nixon. This clearly shows that the Congolese philosophy of international co-operation does not rule out any political or social system.

97. Authentic nationalism remains our principal slogan. All co-operation from east or west, from north or south, must be in conformity with respect for our national interests, the first of which are our sovereignty and our independence. To any State which meets those conditions, to any Government which refrains from undermining our national independence, respects our institutions and abstains from interfering in our domestic affairs, our Government is ready, here or elsewhere, to open the door to friendly co-operation. But no country which refuses to respect our independence or engages in subversive action against our institutions can expect any support whatsoever from our country, either here in the United Nations or elsewhere. This is how we intend to give practical effect to the principle of universality contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

98. Mr. President, it is providential that this period of collective stock-taking should take place not only under your Presidency, but also under the administration of our distinguished Secretary-General, U Thant. His dedication, his courage, his farsightedness and his perseverance in the discharge of his heavy responsibilities deserve particular mention on the part of us all. He remains the guide who each year warns States Members of the dangers confronting the Organization, of the threats to world peace, and reminds everyone of the need to return to strict respect for the principles of the Charter and of the imperious duty to equip the Organization with the appropriate means to enable it

to discharge its peace-keeping responsibilities. We should like to extend to him, and to all his colleagues in the Secretariat, our sincere congratulations for the invaluable support they give the salutary work of this Organization.

99. A saying which has become famous among the Congolese masses since the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo adapted it for his own use runs as follows: "In the beginning was action, and action engendered progress."

100. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, our recommendation is that the international community should be exhorted to act, because only action, being based on a renewed faith in the Charter and the Organization, can resolutely commit mankind to the road of peace, justice and progress.

101. The PRESIDENT: We come now to the rights of reply. Every Government may ask for the right of reply; I should, however, like to take this opportunity to remind those representatives who participate in the debate or in the right of reply in this particular issue that the United Arab Republic has asked for a debate on the Middle East in the week following the commemorative session, so that all delegations will have ample time and opportunity to put forward their views then.

102. I now call on the first representative who has asked to exercise his right of reply, the representative of the United States of America.

103. Mr. YOST (United States of America): My delegation and I listened with close attention, but with considerable regret, to the statement of the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic this morning. The Foreign Minister is an eloquent spokesman of his country and we consider with the greatest care whatever he chooses to say to us and to this Assembly. However, it is not our view that the substance or the tone of his remarks this morning will contribute to what we hope is his objective, as it is ours, namely to create a lasting peace in the Middle East. Indeed it has been our conviction ever since the adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) nearly three years ago that the best hope for peace lay in carrying out that resolution in all its parts and that the best, indeed probably the only, means of carrying it out was through quiet diplomacy and patient negotiation.

104. I would suggest that the character of the Foreign Minister's statement this morning goes far to confirm our belief that public debate is not the way to solve this problem; indeed, that it is certain to heighten tension, exacerbate tempers and raise even greater obstacles between us and our common goal.

105. I do not think it likely that many delegations will accept the Foreign Minister's thesis that the United States deliberately undermined its own initiative of June of this year. My delegation does not believe that public debate on who violated what provision of certain agreements and when is likely to foster the end that

all should be seeking: resumption of negotiations under Mr. Jarring. We regret that the Foreign Minister undertook to launch this debate this morning. Certainly we were dismayed, as were the rest of the peace-loving States of the world, when events in the area brought about a suspension of Mr. Jarring's mission.

106. I should emphasize that, as a result of an intensive period of quiet diplomacy this summer, the United States was able to work out with the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Israel an arrangement whereby all three, explicitly and without reservations, stated their agreement to carry out Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts, including mutual acknowledgement of one another's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, and acknowledgement by Israel of its obligation to withdraw from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict. This was the first time such undertakings by all three parties had been entered into.

107. In order to reach agreement of the details of carrying out resolution 242 (1967), the three Governments agreed to designate representatives to discussions under the auspices of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring. The three Governments agreed to enter into discussions under Mr. Jarring according to such procedure and at such place and time as he might recommend, taking into account as appropriate the preference of each side as to matters of procedure and previous experience between the parties.

108. These were objectives which had long been sought and they were warmly welcomed not only by the Governments but, more importantly, by the people of all the States concerned, and indeed around the world. The arrangements on which this was based, including those concerning a standstill cease-fire, were clearly set down on paper and freely accepted by all concerned. I shall read the essential paragraph from the standstill cease-fire agreement which was accepted by the three parties:

"Both sides will refrain from changing the military *status quo* within zones extending fifty kilometres to the east and 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 and to the rotation and supply of forces presently within the zones."

109. There can be no question, unhappily, but that this pledge was almost immediately broken. New missile sites were constructed and more missiles were placed in position, and SAM-2 and SAM-3 missiles were moved closer to the Suez Canal in the 50 kilometre standstill zone. The inevitable crisis of confidence which resulted understandably, though regrettably, produced an interruption of the talks under Ambassador Jarring.

110. Over the past several weeks my Government has been making every effort to create a situation

wherein these talks could be resumed and the danger of a breakdown in the cease-fire would be avoided. Past experience with the Middle East has demonstrated that the only hope for progress lies in quiet diplomacy rather than in harsh and contentious statements, as a result of which those involved usually dig themselves into rigid positions, precluding movement and compromise. We are continuing these efforts and we hope that others will see the wisdom of joining us.

111. The United States remains convinced that peace can be achieved between the parties to the Middle East conflict based on the carrying out of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts and on agreement among the parties in achieving a peaceful and acceptable settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles of that resolution.

112. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel in the exercise of his right of reply.

113. Mr. TEKOAHI (Israel): I have no intention of replying to the representative of Libya, who came here to suggest that the United Nations should mark its anniversary by entertaining the idea of dismantling one of its Member States and denying its people their right to independence. It is sad indeed that the United Nations should have to hear such aberrations from international law and morality. After all, the eyes of the world are on us.

114. Heads of State and Government and envoys from all parts of the world have assembled here to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, an anniversary dedicated to peace, justice and progress. It is therefore regrettable that the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic should have used this occasion to bring to the Assembly a message of hostility and abuse, of denial of justice to the people of Israel, a message auguring continued conflict and unhappiness in the Middle East.

115. This may not be surprising. For more than two decades Egypt has waged relentless warfare against Israel, threatening its sovereignty, bleeding its people, vowing total destruction.

