

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



**23rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 8 October 1976,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	
Speech by Mr. Kamougué (Chad)	441
Speech by U Hla Phone (Burma)	445
Speech by Mr. Boyd (Panama)	447

President: Mr. Hamilton Shirley AMERASINGHE
(Sri Lanka).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. KAMOUGUE (Chad) (*interpretation from French*):
Mr. President, may I first congratulate you most warmly on behalf of Chad on the occasion of your brilliant election to the presidency of the thirty-first regular session of the United Nations General Assembly. Those who thus have entrusted you with this challenging responsibility know that your abilities as a statesman and your far-reaching knowledge of the problems confronting the international community will enable you to guide our work with the necessary tact and authority, so that some of these urgent and grave problems, may find a felicitous and just solution in conformity with the principles of our Charter. I am particularly pleased, Mr. President, that you come from a third-world country, the Republic of Sri Lanka, whose contribution to the struggle of peoples for independence, freedom and dignity has been so clearly demonstrated. You are indeed the right man to stimulate the necessary efforts to find solutions capable of effectively ensuring justice, peace and security in the world, and I should like to pledge to you the whole-hearted co-operation of the delegation of Chad.

2. I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Gaston Thorn, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg, who skilfully and wisely fulfilled his mandate as President of the thirtieth session.

3. May I also express my country's best wishes to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, our Secretary-General, whose great abilities, devotion and persevering will to succeed have been strikingly apparent in the service of our Organization.

4. On behalf of the delegation of Chad I wish to greet the delegation of the Republic of Seychelles, whose presence here is a source of satisfaction to us. However, we regret that Viet Nam and Angola, two independent countries, have not yet been admitted to membership in our Organization.

5. Chad has already conveyed to the great Chinese people and to its leaders the profound sorrow of our people, of our High Military Council and of our Government on the death of Mao Tsetung, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the People's Republic of China, and my delegation would like to reiterate those sentiments here.

6. Each year, at this time, we have the opportunity to meet in the General Assembly hall to reflect together on problems confronting our world in crisis. These problems are as numerous as they are complex, and generate points of tension in different parts of the world that the international community is concerned to eliminate in order to secure the maintenance of international peace and security. The greater the progress of science and technology, which are making gigantic strides for the welfare of mankind, the more conscience-stricken we are by poverty, ignorance, racial discrimination, expansionism, zionism and so forth. Although the international community has achieved satisfactory results in recent years in the matter of co-operation, decolonization and détente, many disturbing situations unfortunately persist, and these we believe should be considered only by the United Nations. On this occasion I should like to reiterate my country's position on the burning questions of our day, which generate political instability in the world and constitute a threat to international peace and security.

7. In an address broadcast on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Second Republic of Chad, our Head of State, General Félix Malloum Ngakoutou Bey-Ndi, the Chairman of the High Military Council and of the provisional Government, reaffirmed our devotion to the principles of conciliation, reconciliation, unity and good-neighbourliness—principles which are constant elements in our domestic policy.

8. With regard to foreign affairs, the Head of State of Chad unequivocally reaffirmed our faith in the United Nations and our unwavering support for the principles of the non-aligned movement and of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], whose object, like that of the United Nations, is the maintenance of international peace and security.

9. The questions of Rhodesia and Namibia have been discussed at such length in this Organization and elsewhere that it is unnecessary to recall the numerous violations of our decisions by those who stood to benefit by such violations. I shall therefore confine myself to indicating my Government's position on the latest developments.

10. We believe that all the initiatives that have now been taken, although belatedly, to bring Ian Smith and his henchmen to review their position should be considered

realistically, provided the United Kingdom gives a favourable reception to the appeal made by five African Heads of State for the urgent convening, outside Rhodesia, of a constitutional conference representing all Rhodesians. However, if such a conference is to be useful, we must see to it that it gives effect to the real and legitimate aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe, who have been forced, as we know, to take up arms. In the meantime the reactionaries should be given no chance to loosen the vice in which their régime is being squeezed, or to prepare favourable opportunities for the manoeuvres of the imperialists, whose unchanging objective is to install, throughout Africa, retrograde Governments that they could easily manipulate. That is why the patriotic forces of Zimbabwe must continue their struggle.

11. For our part, we believe that all the measures we take must be directed to the following: first, the total elimination from the political scene of Ian Smith, his Government and the black Rhodesians who are gravely compromised with his régime; secondly, the establishment of a transitional Government composed of members of all the groups that have long been struggling for the genuine independence of Rhodesia, pending free elections, based on universal suffrage, with the participation of all the Rhodesian people; thirdly, the participation of all the freedom fighters, without exception, in any negotiations; and lastly, the immediate liberation of all political prisoners.

12. In Namibia, all efforts to find a solution have been contemptuously disregarded and frustrated by those who wish to perpetuate their domination over that country, which has vast natural resources. Here, as in Rhodesia, the people aspire only to freedom, justice and human dignity. To realize these aspirations it is essential to begin by ensuring their national unity and territorial integrity and to prevent the manoeuvres of the *apartheid* régime, which seeks to create so-called national homelands, grotesquely called "bantustans". Moreover, the laws stemming from the so-called constitutional talks at Windhoek, which were held with the participation of dubious individuals whose allegiance to the Vorster régime gives them no moral authority to discuss the interests of the Namibian people, must be rejected. The South West Africa People's Organization, the only movement recognized by OAU because it is the authentic representative of that people, must take part in these negotiations if there is to be real peace in the region. Any attempted solution that did not take this aspect of the question into account could only lead to an intensification of the violence whose dimensions it would be difficult to gauge.

13. We believe the time has come to carry out unhesitatingly the provisions of the Security Council resolutions on Namibia, in particular resolution 385 (1976), and to extend the necessary assistance to the Namibian people in their struggle for independence. If nothing is done, the freedom fighters will have no choice but to extend their guerrilla activities to all fronts until they achieve victory.