116. In recent weeks, Egypt has time and again taken action that has beclouded the international atmosphere, shaken the prospects of progress towards peace in the Middle East and aggravated the tension prevailing in the area.

117. In complicity with the Soviet Union it has deliberately violated and continues to violate the standstill cease-fire agreement, creating a new military threat along the cease-fire line, knowing full well that it is thereby crippling the peace initiative of the United States and the talks under Ambassador Jarring's auspices.

118. While the entire world followed with fear these flagrant violations of the agreement, watching the forward movement of missiles clearly recorded by photography, studying eye-witness press reports on the actual transportation of the weapons into the standstill

zone, Egypt at first denied any knowledge of these facts. It was undoubtedly aware that such denial must inevitably further undermine its credibility.

119. Then, showing utter disdain for the agreement, Egypt seemed to forgo its own denials, and its Foreign Minister declared on 6 October that not a single missile would be moved out of the standstill zone. Two days ago, Egypt's assault on peace-making efforts culminated in the demand to revive the public contest of acrimony on the Middle East in the General Assembly. As was the case with its other actions in recent weeks, Egypt has taken this decision fully conscious of the fact that it would make it even more difficult to resume the talks under Ambassador Jarring and to proceed with the search for understanding and agreement between the parties to the conflict.

120. Mere words professing Egypt's interest in the talks under Mr. Jarring's authority cannot conceal the gravity of repeated actions, dealing one blow after another to this mission. If Cairo really desired to see progress towards peace achieved in the discussions under the auspices of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, it would not have violated the cease-fire agreement, it would not have refused to rectify the violations, it would not have chosen to replace the peace initiative by a tug-of-war in the Assembly, by sterile propaganda polemics and by demands for new resolutions which might sound the knell of the peace talks.

121. At this point I should like to state most emphatically that there have been no Israeli violations of the cease-fire. The only Israeli activities that have taken place in the standstill zone are those clearly permitted under the terms of the agreement. In fact, as the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic himself indicated this morning, the Egyptian charges have been rejected by the sponsor of the recent peace initiative and the author of the terms of the cease-fire agreement.

122. In any case, Egypt's attempt to explain away the introduction of SAM-2 and SAM-3 missiles into the standstill zone by the allegations voiced today by Mr. Riad, such as the claims that Israel is adding some concertina wires to existing installations, is reminiscent of the manner in which Egypt tried in the 1950s to justify its attacks on Israeli patrols along the armistice line. At that time the Egyptian response to Israeli complaints about almost daily armed assaults on the Israeli forces was "Yes, we are shooting at the Israeli soldiers, but they are making faces at the Egyptian soldiers."

123. The essence of Mr. Riad's statement is as simple as it is extraordinary. The Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic asks the United Nations to give its stamp of approval to Egypt's policy of 23 years of illegal belligerency, to accept Egypt's violations of international obligations, to endorse Egypt's view that the settlement of the Middle East crisis should be made of broken undertakings, of repudiated agreements, of callous distortions of the United Nations Charter and Security Council resolutions.

124. Egypt asks the United Nations to ignore and to forget that it is this very attitude to international obligations that plunged the Middle East into bloodshed 23 years ago and has kept the area in the shackles of sanguinary conflict ever since.

125. It was utter disregard by Egypt and by other Arab States for their Charter obligations that made them invade Israel in 1948 in defiance of the United Nations, thus creating, among others, the Palestine refugee problem. It was in repudiation of their obligations under the Armistice Agreements concluded with Israel that the Arab States refused to end the war and establish permanent peace as provided for in the Agreements. It was in flagrant violation of unequivocal undertakings contained in these agreements that Egypt and other Arab Governments organized and launched terror warfare against Israel, beginning almost immediately after the signature of the Armistice and continuing it to this very day.

126. If Egypt had a minimum of respect for its international obligations, it would not have barred the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping in contravention of the Charter, the Armistice Agreement and Security Council resolution 95 (1951). It would not have smashed the arrangements concluded in 1957, pushed out the United Nations Emergency Force, closed the Straits of Tiran and mounted a military campaign which was aimed, according to Egypt's own declarations, at the destruction of Israel.

127. The history of the Middle East conflict is the story of international obligations towards Israel solemnly assumed by Egypt and other Arab States, and then trampled one by one into the dust. If this trend had been arrested in time, the conflict might perhaps have terminated long ago. If the international community had reacted with firmness to the Arab mockery of international obligations, much of the sorrow and suffering which prevail today in the region might have been averted.

128. The standstill cease-fire agreement was the first stone, the corner-stone in the edifice that is to become, hopefully, the structure of a just and lasting peace. That corner-stone has been shattered to bits by Egypt and the Soviet Union. It is obvious that this stone must be restored before we can proceed with building the structure of peace.

129. Finally, an expression of hope. Peace cannot be built on distortion and falsification. Truth is an essential element of understanding. There is no truth in daubing as aggression Israel's success in repelling the Arab assault on its existence.

130. The fact that we defended ourselves successfully in 1948, when the Arab States informed the United Nations that they were launching a war that would be a massacre of the people of Israel, does not turn our defence into aggression. The fact that in 1967 we thwarted the Arab campaign mounted to destroy Israel, that we pushed back the Arab forces bent on our annihilation to the present cease-fire lines, and that we insist

on the establishment of genuine peace before we withdraw, does not detract from the righteousness and legitimacy of our struggle.

131. The failure of the Arab invasion of Israel in 1948, the failure of Arab terror warfare in the period of the Armistice, the collapse of Egypt's aggressive designs in 1967, the *débâcle* of Egypt's war of attrition proclaimed in 1969 in contravention of the Security Council cease-fire—all those do not turn the Arab States into victims deserving sympathy. Their difficulties today are of their own doing, the result of their own aggression and of their own repudiation of Charter obligations. There is no truth in alleging that under Security Council resolution 242 (1967) Israel must return to the vulnerable lines of 1967 when all know that the November resolution did not call for such a return, that the 1967 lines were not borders but military lines, and that secure and recognized boundaries between Israel and the Arab States—to which withdrawal is to take place—must be established now, for the first time by agreement between the parties.