14. In South Africa a national movement has arisen which sufficiently demonstrates the resolve of the black masses to rid themselves of the inhuman and tyrannical *apartheid* system. Is it not shocking that, at a time when the international conscience is more than ever horrified by the

murder of women, school children, and other innocent people perpetrated by the Vorster Government in Soweto and other townships in South Africa, the allies of this sinister personage continue shamelessly to use wretched excuses to sell war *matériel* to South Africa or to assist it to manufacture such *matériel*? The judgement of the racists in power in Pretoria is clouded to such an extent that one of their spokesmen, the Minister of Police, had the unbelievable audacity to declare on 10 September last: "There is a historic situation in South Africa where the white man is in a position of authority which he is not ready to give up."

15. However, the erosion of this so-called authority will not be prevented either by criminal and gratuitous repression, or by the supply of increasingly sophisticated arms, which encourages increasing repression. The international community, which has declared the minority racist régime in South Africa illegal in its resolution 3411 (XXX) and declared the *apartheid* policy to be an international crime, must not be content with tolerating the situation prevailing in the zone. It must rather realize the grave threat which the *apartheid* régime poses to international peace and security in order to find appropriate measures which could effectively assist the population to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination. It should, moreover, demand the liberation of all the political prisoners, thousands of students, African opposition leaders opposing the *apartheid* régime and other political detainees under the laws on "terrorism and the security of the State." As regards South Africa, we would be committing a grave error if we were gulled by the idea advanced by some that the independence of Zimbabwe and Namibia will cause *apartheid* to fall of its own weight like an overripe fruit.

16. The problems of concern to southern Africa are unfortunately to be found in other regions of Africa and the world where peoples are still subjected to imperialism, colonialism, racism and zionism.

17. In this connexion, we cannot fail to mention the infringement of the sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity of the Comoros by the former colonial Power. Our attitude towards the dismemberment of that country, in total disregard of the aspirations of its people, has been clearly expressed from this rostrum last year.¹ I will not repeat it here; but I should like to stress unequivocally that my Government considers that the occupation of a part of the territory of a State constitutes, whatever the motivations may be, an extremely dangerous precedent. This behaviour, which increasingly affects some States in violation of international law and the will of peoples, should be systematically rejected. It should lead us to be increasingly vigilant if we want to avoid the dismemberment in the near future of a State Member of this Organization by those who want to indulge in this game either by force of arms or by simple subversion where successionist impulses are present.

18. Let us now turn to the situation in the Middle East, where no solution has been found despite the numerous initiatives and resolutions adopted in this regard. There has

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2359th meeting.

been no satisfactory solution because these efforts have constantly come up against deliberate obstacles set up by those who think they stand to profit therefrom.

19. The prolonged sufferings of our Arab brothers, the origins of which are well-known, must be brought to an end through the attainment of a genuine and durable peace. The oft-repeated principles for a settlement are acceptable; hence, any other manoeuvre, however subtle, would only amount to a smoke-screen. A genuine and durable peace means, first and foremost, the immediate evacuation of Arab and African territories illegally occupied by Israel since 1967; secondly, the restoration to the Palestinians of all their inalienable rights; thirdly, international guarantees for all the States in the region to live within secure and recognize/ boundaries; fourthly, compensation to the Arab peoples, particularly the Arab people of Palestine, for damages due to Israeli aggression.

20. Likewise, we feel profound sorrow at the Lebanese tragedy which stems directly from the Israeli-Arab conflict. The destruction of Lebanon only renders more evident the urgency and the need to find a global solution in this part of the world.

21. The small countries, more than the developed ones, need the United Nations to develop and to see their interests protected.

22. If the fundamental principles of our Organization are immutable, none the less the Charter contains some obsolete provisions. Proof of this is the right of veto, which is being abused by certain permanent members of the Security Council to protect their selfish interests. The Security Council, whose principal role is to safeguard international peace and security, should reflect the geographical composition of the international community. The area of international peace and security should not be the exclusive monopoly of the great Powers. The right of veto, to mention but one of the obsolete provisions of the Charter, is an anachronistic institution. We should correct certain errors harking back to a time that has been superseded to turn our Organization into an effective tool for co-operation among States for the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security.

23. As our Head of State has already had occasion to state to the Secretary-General on the occasion of his official visit to N'Djamena on 12 May 1976: "We in Chad have great hopes in the future of this community".

24. The independence acquired at great cost is being consolidated where foreign and sordid interests seek to question it. I should like therefore to renew the sincere greetings of Chad to the glorious people of socialist Viet Nam, of Laos and Kampuchea, whose striking victories over the forces of evil prove, if need be, that no foreign intervention can frustrate the desire of people to live freely as they wish. We sincerely wish that after having endured 30 years of ruthless and unjust wars these people might finally know peace in order to devote their entire energies to the reconstruction of their destroyed economy and to the rehabilitation of their social and cultural life, which has suffered such upheavals as a result of foreign intervention. Thus, they could fully contribute to our efforts here to

improve the peaceful relations among nations and to establish justice in their relations.

25. My country, which prizes peace and justice, subscribes unreservedly to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the strict respect for the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of States.

26. We firmly oppose the use of force in international relations; this practice is only aimed at the small countries which do not have sufficient means to enjoy their legitimate right to self-defence. We support a convention on the non-use of force in relations among States.

27. We also sincerely believe that the extravagant territorial claims and the campaigns of subversion, aided and abetted by certain States, greatly increase the risk of international tension and constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. We welcome the efforts of the General Assembly, which adopted resolution 3496 (XXX) of 15 December 1975 aimed at convening in 1977 a conference of plenipotentiaries on the succession of States in the matter of treaties in order to draft a convention, one of whose essential provisions would be to guarantee existing frontiers among States.