132. For two decades the people of Egypt have been told that war is better than peace, that hatred is sacred and that violence is proper in international relations. When terrorists killed women and children, ambushed school buses and hijacked airplanes, the people of Egypt were told that these were acts of heroism. When Egyptian planes bombed defenceless Yemeni localities and used gas against Saudi Arabian villages, the Egyptian people were told that that was a just war. When the Egyptian people sank deeper and deeper into the mire of misery, sickness and national catastrophe, they were told that that was progress. It is time the Egyptian people and its leaders delivered themselves from this travesty of human values.

133. Peace can be built in the Middle East. Peace must be built in the Middle East. But it cannot be constructed on acrimony, on abuse, on distortion and on blind hostility, as expressed in the statement of Egypt's Foreign Minister. Peace can be attained only by creating mutual confidence, by practising tolerance and by respecting truth. We hope the day will come when Egypt will be guided by these precepts.

134. The people of Israel and all the peoples of the Middle East want peace, need peace. Peace is possible, but the search for it cannot be pursued effectively and fruitfully if it is confronted by the policy enunciated today by the Government of the United Arab Republic. It is in the fundamental brotherhood between the Jewish and Arab peoples that we must seek peace in the Middle East.

135. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United Arab Republic in exercise of his right of reply.

136. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (United Arab Republic): Although I was not in this hall I did have an opportunity to listen to Ambassador Yost and I thought I should like to put on record one point of difference between us and the United States delegation. I thought that

by highlighting it we could perhaps agree on an assessment of the two points of view.

137. The quiet language which I was going to use was not aided perhaps by the voice which I heard upon entering this hall and with which I will not—and certainly and very humbly cannot—compete in its arrogance and its pretension of passing divine sentences on peoples and Governments and leaders.

138. I heard Ambassador Yost speaking about quiet diplomacy as opposed to our resorting to a general debate in this General Assembly. People whose profession is diplomacy are certainly bent towards preferring the exercise of their traditional profession, but we live in the era of the United Nations. We live, or try to live, under the United Nations Charter. We all of us have a collective responsibility to all, and without it, indeed, there is no meaning for this gathering. We do not forget that for every simple problem every nation must hurry to ask the help, the assistance and indeed the judgement of all its sister nations, but when a country—when more than one country—has had to live with foreign soldiers treading over its soil for more than three years I suggest that all that it was possible to achieve by quiet diplomacy has been exhausted. When we find that quiet diplomacy is not leading to anything but to quiet surrender to the will of the powerful, to the rule of violence, then we will be not only exercising our rights but doing our duty in bringing our case back to the comity of nations from which it was taken away three years ago.

139. From the halls of this Assembly of some 120 members the problem of the invasion by the Israeli armed forces of my country, of Jordan and of Syria had been put before the esteemed members of the Security Council who, although unanimous in their resolution that the Charter must be applied, that the annexation or conquest of territories by force cannot and will not be condoned, found in the end that they had to give the ball, so to speak, to the permanent members—now 4. The 4 began meeting and meeting until we found that the 4 were subjected to the veto of 1 of them, at least at one level, when the American delegation decided to leave the talks of the deputies. From 120 representing the conscience of man the question went to the 15 who were supposed to be the guardians of security to the 4 who had a special responsibility, then to bilateral discussion and then to Ambassador Jarring, giving him a responsibility which he could not carry by himself, sitting in his room awaiting the pleasure of one of the parties to come—as indeed it was summoned to do by your will, by the Security Council and yet refusing to do so—without resorting to the authority of the people of the world who have decided and want to see our generation relieved from the scourge of war.

140. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to you, to bring back the case to you before we either take the path—God forbid—of surrender to the violence of power or resort to self-defence. I think that we have heard quite enough about quiet diplomacy and general debate. Quiet diplomacy would have had to have been

effective in the year 1967, or in the year 1968 when the French initiative was taken, or in the year 1969 when the four Foreign Ministers of the four big Powers met here and decided to implement the Security Council resolution, or indeed this year when we found that it was in the power of one party, in this case the Israelis, to bring to a standstill all the procedure of law. To live by the Charter, or not to live by it? This is why we are bringing our case to you. But we are not bringing it now: we thought that we first had to finish this commemorative session.

141. But this is a question which must be present in our minds, and now I am trying to reply to the second speaker. We must know what this United Nations is and what it is not. Has it really ushered in a new life for the nations where their violence cannot bring them any fruit, where their conquests cannot give them anything, where war cannot pay and therefore should not be waged—or not? If we are going to outlaw war we must make it useless, and we will make it useless only by removing all the incentive to give power to people that try to get power or to use it, but we seem to be thinking of one thing while the Israeli leaders think and act according to quite another thing.

142. One of the important statements of one of the important leaders of Israel was: "Your General Assembly resolutions are nothing but political statements." The opinion of the Foreign Minister of Israel given in a television broadcast here in New York was that we must know what the United Nations is and what the United Nations is not. The United Nations, he said, is a microphone with the greatest resonance; you use it to address people to get your propaganda across. It is not, he said, an organization for the security of nations; nations must achieve their security in other ways. Well, we happen to believe in the Charter, in this Assembly, in the Security Council and in the moral power of men all over the world. We do not think it is a microphone to be used. We think this is a place where the Charter must be kept aloft and must be implemented and that you, the Members, are judges and that we are only coming to you as the judges. But we are not coming now: we shall come later.

143. Thinking that United Nations resolutions are nothing but political statements is, of course, a process of pick and choose. The Israelis have picked and chosen before and they picked and chose five minutes ago. In picking and choosing before they found that resolution 181 (II) of 1947 partitioning the land of Palestine is, of course, as legal as can be. It is the cornerstone on which their legality is based. It is not a political statement as far as they are concerned. Picking and choosing now—with this I will conclude my reply—the representative of Israel said that they are occupying the land of Egypt, they are occupying the land of Jordan, they are occupying the land of Syria by virtue of a resolution of the Security Council. I try to imagine how that Security Council resolution was written. Was it "The Security Council, having looked at Article so and so of the Charter, decided that the Government of Israel would occupy the land of Egypt or part of

it, would occupy the land of Syria or part of it, would occupy the land of Jordan or part of it"? Would there then be another clause saying that a Permanent Member would be appointed to make sure not only that the existence of Israel was protected but that its conquests were protected too? Was this to be the resolution? The speaker was referring to resolution 233 (1967) on a cease-fire which was adopted to save life in June 1967 while overcoming the tactics which delayed the Council from taking what it had always taken in every case—a resolution calling for all forces to withdraw to the places from which they came before the battle began.