28. These sacrosanct ideas of peace, justice and peaceful coexistence enshrined in the Charter are a guarantee for small countries, including mine.

29. While colonialism is progressively crumbling, other insidious forms of domination, remote-controlled by imperialism, gradually emerge in order to disturb friendly and brotherly relations among States which have just acceded to independence. If we do not rapidly unmask these vicious manoeuvres, peace in the entire world will be jeopardized. In this connexion, I should like to refer to questions increasingly raised in the minds of people concerning the relations of my country and some of its neighbours—relations mentioned in an Associated Press release and reflected in some of the mass media, including *The New York Times* of 10 September 1976. In an article which can only be called extravagant, in mentioning some countries including Chad, *The New York Times* said, *inter alia*, that Chad apparently had sold off part of its territory to a neighbouring State in return for substantial economic assistance, and no one had protested this.

30. We should wonder what the people in my country think of these reports. I would like to say that vast efforts have been undertaken by the new régime radically to change the mentality of the Chadian masses, who are now becoming increasingly aware of the just relations they should maintain with one another and with their neighbours, how they should handle internal or external subversion, and the vigilance and responsibilities they require in order to exercise full control over the exploitation of their natural resources, taking into account the backwardness and the obscurantism into which they have been deliberately plunged by colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism. Our country has been listed by the United Nations as one of the poorest countries on the planet—a land-locked country where internal communications become impracticable during each rainy season.

31. We should like to state that we are working to eliminate these difficulties, but it should be clearly understood once and for all that despite these factors, the Chadian people will never compromise on the vital questions of its independence, its sovereignty and the total integrity of its territory.

32. I should like to state today, before world public opinion, that my country will never yield one inch of its territory to anyone.

33. As I have already stated at the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo, nothing will weaken the idea that the Chadian people truly constitute a nation of all its children, including those who are now expatriates for various reasons, and nothing will detract us from the duty to defend it.

34. As regards the Indian Ocean, I should like to reaffirm the positive vote of my delegation on resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971 and other resolutions declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. We should like to appeal to the great Powers and the main maritime users to conform to the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

35. As regards Cyprus, we should like to reaffirm our determination to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus. The solution of the Cyprus problem can only result from direct negotiations between the two communities—the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots—without any foreign interference.

36. After this brief political outline, I should like to deal briefly with economic questions.

37. In this connexion, I should like to point out with profound regret that we continue to live in a world of good intentions, where concrete actions and political will are often absent. Indeed, the meetings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD] follow one another, the North-South Conference is marking time, and—something which indeed bears repeating—the gap that separates the rich and the poor becomes wider and wider. The third world is left to draw the balance sheet of its poverty, all the more aggravated by the problem of foreign debt.

38. The alarming element of the present situation is that the developing countries, which represent 70 per cent of the world's population, have only 30 per cent of the world income.

39. The developed countries are aware of this state of affairs, but they remain indifferent or, at most, endorse it; but the increasing awareness of the international community cannot remain indulgent to such an attitude which, in plain words, is a deliberate act further to enrich the minority and to impoverish the majority, and to maintain it in a situation of poverty, disease, hunger and illiteracy.

40. Faced with the urgent problems of raw materials and development, the sixth special session of the General Assembly adopted resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) relating to the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order.

41. Dealing with these problems at its seventh special session, the General Assembly, through resolution 3362 (S-VII) requested the fourth session of UNCTAD to come to decisions on the improvement of market structures in the area of raw materials and commodities, including decisions relating to an integrated programme and the implementation of the elements of this programme.

42. International action in favour of trade in commodities has not made general progress since the adoption of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [resolution 2626 (XXV)].

43. It is not surprising that many of the provisions of this Strategy concern commodities, since these provide a large portion of the foreign exchange earnings of the great majority of developing countries.

44. Thus, turning more particularly to the community of poor nations, we believe that the dynamics of future development cannot be confined to "bipolar" relations between third-world countries and developed countries but should also be founded on the strengthening of economic co-operation among developing countries in order to translate into concrete action the notion of collective self-sufficiency. As the production capacity of our countries increases and as our own internal consumption is intensified, our countries should strengthen their over-all infrastructure by strengthening their ties in the commercial, financial and monetary fields as well as in the areas of production and investment. In future, these links could be expanded in order to encompass new types of distribution in all areas.

45. In this connexion, the Mexico Conference that has just completed its work,² has laid the groundwork for horizontal co-operation more than ever necessary. It was successful in so far as there was unanimity in the adoption of measures concerning production, trade, infrastructure, services and, particularly, monetary and financial areas, the area of science, technology and technical co-operation.

46. The establishment of a new, international economic order as we see it would remain an insoluble problem if developed States persist in their egoism and fail to agree to fundamental changes in relations governing existing trade relationships.

47. I should like to dwell for a minute on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea whose work, Mr. President, you have been guiding for the past few years.

48. This important Conference, whose aims are the drafting and the conclusion of a convention which would lay down international maritime law, is deadlocked despite the increasing efforts that you, Mr. President, and the representatives of developing countries have unceasingly exerted. In the opinion of my delegation, the responsibility for the little progress achieved at the fifth session of that Conference devolves upon the maritime Powers, which deliberately delay the work of the Conference in order to

² Conference on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries, held at Mexico City from 13 to 21 September 1976.

exploit for their own profit the resources of the sea-bed. Their intention is to include in the future convention provisions which would further strengthen their position of hegemony.

49. The future convention should take into account the interests of all parties concerned, bearing in mind the new international economic order and the principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*]. Chad, which is a land-locked country, will support any initiative aimed at including in this convention provisions according preferential treatment to developing countries which are land-locked and geographically disadvantaged.

50. I cannot close the economic part of my statement without dealing with its corollary, that of the foreign debt which, according to the conclusions of the Conference just held in Stockholm, grouping businessmen of 34 countries under the auspices of the International Chamber of Commerce, today amounts to \$US 120 to 170 billion. Within the present international context, it is very difficult, if not impossible, for the developing countries to repay this debt and the interest incurred unless their foreign exchange earnings are guaranteed. Consequently, it is essential to ensure to these countries effective guarantees that their products will sell at competitive prices on the world market.

51. It is therefore urgently necessary to convene an international conference on debt which could study the modalities and payments arrangements. Such a conference, in my view, would undoubtedly foster a better understanding of the real scope of this heavy burden and would prove to all the urgent need to establish a new international economic order enabling developing countries to discharge their obligations.

52. In conclusion, I should like to thank very sincerely on behalf of my delegation all members of the General Assembly for the confidence they have expressed to my country in appointing us one of the Vice-Presidents of the present session.

53. U HLA PHONE (Burma): Mr. President, permit me first of all to convey to you the warm congratulations of the delegation of Burma on your election as President of this General Assembly. We wish you every success in the discharge of your high office and assure you of our support and co-operation.

54. To our outgoing President, Mr. Gaston Thorn, we take this opportunity to pay a tribute to his energetic efforts in presiding over the last Assembly.

55. We should also like to take this opportunity to extend to the delegation of the Republic of Seychelles a very warm welcome to our Organization.

56. At the same time, we regret that our friendly neighbour, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has not yet been able to send a delegation to participate in the work of the General Assembly. The consistent view of our Government is that each application for membership should be decided strictly on its merits in accordance with the

provisions of Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations. Since last year, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has clearly established itself as a reunified nation of national independence with a Government exercising effective control over the entire country. Clearly it is entitled as of right to be represented in the United Nations according to the principle of universality of this Organization and on the same basis as every other Member State. The delegation of Burma looks forward to welcoming soon the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam into our family of nations.

57. Likewise, we very much regret that the People's Republic of Angola which has been accorded *de jure* recognition by more than two thirds of the States Members of the United Nations is still denied admission to our world Organization. This is contrary both to the spirit of the United Nations Charter and to the principle of universality.

58. The addition of each new Member implies the growth of this world forum in both strength and stature. It also implies the Organization's continuing validity and efficacy. Despite its short-comings and despite its apparent inability to make an impact on some of the most vital issues facing the world today, the United Nations remains a basic necessity of our times and the best hope of mankind.

59. In recent years, the tendency of the great Powers to have recourse to negotiations, dialogue and contact in the search for political solutions to their differences has resulted in the relaxation of tensions among them and has been instrumental in giving a positive direction to their relations. The fact remains that this is chiefly a bilateral process based on mutual interest and security. It cannot be meaningful for other countries unless the same great Powers limit their involvement in the areas of the world where their competing interests tend to interpose.

60. Peace and security are indivisible. It is important to stress here that in the closely linked world of today, peace and security cannot be confined only to a few Powers. It is our fervent hope that it will be equally possible for other parts of the world to benefit from the favourable trends in great Power relations, so as to achieve the greatest possible spread of peace and security.

61. The longstanding areas of crisis in southern Africa, the Middle East and the Korean peninsula, continue to constitute a threat to international peace and security. Over the past 30 years, the General Assembly has been preoccupied with many of the problems of these crisis areas. Yet there is no discernible prospect of fruitful advance towards their resolution. Today, the situation in these areas is marked by acute tensions. The issues have become more intense and complicated than ever as time and history overtake events.

62. We meet at a time of grave forebodings in southern Africa. Dark clouds of war hover menacingly as the people of the region mobilize for armed struggle to liquidate colonialism, racism and racial discrimination. The collective efforts of the United Nations to assure the peaceful fulfilment of the aspirations of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa have long been up against the solid wall of open defiance by the minority régimes of Rhodesia and South Africa.

63. South Africa persists in its intransigence by continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia, as well as by its unabated policy of *apartheid*, in defiance of countless resolutions of the United Nations. In Zimbabwe, the situation has been escalating rapidly with the intensification of the armed struggle against minority oppression. There is now a belated recognition by the illegal régime of the principle of majority rule. The situation is, however, still extremely tenuous and would require greater efforts to ensure a transition from the threat of war to prospects of a peaceful solution.

64. If the minority régimes are to be induced to change their course, this can be accomplished only through united action on the part of the international community to dispel such illusions in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

65. So long as the Korean problem eludes settlement, it will remain a source of world tension. Burma regards the joint North-South communiqué of 4 July 1972³ as an act of statesmanship opening the door to dialogue to facilitate conditions for a peaceful solution of the Korean problem. Given the spirit which moved Korean statesmen to agree on the three principles of the joint communiqué, may we be permitted to express the hope that they will overcome their present differences and prove equal to the commitment to seek national unity and the peaceful reunification of Korea. It is our view that the Korean people themselves should work out, without any outside interference, acceptable positions that could be adopted as a basis for eventual reunification. It also stands to reason that any process directed towards resolving the Korean problem must involve the active participation of both the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea.

66. The crisis in the Middle East continues to command world attention. The situation there has, in fact, become more confused and complex with recent happenings in Lebanon. The lack of a lasting and permanent homeland for the Palestinian people is the underlying cause of the problems of the Middle East. The basic prerequisite for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region is obvious: it is the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish their own State. It is also clear that the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of all States in the region and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized borders cannot be ignored and must be respected.

67. Burma is, in principle, opposed to any territorial acquisition by war. We consider the rectification of the problem of the Israeli occupation of Arab lands of 5 June 1967 to be of the utmost importance.

68. Allow me to turn briefly to the region in which my country is situated. The end of the war in Kampuchea, Viet Nam and Laos last year was highly welcome in South-East Asia. It was a great relief to the region, which had not known peace and tranquillity since the beginning of the Second World War. Now, after 30 long years of arduous

struggle by its people, Viet Nam has emerged as a reunified nation. Kampuchea and Laos are also proud to stand once again as united independent nations.