144. The second part of the resolution was adopted on 22 November 1967. But because of this picking and choosing, using the United Nations and not abiding by the Charter, we have all of us just heard that Israel is in the occupied lands, the lands it occupied in its last campaign, in the campaign for the frontiers of 1967, by virtue of the 1967 cease-fire resolution.

145. If anyone believes that the Security Council has indeed ordained and decided that one Member State could occupy the lands of another Member State, I suggest that something must be wrong in that resolution, in the Charter or in my own mind.

146. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia in exercise of his right of reply.

147. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): For a moment after Mr. Tekoah started to speak I thought it was the atmosphere of the Security Council, which, in spite of the many meetings it has held since 1947, has accomplished nothing to solve the problem.

148. The situation in Palestine does not stem from the 1967 war. Inasmuch as I shall recall certain historical facts later in my statement, I feel in duty bound to the new Members of the General Assembly to enlighten them, to the extent to which I am capable, lest they be misled by the tendentious statements of Mr. Tekoah. And if I were to base my statement on his distortions alone I would not finish in an hour or even two; but I want to draw attention to one basic fact that stems from his own distortions.

149. He said—and I am paraphrasing; I made a note of the words—that Egypt and later, by implication, the Arabs were guilty of an aberration from international law. Then he mentioned that the eyes of the world are upon us. Parenthetically, we are conducting this session in a beleaguered fortress and the world has grown tired of us, it seems. We are suffering from a cholera epidemic of speeches, words *ad nauseam*, general debates, platitudinous statements—all this while tension is mounting in the world in general, and in my region, the Middle East, in particular. Truly, the eyes of the world are upon us.

150. But let us examine Mr. Tekoah's statement and his reference to the aberration from international law. This is the Charter; I did not want to quote from memory, lest I should miss a single word in regard

to self-determination. I witnessed the signing of the Charter in 1945—and you, Mr. President, were there. The Charter states, in Article 1, paragraph 2:

“To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace”.

151. There was no State of Israel in 1945. There was a Zionist movement; it started towards the end of the nineteenth century. Zionism was a political movement which used Judaism as a motivation for political and economic ends. The Zionists in Germany tried to prevail upon none other than Sultan Abdul Hamid—may God rest his soul—the same Sultan who tried to save his empire, which was really a commonwealth, from the intrusion of the western European wolves, and at that time saw fit to make friends with the Germans in the interests of the balance of power so that he might, he thought, save his kingdom.

152. In fairness to the Germans it must be said that there was no discrimination against the Jews during the time of the Kaiser—in fact, some of his best friends were Jews. I am not drawing upon history books; I happen to have known several members of the Ottoman royal family, two or three of whom were my close friends. The Zionists interceded with the Kaiser, when he visited Istanbul, to persuade the Sultan to build the Berlin-Baghdad railroad—of course this was opposed by the British because it would have interfered with their trade routes to India and the Far East. With his unusual sagacity the late Sultan Abdul Hamid, when the Kaiser asked him whether he would give the Zionists an enclave in Palestine, said: “I have many religions and sects”—*millets*, in Turkish—“and I cannot favour one sect or one religion”—or one *millet*—“over the other. Jerusalem is a trust and the Holy Land, Palestine, is a trust.”

153. The Kaiser went back empty-handed as far as the Zionists' aspirations were concerned. He told the Zionists what the Sultan had said to him. It seems that the Zionists were intelligent and knew that nothing could be done by way of the central Powers, more specifically Germany. The Zionists began to work with the British. In 1916 the British were having a very hard time with the Germans. There was a certain gentleman by the name of Weizmann who spent his formative years in Germany studying chemistry and other subjects, but finally we find him working as a chemist in the acetone industry in the United Kingdom. He was one of the protagonists of Zionism. He worked with his fellow Zionists—and I am not going into too many details—to bring the United States into the First World War in 1917. At the same time the British had made a promise to Sharif Hussein in Mecca. Of course, these colonialists did not promise him anything in Mecca, for they cannot set foot in Mecca. Their representative was in Jidda—Mecca is too holy ground for any colonialist to set foot there. They promised him that if his people fought against the Ottomans they would be liberated from Ottoman rule.

154. I as an Arab must say that we should never have fought against our brothers, the Turks. But we were forced to do so because of the Young Turks who had imported the nationalism of the French Revolution from Europe and become chauvinistic. They even deposed Sultan Abdul Hamid. I knew Enver Pasha as a child. I knew Jamal Pasha in our area. I did not know Talaat Pasha. These were the triumvirate. They were better than many Young Turks of that era who thought that they were superior, as many western countries thought that they were superior, to the Asians and the Africans. They imbibed those ideas of national superiority from the West. But before that, the Arabs with our Turkish brothers were partners in the Empire. But to make a long story short the Arabs thought that they wanted to liberate themselves from those Young Turks.

155. Britain was having a very hard time during that period—I think that Britain also had a hard time during the Second World War. The Zionists, with their usual intelligence, began to work from within the United Kingdom. The Zionists told the British: “We will enlist the United States into the First World War provided you give us Palestine, after victory.” Before that, in 1916, the British had promised the Arabs in writing that those parts of the Ottoman Empire that were Arab would be free. We have to go to the genesis. I am a contemporary of both world wars and in the twenties I was a young man. All this took place in 1919, 1917, 1916. They did not promise Palestine to the Zionists—as you know, according to the Balfour Declaration, they said that they would let the Zionists have a national home. Books have been written about the term “national home”, whether it should be a State or an autonomous people—but whatever it was, they promised them something. By the same token they had promised the Arabs independence. Do you think that we have finished with the double standard? In fairness to the British of those days, it must be said that it is still with us today.

156. In the meantime Brandeis and others prevailed on Mr. Woodrow Wilson, the President who started out as an isolationist, like Mr. Roosevelt in 1939, to railroad this host country into the First World War. The price was to give the Zionists Palestine. Of course, had it not been for the Americans in 1917, I do not know whether the Allies would have won the First World War. The American Government, or I should say, the authorities, had to pay for their promises, but not in cash.