69. As a result, the whole region is undergoing a process of far-reaching political, economic and social change and, of late, there have emerged trends towards establishing new relationships among the countries in the area. There is a growing awareness among these countries that they themselves have to play an increasing role in creating conditions under which peace and security can be maintained, and co-operation for economic and social advancement promoted. We view these positive factors as providing the countries of the region with an opportunity to work together for their common objectives of safeguarding national independence and promoting peace and social progress.

70. Let me now turn to another area in which resolute and co-ordinated international action is urgently required. For over 30 years now, the world has been concerned with the problem of disarmament, but nations are engaged in rearmament. Indeed rearmament has been pursued so ruthlessly that, over the past decade alone, world military expenditures have more than doubled to the staggering annual rate of \$US 300 billion at constant prices. What is perhaps even more alarming is that an end to this escalation of military spending is nowhere yet in sight. Along with military expenditures, military arsenals—particularly those of the major armed Powers—are continuing to grow unchecked in size and in diversity. New and even deadlier weapons systems are being developed. Massive arms transfers are taking place on an unprecedented scale. In short, the uncontrolled arms race is threatening to become uncontrollable.

71. To quote the words of our Secretary-General “in a world increasingly preoccupied with the problems of social justice, hunger, poverty, illiteracy, disease, development and an equitable sharing of resources”, in this situation, such continued diversion to armaments of creative human energies and productive resources on a colossal and ever-increasing scale is both tragic and intolerable while keeping the world in a constant state of insecurity and tension.

72. My delegation cannot fail to stress that the ominous implications of nuclear weapons continue to impinge upon our lives. No progress has been made in nuclear disarmament despite the priority assigned to it in negotiations for the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Nuclear testing continues. At the same time, ever newer and deadlier types of nuclear weapons and systems are being devised and produced. The number of nations possessing technological capability to produce nuclear explosives has increased and the possibility of its misuse is becoming a matter of grave concern.

73. The armaments race has thus become one of the greatest scourges of humanity, and failure to act wisely and effectively at this juncture in order to halt and reverse it is bound to confront the world with an unpleasant and irreversible reality.

74. That is why my delegation would urge the General Assembly to give due consideration to the call made by the

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 27, annex I.*

recent Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Colombo, for the holding of a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament as early as possible and not later than 1978 [see A/31/197, annex I, para. 139]. A special session will not only focus the attention of international public opinion on this age-old and pressing problem, but will also enable Governments to explore and devise ways and means whereby our common goal of universal disarmament can be pursued more methodically and with a greater sense of purpose and direction in the decades ahead than in decades past. My delegation is most gratified that our distinguished Secretary-General has lent his valuable support to the proposal of the non-aligned nations.

75. We have often stated in the General Assembly that Burma strongly favours the governing of the oceans and their uses by generally acceptable and universally applicable rules of international law, elaborated through multilateral dialogue and consensus. We have stated that if multilateral dialogue should fail, or become unduly protracted, necessity would compel nations to resort to unilateral action in establishing national maritime zones along their coasts. This is precisely what is happening now in various parts of the world, including our own.

76. As some of my colleagues present here are probably aware, the Prime Minister of Burma in his report to the Pyithu Hluttaw (Parliament) on 10 March 1975, stated that arrangements were under way to establish Burma's exclusive economic zone at 200 miles. Till now we have kept faith with the negotiations of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. However, faced with the prospect of even further protraction of those negotiations, we in Burma consider that the time has now arrived for us to judge what measures are needed to protect our national maritime interests and act accordingly. We must, however, hasten to add that the historic international effort to elaborate a new convention on the law of the sea has not been an exercise in futility. It can fairly be said that, as a result of the Third Conference, new legal concepts have already emerged as principles and rules of international maritime law which will provide a sound and viable basis for inter-State relations with respect to the sea.

77. I would now like to say a few words on the state of the international economy. As the representatives present here are fully aware, one of the basic aims of the United Nations is to promote social progress and better standards of life in greater freedom and, towards this end, to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

78. To what extent has this objective been achieved? Over the past three decades, numerous consultations have indeed been held both within and outside the United Nations with a view to resolving the economic problems facing the world today. As a result of these consultations, many important issues have been clarified and useful approaches to the solution of the problems involved have also been identified. The large number of resolutions adopted and recommendations made, particularly the recommendations contained in the International Development Strategy, testify to this.

79. For all this, however, no substantive progress has been achieved in the economic and social advancement of all

peoples. The reason for this state of affairs is that these resolutions and recommendations, like many resolutions on political issues, have largely remained unimplemented.

80. In recent years, the sixth and seventh special sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, the fourth session of UNCTAD, and the recently concluded Colombo Conference of non-aligned countries have highlighted the tasks ahead. It is imperative that the international community address itself urgently and resolutely to these tasks if any appreciable progress is to be made towards the achievement of the objective set out in the Charter of the United Nations.

81. The resolutions and decisions taken at various United Nations forums have not had the political impact we had hoped for. This should not, however, make us lose sight of the useful work the United Nations and its agencies are performing in the economic and social field. In this regard, we are glad to note that the activities that the regional commissions, the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies have undertaken in support of the development effort of many developing countries have met with a considerable degree of success.

82. Obviously, we are in favour of increasing the effectiveness of this role of the United Nations. We therefore welcome the present attempt to restructure the United Nations and to make it a more effective instrument for economic development and international co-operation.

83. I have so far dealt with the problem of economic development and social progress in the international context. This is because in our increasingly integrated world, the interdependence of the interests and well-being of developed and developing countries is a factor of growing significance.

84. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that, although a favourable international setting can be conducive to promoting economic progress, the main effort for development must be made by the developing countries themselves. International assistance and co-operation can, at the same time, play a useful supplemental role in aiding such efforts. The assistance thus provided, at present and in the future, should be expanded and made more effective. This, we feel, is a responsibility which the developed countries should undertake in co-operation with the developing countries.

85. These are in general the reflections of the delegation of Burma in reviewing the world situation.

86. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is with genuine feeling that I return to this podium where I first came when I addressed the eleventh session of the General Assembly as Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama on 27 November 1956.⁴ At that time we supported the right of the Egyptian people to nationalize the Suez Canal and we indicated the similarities between the Suez and Panama Canals. Today, 20 years later, we come before you after the liberation of all the African continent to prove to you how mistaken the United States continues to be by insisting in perpetuating its presence in the colonial enclave known as the zone of the Panama Canal.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Eleventh Session, Plenary Meetings, 598th meeting.

87. Many events have occurred in the world and there are many things which God and fate have allowed me to witness at this rostrum where I have served my country as permanent representative during 13 years. So it is with happiness and a little nostalgia that I address myself to so many friends with whom I have had the honour to share the major international responsibilities entrusted to us by our Governments throughout the years.

88. On behalf of the delegation of Panama I wish to join my colleagues who, when speaking, started by congratulating Mr. Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe on his election as President of the thirty-first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Everyone present here knows the important part you played as President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and we know well, too, the lofty intellectual and diplomatic qualities that will enable you effectively to lead the work of its next sessions. We are particularly happy at the selection because we have recently returned from your beautiful country, Sri Lanka, where we enjoyed so much courtesy and the warm hospitality of a fun-loving and hard-working people whose memory will stay with us for ever.

89. We share with the Secretary-General his conviction that by working together with courage and persistent constancy we shall move forward along the course which leads to the major objectives of peace, justice, human dignity and equity which have for centuries been a legitimate aspiration of mankind.

90. It is inconceivable as was rightly pointed out a few days ago [*1st meeting*] by the President of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly and Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg, Mr. Gaston Thorn, that \$300 billion are spent every year on the arms race and at the same time not one tenth of that amount is allocated to fighting under-development, which condemns to the most wretched poverty 1.2 billion people, many of whom are totally destitute.

91. In welcoming the Republic of Seychelles as a new Member of the United Nations family, we wish to place on record that we would be pleased if shortly the People's Republic of Angola and the united Socialist Republic of Viet Nam were to occupy their lawful places in this hall.

92. On behalf of the Revolutionary Government presided over by Mr. Demetrio B. Lakas, and whose head of State is General Omar Torrijos Herrera, we cordially greet all States Members of the United Nations attending this session and we thank them for having elected Panama as a Vice-President of this session of the General Assembly.

93. While it is true that détente has brought about a relaxation of tensions among the great Powers which removes the possibility of an atomic crisis, we cannot affirm that mankind has been freed from armed conflicts and threats to international peace and security which are potential crises unless they are resolved.

94. Possibilities for the developing countries to share among themselves their capacity for development has increased in the last years. We now have unprecedented opportunities to achieve the scientific and technological

break-throughs which are vital for development. Therefore technical co-operation among the developing countries could be an important contribution to their development and to achieve economic independence and everybody recognizes that the needs of the developing countries are a joint responsibility of the entire international community.

95. Technical co-operation among the developing countries is one of the mechanisms basic to the establishment of the new international economic order and it is also an instrument which contributes to changing the structure of international relations. In our region, the Latin American Economic System, known as SELA, offers new perspectives for co-operation.

96. We have attentively followed the discussions at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund which were held in Manila. Panama agrees with the Managing Director of the Fund that both the developing countries as well as the industrialized countries should find a solution to the continuous use of high-interest loans which are requested to cover deficits in balances of payments so as to eliminate those perpetual deficits resulting from the unjust interactions which now prevail in international trade.

97. Our delegation joins others who have preceded us in affirming that Panama will spare no efforts in seeking a remedy to the deterioration of the international economic situation. The picture is a sombre one and it is the duty of every nation which is financially more solvent to raise the availability of development loans with less harsh and burdensome conditions for poor countries.

98. At the same time efforts must be made to set up on a universal level a policy to control inflation which is the scourge of all countries and devastates the less developed countries.

99. Panama is undergoing an economic crisis similar to that occurring in the vast majority of the developing countries. This year more than ever before we have felt in my country the effects of unemployment, inflation and recession.

100. At the same time the United States continues to delay a solution to the problem of the Panama Canal, which is closely connected with our economy since it is the most important natural resource we have. We do not believe it is just that the most powerful nation in the world should continue fully to exploit this resource while the majority of our people lacks the most elementary needs of a dignified life.

101. For the economy of Panama to be reactivated and for us to come out of the present economic crisis within a reasonable time, we have to make a better use of our geographical position so as to attain the degree of economic growth and stability which will enable us equitably to participate in the new international and economic order which we advocate.

102. The Revolutionary Government of Panama, even though it respects the system of free enterprise, has through labour laws and taxation attempted a more equitable distribution of our national wealth among all our inhabitants.

103. Our country has at all times regretted, while totally condemning, the ever-spreading practices of international terrorism and we have so stated energetically on repeated occasions.

104. The social phenomenon of terrorism which has affected different countries on different occasions has always been condemned by all States. In most cases, it strikes innocent victims and affects fundamental values such as human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person.

105. Since 1973 when this item became a burning issue in the debates of this Organization, Panama has been outstanding in its co-operation and endeavours in this field. Panama had the honour and the responsibility to be Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism established under resolution 3034 (XXVII) of the General Assembly and has always based its arguments condemning such a practice on some fundamental premises which in substance mean that the United Nations must intensify its efforts to eradicate the causes of international terrorism.

106. Panama will at all times endeavour, as it has in the past, to assist in formulating measures which might constitute a real barrier to or brake on the continued practice of international terrorism.