157. I must also remind the newcomers here that there was a region called Palestine and its people were called Palestinians. Mr. Wilson went to Versailles and proclaimed his Fourteen Points. Self-determination was amongst them. I want to say something about Clemenceau, because I knew one of his friends who told me what actually happened at Versailles. When the Middle East was placed under British and French Mandate, Mr. Wilson remonstrated and said: “I think those peoples should have been liberated.” Monsieur Clemenceau—the Tiger, as he was called, although he was a doctor by profession—took Mr. Wilson by



the tie and almost choked him, and said: "You go back where you came from. We did not shed our blood at the Marne and Verdun for you with your Utopian idealistic views"—of course, I am paraphrasing what that gentleman, who knew him, told me in Paris in the twenties—"to have you come and tell us what we should do". They forget the aid of the United States. Remember those episodes which are the genesis of the Palestine question because Mr. Tekoah mentioned "international law" and "obligations".

158. We all know what Mr. Balfour did. Sharif Hussein had remonstrated with the British, through the British High Commissioner, after the Russians, following the Battle of Tannenberg, had divulged the contents of the Sykes-Picot-Sazonov Agreement of 1916 revealing that the Middle East was to be partitioned into colonies under the name of Mandated Territories. The British denied this and they exiled him to Cyprus, although he had fought on their side. He died in Cyprus in 1924. Many of us demonstrated in many Arab cities against the British for having exiled him because he told the truth.

159. Whom do those colonial Powers think they are fooling? Of course, I must say in fairness to the Jews of those days that I do not think that the British liked the Jews very much. They thought that if they had Zionists concentrated there it would be a pretext for them to interfere in the area in order to safeguard the roots of their empire.

160. Wake up, gentlemen. That was power politics at its worst—balance of power and power politics. And one would have thought that that whole episode belonged to the past. But the Second World War comes and we find Mr. Roosevelt declaring—and I heard him in one of his fireside talks while I was here in this city of New York, but not in this slaughter-house for sheep and cattle; for Turtle Bay, this site given by Rockefeller, was a slaughter-house, and I shall come to Rockefeller next; I shall not spare him—"Again and again and again I promise you that I will not send our boys to perish on foreign battlefields". The same isolationism as that of Mr. Wilson expressed by Mr. Roosevelt.

161. And, little by little, the Allies came under pressure. Mr. Churchill came to these shores—of course, his mother was American—and spoke about "our cousins the Americans". Somebody of Anglo-Saxon origin told me: "We Americans are not composed only of Anglo-Saxons; we have Italians, we have Irish, we have Africans". At the time when he told me that, there were 15 million Americans; they have since proliferated—and let them go on proliferating because this is a democracy and the more blacks there are the more things will change in this country, I think.

162. What happened? Mr. Churchill called them cousins: the Americans of Italian origin became his cousins; the Negroes became his cousins too; he lumped together everybody in America. He was a great orator. I remember him in London before I came to this country, in the 1930s.

163. Tyranny was epitomized in the figure of Hitler. No doubt he was a tyrant. But they acted as if no other tyrants had ever existed. They forgot their colonial days; they forgot how they had hijacked empires—they talk nowadays of hijacking planes.

164. They gave the war a motivation: the four freedoms. Freedom from fear—there is more fear now, in 1970, than there was in 1935; it has spread all over the world. It was just like the slogans of the First World War—to save the world for democracy; to save the world from German militarism. It was German mercantilism. Whom were they trying to fool? Now the young have awakened and they will not go by those slogans. Many of the people of my generation were susceptible to indoctrination. They were fools. They even sent their sons to the battlefields.

165. And what happened? We find Zionists very active in again railroading this host country, the United States of America, into the Second World War. I do not say they were wholly responsible, but they contributed a lot towards this railroading. This was a very fine trick, which worked. Through American Zionists they injected themselves into the domestic policies of the United States, taking note that both political parties—the Republican and the Democratic—needed something to tip the balance. They always said: "If you do something for the Zionists, we shall vote for you."

166. And the same old story is still going on. In those days they said: "Try to help the Zionist movement and we shall vote for you". Today they say: "Now, try to help Israel and we shall vote for you". Is it any wonder that Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Lindsay, the Governor of this State and the Mayor of this city, respectively carry yamulkas and put them on their heads and eat pastrami and salami? They say: "Give us your votes". If I were a Jew I would scorn them because I would know that they were doing this to get my vote.

167. Baroody tells the truth. I am not talking in platitudes. We have had enough platitudes here.

168. Many think I am a Palestinian. I am not a Palestinian. I am a Pan-Arab. We the Arabs are one nation. We do not have any Arab blood; we do not have any Arab race. The things that unify us are Islam and Arabism. And we ourselves respect all other religions. We have never had persecutions of Jews or Gentiles. We have been persecuted since the days of the Crusaders by Europeans. They wanted to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the infidels. Who were the infidels? Are we the infidels? We believe in the same God. The God of the Christians is the same as the God of the Moslems. The Christians in the Middle East in the times of the Crusaders fought on the side of their Moslem brothers, because there is no distinction. And who paid the price? The Jews, our Jews, who lived there. They were massacred by the Crusaders because they crucified Christ. The poor Jews—whether Christ was crucified or not is beside the point. But suppose he was crucified. Why should

generation after generation pay the price? The Pope finally woke up and said that the Jews of today did not crucify Christ 2,000 years ago. That is true. But people are bigoted, more so in the West than in our part of the world.

169. Those are truths and they have to be spoken from the rostrum of the United Nations. I challenge anyone to refute them; and I am prepared to answer any refutation. I also stand to be corrected if I am wrong.

170. So in 1945 there was no State of Israel, but neither was there a British Empire. Our British friends were bankrupt. Had it not been for lend-lease and I do not know what else, they would have been even more bankrupt. They could not sustain the Mandate. They threw it into the lap of the United Nations just as they had previously thrown the Mandate of South West Africa into the lap of the Republic of South Africa. I do not know why they did not throw South West Africa into the lap of the United Nations. Now I am thinking that that is something to explore in the Special Political Committee and the Fourth Committee. It is very interesting that they did not do so. You black representatives here from Africa: why do you not ask that question? Why did they throw the question of Palestine into the lap of the United Nations and not throw the question of South West Africa into the lap of the United Nations? Very interesting. It is something to explore. The answer is, of course, vested interests. But perhaps there is something more to it. We shall find out.

171. And do you think they would have relinquished the Mandate over Palestine and Iraq? Iraq, yes; they put it up as a consolation for the Hashemite House. Prince Faisal, whom I knew personally, was deposed by the French because the French thought that he was in collusion with the British.

172. I am a man of the area, Mr. President, I am telling you this. You are a Scandinavian. You are clean; you do not know; you have never had colonies since the days of the Vikings. These people have been playing chess with us for centuries, ever since the days of the Crusaders. And do they think they can fool us now? No, no. This should be declared from the rostrum of the United Nations once and for all, although I have already spent a lot of time talking about this question in Committees and in the Security Council.

173. All right, there are specialists in every country. The specialists in the State Department of the United States said: "It is not in the interests of the United States to alienate the Arab peoples. We have interests there." It was not because they loved us; I do not think they loved us more than the Jews or hated us more than the Jews. We were Arabs—"you Arabs", they used to call us in western Europe when I was there in the 1930s. To the Indians they said "you Indians". There was no Pakistan then; there was only one country in those days.

174. I knew Mir Khan, who became Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States. He was the Secretary to the Finance Minister of the Nizam of Hyderabad. He had to put up the Deputy High Commissioner for India—he was a Moslem, Rashid uz-Zaman, God rest his soul—in Mount Royal, in his apartment, because of his colour; he was of an olive complexion.

175. You talk of discrimination. Discrimination is still there. The words have changed but the attitudes are still the same. They cannot fool me and my African and Asian brothers.

176. So what happened was that the Zionists injected their question into the domestic political affairs of this country, of the United States. That is what they did, and they have succeeded.

177. In 1947, specifically—and if Mr. Tekoah is here, let him open his ears—specifically, they broke the principles of the Charter. In 1919, 94 per cent of the indigenous people—do not call them Arabs, do not call them Palestinians; some of them may have been Jews and embraced Christianity or Islam—94 per cent of the indigenous population of the Holy Land were non-Europeans. And I submit that the Zionist movement is a colonial movement from Europe, using a noble religion, Judaism, as a motivation for a political end, just as the Crusaders went to our part of the world using Christianity, another noble religion, as a motivation for political and economic ends—not political or economic ends, but political and economic ends. Nothing has changed.

178. Mr. President, somebody is talking, bothering me there. Will you kindly tell him to shut up, Sir.

179. The PRESIDENT: Mr. Ambassador, may I just remind you that I stated before, with regard to the exercise of the right of reply, that everyone would have the opportunity to speak at length on this question when we have the real debate later?

180. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Perhaps you are bored with me.

181. The PRESIDENT: Mr. Baroody, I am never bored by you. It is always nice to listen to you. But if the right of reply is used—

182. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I mentioned this before. Somebody bothered Mr. Riad this morning from there, and I spoke to Mr. Stavropoulos.

183. The PRESIDENT: From where?

184. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): From behind the windows, or somewhere. Somebody is bothering us. I thought we were a fortress here. Is there somebody snooping behind there?

185. What is the matter with you? I want to finish my statement. With all due respect, we have no power except the power of words. Power belongs to those who exercise it. You have no power, Sir, but you are

a member of NATO. We are a member of no power bloc. We want to have our say. I have other Committees to service. The Egyptians will deal with the situation in the Middle East, and there are other Arabs. I have to have my say. We come here to work, and it is not six o'clock yet.

186. Of course, I bow to you, Sir. I would ask Mr. Stavropoulos to check whether my words are being carried outside this hall. Some of the people around here are aware of the facts I am presenting, but there are many people in the host country who are ignorant of the situation because no one briefs them except the Zionists through the mass information media which they control, not only in this country but in many countries, western countries mostly. This is an opportunity for me to educate—if I may use the word, because I am not speaking with rancour or hatred; I have nothing against the Jews as such—to educate the people of this country. May be they will wake up and see that their politicians curry favour with the Zionists for their votes. That is a domestic matter, and if that domestic matter did not touch us, I would never mention it. Far be it from me to interfere in the domestic affairs of another State, inasmuch as I would not allow anybody to interfere in the domestic affairs of my State.

187. But this does not affect us Arabs alone. This affects the world. The Zionists have made a world Jewish problem, and I will be very sad if one day they find they have become the scapegoat of the Gentile world—not “gentle” but “Gentile”; sometimes it becomes very ferocious, as history has shown us.

188. Paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the Charter speaks of the principle of self-determination, which this Organization elaborated into a right between 1947 and 1949 and which now figures as the first article in both International Covenants on Human Rights [resolution 2200 A (XXI)]. The right of self-determination of peoples. Who has violated the Charter and international law? We warned Members of the United Nations. I was here in 1947, I was sent to warn some of them. What were we told? “No, we will see what we can do. We may place this under a Trusteeship until we can find a solution. After all, these poor Jews were persecuted in central Europe.” And they assured us that the Arabs would be treated with justice. Then, with my colleagues, I requested that the question be referred to the International Court of Justice. Mr. Tekoah speaks of an aberration from international law. And none other than the Western Powers put spokes in the wheel of those who wished to refer this question to the International Court of Justice in 1947 and 1948, to see whether the people's right to self-determination had been violated or not. Who violated international law? And how did the Zionists succeed in their task? By pressure, by bribery. I am not going to embarrass a country whose representative is with us here. He is a contemporary of mine; indeed he is older than I am. He spoke for two hours against the partition of Palestine in 1947, when we were at Lake Success. And then none other than Mr. Truman sent word to the President of that gentleman's country, telling him:

“We will withhold American aid if you do not vote for the partition of Palestine.” This is the way Palestine was partitioned. There was an Ambassador of a Latin American country—I do not want to mention the name—who told me one day that a package had been received by his wife, and in it she found a fur coat. In those days it was worth \$8,000; in the inflated dollars of today it would probably be worth \$35,000. When he came home she embraced him and said: “How could you afford this coat?” He said: “I did not send you anything.” Then it dawned on him where that coat came from, and they sent it back.

189. Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, died of a frustrated depression. He became sick, because he was opposed by his Government. He said: “It is not in the interests of the United States to alienate the Arabs.” I do not know whether anybody pushed him from the window of his hospital or whether he committed suicide. I am not a judge. I should not arouse suspicion.