107. The fighting in Lebanon is of the utmost concern to us. With profound sadness we witness the pain of the internal tragedy of civil war in Lebanon, which has brought death to thousands of human beings and incalculable material losses. We hope that the groups involved in the present conflict, the leaders of all sectors and, in general, the population of Lebanon will help to halt this fratricidal struggle and strive to re-establish peace and order. We are pleased to have heard the news this morning that a meeting will be held in a few hours to that end. We hope that this friendly country will maintain its unity and territorial integrity so that all will respect its rights as a free, independent and sovereign nation.

108. In order to arrive at a just and lasting formula for peace in the Middle East we reaffirm the need for the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all the territories occupied in the 1967 war. We support the idea of implementing Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), taking into account that the Palestinian problem must be resolved on the basis of the establishment of a Palestinian State which will include Gaza and the West Bank of the Jordan, and we consider that Jerusalem must be given a special international status. At the same time we believe it is vital for the Arab countries to accept the right of Israel to live within secure and recognized frontiers like all the other States in the region.

109. In the case of Cyprus we advocate the withdrawal of the occupation forces as called for in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly two years ago [resolution 3212 (XXIX)] as a point of departure, so that later through negotiations an agreement may be reached to preserve the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus so that all its inhabitants may live in peace and the country can return to the prosperity to which it is entitled.

110. The Republic of Panama fervently hopes that through responsible negotiations an agreement will soon be reached which will be satisfactory to Guatemala and at the same time will respect the principle of self-determination and independence for the people of Belize so as to guarantee peaceful coexistence within the Central American isthmus.

111. Panama reiterates its support for the just claim of the Argentine Republic regarding the Islas Malvinas and we hope that soon a formula will be found which will make it possible to restore that territory to the sovereignty of Argentina.

112. Panama reiterates its hope that the negotiations which would give Bolivia an outlet to the sea will advance in a positive direction until the desired objective is obtained.

113. The constitution of Panama of 1972 provides fundamental guarantees protecting nationals and foreigners under its jurisdiction in all matters pertaining to the sacred rights to life and liberty and indicates a revolutionary concept on the scope and vastness of the human rights enjoyed throughout the entire Republic.

114. Participation in the government of my country through mechanisms of people's power which function from one end of our national territory to the other is a right and obligation of all Panamanians.

115. In a dynamic and tangible manner, which is shared by all sectors of the Panamanian community, we apply the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights which we have ratified, as well as the Optional Protocol. In this respect all that remains for us is publicly to declare our hopes that the 38 States which are now parties to the Covenants will by joined by many others so that this system of protecting human rights will soon attain the desired goal of universality.

116. Without leaving the context of human rights we wish to emphasize here that we are offended and afflicted by *apartheid* and rampant racism which white minorities have imposed on the indigenous majorities in southern Africa in bloody defiance of the clear-cut provisions and mandates of the international community and of the historic transformations which are inexorably advancing throughout the entire world.

117. We are encouraged by the latest diplomatic initiatives undertaken by the Western Powers with a view to achieving political independence in Namibia and majority Government in Zimbabwe. The struggle for liberation which has been intensified by the heroic people of Zimbabwe in recent months with the support of OAU so as to achieve genuine independence on the basis of majority government has the total support of Panama.

118. We hope that the transfer of power from the racist minority of Ian Smith to the majority of the Zimbabwe people will be carried out rapidly so as to prevent more sacrifices by that heroic people. We appreciate the efforts made to that end by the Secretary of State of the United

States and we hope that the conference to be held shortly at Botswana, under United Kingdom sponsorship, will overcome every obstacle and difficulty so as to prevent the sufferings of a long war, the inevitable result of which would be the triumph of the 5 million people who have been suffering the indignities of the racist régime for more than 11 years.

119. To make majority rule viable with a low cost in human life the Secretary of State of the United States has offered the United Kingdom considerable economic assistance in order to compensate the white minority in Rhodesia which wishes to emigrate.

120. Taking note with satisfaction of this generous plan of the United States to relocate more than 200,000 white Rhodesians, we cannot fail to remind the leaders of North America that they could do the same to relocate the 3,000 North American Zonian families resident in the Panamanian territory known as the Panama Canal Zone so as to facilitate the negotiations on the new Canal treaty and eliminate once and for all the primary source of conflicts which perturbs relations between the United States and Panama.

121. Repeatedly we have said, and we say again, that we welcome North Americans and in general all foreigners who wish to adjust to the atmosphere and customs of Panama and we reiterate that we are prepared to give them the same cordial treatment which our people has always given once we have eradicated from our territory the colonial enclave known as the Panama Canal Zone.

122. We are pleased to note that, in United Nations bodies, Africans and Latin Americans have made common cause to condemn every kind of colonialism.

123. It was the privilege of my country that its capital was chosen by Simón Bolívar, the Liberator, as the venue for the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, which met on our isthmus from 22 June to 15 July 1826, and we were particularly pleased to note that, on the initiative of the Latin American group of States, we have on the agenda of the present session an item entitled "One hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama" [item 117]. The Foreign Minister of Venezuela, Mr. Ramón Escobar Salom, quite rightly said in this hall: "This Congress was a 'historical event which for the first time collectively defined the political strategy of the Latin American continent' [6th meeting, para. 108]. At that Congress Bolívar aimed at setting up a league of Latin American nations to be a spokesman for the colonial peoples of the world in opposition to the imperialist claims of the European Holy Alliance.

124. We are therefore certain that the special plenary meeting which will be held by this General Assembly to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama and to pay a tribute to liberator Simón Bolívar, will have the enthusiastic support of all States Members of the Organization. This celebration is of singular importance for the Latin American nations and for the non-aligned countries. For the former, the genius of Bolívar converted into continental doctrine the feeling and thinking of unity which was common to the

heroes of the emancipation of the Latin American nations. For the latter, Bolívar, with his far-sighted thinking, opened up broad ways and means of achieving the fundamental objectives of defeating imperialism, colonialism, racism and foreign domination.