190. Mr. Rockefeller toured some of the totalitarian régimes in this hemisphere and got votes. He was a young man then. I remember when Mr. Roosevelt at the age of 37 gave him the Latin American desk. Zionist rabbis only a week ago had a full page in *The New York Times* thanking Mr. Rockefeller, who wants to be Governor again, for having prevailed. It must have cost \$5,000 or \$10,000, unless *The New York Times* has turned Zionist and gave it to them free. I do not know. They claim that they are not. It said: “Thank you; in the time of crisis you brought certain votes for us.”

191. A prelate in this town—I am not going to mention the sect lest I touch religious susceptibilities—died a broken man at about the age of 80. He was one who played on the sentiments of certain government men to get votes for the partition of Palestine.

192. And then in a sanctimonious “holier-than-thou” manner, Mr. Tekoah says that the Arabs violated the Charter. Those who violated the Charter were those who since 1919 have not heeded the principle and later the right of self-determination, as it is enshrined in the Charter which U Thant referred to the other day as our bible. What bible? People read the bible and the next day they commit murder and adultery. What bible? This is the bible?

193. No acrimony; no hatred. We are all brothers and sisters under the skin. But let those who throw aspersions on others delve a little more into history, the real history. As for Mr. Tekoah, he comes from Shanghai. He looks to me like a Ukrainian. He is not a Semite. I do not say that derisively. We respect others who are not Semites as we respect ourselves. But those Khazars of central Europe who were converted to Judaism in the eighth century banded themselves together because the Europeans had persecuted them throughout the centuries and they were hounded by the Europeans. What did they do? They came to colonize our part of the world. They were foolish, because if they had come without the flag of Israel, they could

have colonized us economically. All the Arabs now are alert to this new European colonialism under the guise of religion, as if God gives people land. They say: "God gave us Israel." Why does not God give me anything? I pray to Him every day. Is God in the real estate business? He parcels land out to nations? Then good Lord, he is a discriminating God. Whom are we fooling? This is all fundamentalism, which even the orthodox men of religion, whether Jew or Gentile, do not believe in any more. They learn it by rote. God does not give. We are all the same human family. And what about those who do not believe in God? It seems that God gave them big tracts. What has God to do with this question? It is man. And every time he wants to bolster his argument he brings God into the picture. God is fed up with humanity. That is why we, Jew and Gentile, are having so much trouble today.

194. I felt so deeply touched when Mr. Tekoah said the Egyptians "bombed our villages". There was some war in Yemen and unfortunately we Arabs as well as non-Arabs acquire arms from the manufacturers and sometimes there are certain excesses. But I do not think that anybody, unless he was in Yemen, was burnt. But what about that minister? He was an American protestant minister who spoke Arabic and he came to see me at the time when I had five operations in succession. Finally he waited and waited for months to see me, and he came, almost crying, to show me an illustrated pamphlet in English about the Arabs in Palestine, or the Palestinians—forget that they were Arabs—who were burnt by napalm by the Zionists. I said: "I do not want to see this; you are a hypocrite; go and show it to your Government. I do not know whether it is true or not true. You remind me of a person whose Government kills someone and you are bringing this to wipe your tears on at the funeral. Get out of my sight." I sent him out. I do not want hypocrites.

195. Then they instituted here the organization called the Friends of the Middle East: our American friends. I never went to their lunches. I said: "Individually we are friends." Finally, we found out that they were an arm of the Central Intelligence Agency. They folded up. I am glad that I did not partake of their hospitality. Whom do they think they are fooling, those big Powers?

196. I do not know where our friend Gromyko is—I call him Gromyko because I have known him since 1945. The only mistake the Russians made was that they also participated in the partition of Palestine. Good Lord, that is one thing the big Powers agreed on. What have we done to the Russians or to the Americans? And now each one wants to bring in his fleet. I thought this gunboat diplomacy belonged to Teddy Roosevelt's day—brandish the stick, speak softly. Now they do not brandish the stick. They send fleets and insult us too. They tell us that they are the arbiters of our area. I think that our region is 7,000 miles away from their country. Why should they be the arbiters, just because they emerged as great Powers after the Second World War? To heck with it. They will disintegrate like other great Powers. Why should we be the victims? We never molested the Americans or the Russians, or the English for that matter.

197. All we want is to be left alone. So they planted that European element in our midst—violating the Charter, violating the right of self-determination, refusing to transmit the question to the International Court of Justice. Now I note that in the Canadian-Japanese—the so-called Western—draft resolution on international security [A/C.1/L.514], which is being dealt with in the First Committee, they talk of the International Court of Justice. Why, when we begged them to take the Palestine question, the question of self-determination, to the International Court of Justice, did they turn their backs on us?

198. Mr. Leon Henderson, who I think is still alive and must be close to 80, told Mr. Truman—with others, including Paul Allen, whom I knew, and who told me this later—that it is not in the interests of the United States to alienate the Arab world, and the Moslem world for that matter, by pushing the Zionist cause too much. And Mr. Truman mentioned it in his memoirs.<sup>3</sup> He said: "Do I have to listen to those striped-pants boys of the State Department—what they tell the President of the United States to do? And if I did anything, I did it out of humanitarian concern." I am paraphrasing volume II of his memoirs. You can buy it for \$2 in a paper-back; you do not have to spend much. And then he said: "I did what I did because they pestered me; they used to come by the back door to the White House, those Zionists."

199. In fairness to Mr. Truman, I would say that he was sometimes honest in telling what happened. He said: "They were bringing pressure upon me." Then, finally he digressed and said: "I felt sorry for the Jews, so I gave them Palestine."

200. Why did he not open the expanses of Texas and Kansas? And if he was such a humanitarian gentleman, why did he erase Nagasaki and Hiroshima from the map of the earth? Why did the Americans and the British erase Dresden, which was not a military target? And when those frustrated Palestinians hijack a plane or two in order to stir world public opinion about their case, they say "Oh, those barbarians."

201. Sir Alec Douglas-Home—I made him a lord the other day—mentioned here that it was mediaeval barbarity. It is not mediaeval barbarity. The weak have to resort, unfortunately, to extraordinary measures. They are not expected to go to the battlefield when they have no arms. And we here, we should discourage conflicts of that nature, whether it is on a small scale or a large scale. But let them examine their conscience and not be politicians. Let them be statesmen and not throw words around.

202. We, the Arabs, harbour no ill will towards anyone. And the Koran, which is the law of the country I represent, in describing God did not draw on many of the magnificent descriptions of God, who in the end it says is the ineffable, the invisible. It does not say "In the name of God the powerful"—although this is one of the adjectives—"the magnificent", "the

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs by Harry S. Truman, Vol. II: Years of Trial and Hope* (Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1956).

sublime", and so on and so forth. It says "In the name of God the merciful". But it did not stop there. For reaffirmation it said "and compassionate", because the Koran, Islam, speaks of the universality of man, and of man as being a member of one family, the family of mankind. And this is in our tradition. Chivalry stems from Islam.

203. We do not hang our enemies when they surrender, as the Europeans did in the Nuremberg or Tokyo tribunals. I took issue with Taylor, the prosecutor of Yamashita, in Spokane, Washington, when he passed through. And he turned yellow when I said: "You had no right to kill those who surrendered to you. Where is your sense of chivalry?"

204. We still maintain our chivalry. It is in our mores; it is in our religion; it is in our tradition, because we suffered for years and years. Maybe the Europeans did not suffer enough, notwithstanding two world wars. They still use that vindictiveness, but they dress it up with all kinds of embellishments. I am not talking of the people of the West. They are as good and as bad as any; they are marvellous individually. I am talking of the leaders who still utilize deception.

205. That is why I took the floor: to tell you that before this Zionist movement took root and usurped the Palestinian's rights we never persecuted the Jew. In fact, one of our Arab Jews is called Samauel. He is noted for his hospitality. Proverbially, Samauel—Samuel—was an Arab Jew. Maimonides was an Arab Jew; he worshipped the same God, but those eastern and central European Zionists are secular. They are colonialists, they created a foreign element in our midst which caused an abscess, and the whole body politic and body social has been shaken by this new intrusion in our midst.

206. If they had come as Jews, without the banner of Israel, without lording it not only over us but also over what they consider second-class citizens of Israel, those oriental Jews who had flocked to Israel because they were the victims of the Zionist movement, nobody would have molested them. We would have considered them not our cousins but our brothers, as we are told to do by traditions and our religion, which we live, not preach as many do.

207. People go to church on Sunday; they used to go in 1947 and in 1948, and on Monday they were conspiring to cut our throats—whether in Palestine or in other areas of the world. This is schizophrenia, to go and offer prayers to the Prince of Peace, Jesus—Issa, in Arabic. We believe in Issa. Many people think that the Moslems do not believe in Issa—Issa, from the spirit of God. That is a double standard.

208. And we come here and babble about missiles, cease-fire lines, surreptitious moves—all words. And the arbiters are Mr. Yost, here, and also those behind him. They, and also our Russian friends, are arbiters. Our American friends and our Russian friends—put it that way, so that it shall not be thought that I am discriminating. We have an Arabic saying: "I have

had it up to here, up to my nose"—up to the nose of every honest man whether he be an Asian Arab or non-Arab, an African Arab or non-Arab. We have no discrimination. Our Sudanese brothers are pitch black, many of them; they are Arabs, they are Moslems. The Semitic Jews are not our cousins; they are our brothers. Abraham is their patriarch and our patriarch—but not those Khazars who are acting like the colonialist of yore in our area.

209. Far be it from me, Mr. President, to tell you or this august Assembly what we should do. I have the privilege of talking as a human being and, personally, I think nothing will come out of the United Nations on the Palestine question, or on Viet-Nam for that matter—at any rate, we are not concerned with the latter question since it has not been brought here—unless we are conscientious; we really want peace with justice, not the peace of the grave, not the peace of appeasement. And if there is no justice—and there will be no justice—we might as well fold up, just as I saw with my own eyes the League of Nations fold up.

210. The PRESIDENT: I have some announcements to make before we adjourn the meeting. First, I want to tell representatives that I have just received a letter from the Chairman of the Second Committee—a letter which has now been given to the Secretariat to be translated and distributed as a document—stating that after assiduous work and very difficult negotiations, the Second Committee has been able to terminate a report on the Second Development Decade [A/8124] which is ready for the plenary to discuss tomorrow. We can then treat it in such a way that that declaration can be part of the solemn declaration to be adopted on 24 October. In order to give representatives more time to study that document, which has been distributed, it is proposed to hold the meeting at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. There will be no morning meeting tomorrow. There will be an afternoon meeting to terminate that part of the work of the Second Committee.

211. The Committee for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations has not yet terminated its work and, in order to be able to treat that declaration in the same way as the declarations on friendly relations and the Second Development Decade, we shall have a night meeting at the beginning of next week.

212. Perhaps the Assembly will allow me also to repeat some of the things that I have already stated about the remaining meetings of the Commemorative Session.

213. Beginning next week, there will be five or six speakers scheduled for the morning meetings and six or seven speakers for the afternoon meetings. I hope that representatives will forgive me if I mention again that it will be impossible to complete such a heavy schedule of speakers if they do not try to impose upon themselves a certain discipline concerning the length of the speeches. It will be remembered that the Committee for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary recommended

that statements on behalf of Member States that did not participate in the general debate should not exceed a maximum of 25 minutes, and that those on behalf of Member States which had already participated in the general debate should be correspondingly shorter, not exceeding a maximum of fifteen minutes. I trust that delegations will find it possible to abide by the Assembly's decision and that, therefore, it will not be necessary to carry over speakers to the next plenary, which might, of course, lead to the convening of night meetings to accommodate all the speakers whose names are inscribed on the list.

214. Furthermore, I should like to make a polite request to representatives to try to refrain from their enthusiastic gratitude to speakers and not interrupt the meeting by crowding round them to congratulate them immediately after the speech, because that does disturb the representative who is called upon to speak immediately afterwards. I hope representatives will

understand that I make this request only to enhance the dignity of the meeting.

215. I have two more small things which I should like to add. One is that it will be quite impossible to finish this programme if we do not start the meetings on time; and I might even suggest that it is a matter of the greatest courtesy to the first speaker of the meeting that representatives should be present to listen to him.

216. Lastly, I should like to state that I hope that during the next week speeches will be such that representatives will not feel compelled to ask to exercise the right of reply, which also changes the character of the meetings. But if it should be necessary to have rights of reply, the President will probably propose a time-limit on those replies as provided for in the rules of procedure.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*