125. My delegation shares the view of the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Kissinger, in his last speech here [11th meeting], regarding what hemispheric relations should be. Panama, which is the geographical and sentimental centre of the Latin American continent and which is both the window and the mirror of the hemisphere, is where the United States should show mankind a good example of what a mutual conception of relations between North, Central and South America should be.

126. The negotiations between my small country of Panama and the great North American super-Power on the question of the Panama Canal, which were started 12 years ago after the violent events which endangered peace in the region in 1964, are still awaiting a solution. We trust that Mr. Kissinger, despite the rhetoric of the political campaign in North America, will not leave this task unfinished, and we hope that, with the assistance of other open-minded statesmen, we will reach an agreement which will satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Panamanian people before the end of next spring.

127. The so-called Panama Canal Zone, 10 miles wide and 50 miles long, which cuts and fragments the central part of the Panamanian isthmus and makes of the Republic of Panama a divided nation, is today an anachronistic colonial enclave. There is no justification for its existence and it must disappear so as to restore the territorial integrity of the State of Panama and promote relations of peace and friendship in the region.

128. The brotherly and unanimous support of the Latin American countries, as well as of the United Nations, the third world and other States Members of the United Nations, has given renewed impetus to the cause of Panama.

129. Among the manifestations of international public opinion in favour of Panama made with growing intensity after 1973, we must emphasize the statement of the Secretary-General of the Organization. On 20 March of that year, the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, urged that the burning issue of Panama be considered in accordance with the spirit of our times and within the present historical context. He said:

"The problem awaits a solution which can only be based on the respect for law and the search for justice. A solution will have to take into account the basic principles which are enshrined in the Charter such as the principle of territorial integrity, sovereign equality, the obligation to settle all international disputes by peaceful means and the principle which by now has become an accepted common standard, namely, that any State is entitled to put to full use and for its own account all its natural potentialities."⁵

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, 1701st meeting, para. 16.*

130. As I said earlier, in April 1964 the Governments of Panama and the United States, after the violent events which disturbed peace in the region, signed, through the Organization of American States [OAS], a Joint Declaration in favour of a new Panama Canal treaty, which includes the words: "to seek the prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between our two countries without limitations or pre-conditions of any kind."⁶

131. As part of the agreement at that time the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, after consulting former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, committed the honour of his country to the negotiation of a new treaty. For 12 years we have been negotiating with three different United States administrations for a treaty which will be reasonable and just for Panama.

132. On 21 March 1973, when the Security Council met in Panama, the United States vetoed a resolution which took note of the willingness shown by the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama to establish in a formal instrument agreements on the abrogation of the 1903 convention on the Isthmian Canal and its amendments and to conclude a new, just and fair treaty concerning the present Panama Canal which would fulfil Panama's legitimate aspirations and guarantee full respect for Panama's effective sovereignty over all of its territory; it further urged the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama to continue negotiations in a high spirit of friendship, mutual respect and co-operation and to conclude without delay a new treaty aimed at the prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between them.⁷ This resolution won the affirmative vote of all members of the Security Council with the exception of the United Kingdom, which abstained.

133. We are particularly pleased to place on record that on 17 September Mr. Edward (Ted) Rowlands, member of Parliament and Minister of State of the United Kingdom, after a meeting held with myself to deal with Anglo-Panamanian affairs, agreed to a declaration which states in part:

"Mr. Rowlands emphasized that, since Great Britain is one of the main users of the Canal, Her Majesty's Government is most desirous that the present negotiations should lead to a prompt solution acceptable to both parties which would satisfy the needs of the negotiating parties by eliminating the causes of conflict among them. This treaty would naturally restore to Panama jurisdiction over its entire territory."

134. On 15 May 1975, OAS unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

"HAVING HEARD the report on the negotiations concerning the Panama Canal question made by the representatives of the United States and Panama; and

⁶ See *The Department of State Bulletin*, vol. L, No. 1296 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 656.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1973*, document S/10931/Rev.1.

"CONSIDERING:

"That the Meetings of Foreign Ministers held in Bogotá, Tlatelolco, and Washington proclaimed the Panama Canal question to be of common interest for Latin America;

"That on March 24, 1975, the Head of the Panamanian Government and the Presidents of Colombia, Costa Rica, and Venezuela signed in Panama City a Joint Declaration concerning the Panama Canal question; and

"That the Declaration has as antecedents the Joint Declaration signed by the United States and Panama in the Council of the Organization of American States on April 3, 1964, and an eight-point agreement signed by the two countries on February 7, 1974, known as the Tack-Kissinger Statement,

"RESOLVES:

"1. To note with satisfaction that on February 7, 1974, the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Panama and the Secretary of State of the United States signed an eight-point Statement setting forth basic principles that will serve as a guide for the negotiators of the two countries, in which it is stipulated, *inter alia*, that the Panamanian territory of which the Panama Canal forms a part will soon be returned to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, and that the Republic will assume total responsibility for the inter-oceanic canal on the termination of the new treaty.

"2. To note with satisfaction the report represented by the Delegation of the United States and of Panama, which records the progress made.

"3. To express the hope that a prompt and successful conclusion will be reached in the negotiations that the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama have been conducting for eleven years for the purpose of concluding a new, just and fair treaty concerning the Canal, which will definitely eliminate the causes of conflict between the two countries and be efficacious in strengthening international co-operation and peace in the Americas."⁸

135. On 9 June 1976 at the sixth session of OAS General Assembly held in Santiago, Chile, I had the honour to read the joint report presented by the Government of the Republic of Panama and the United States of America, which in part states:

"...both governments are in agreement with the concept expressed by General Torrijos that we are not simply seeking any new treaty—we are seeking a treaty that will fully meet our common goals in the future and be seen by our sister republics as reflecting a new era of co-operation in the Americas."⁹

⁸ See Organization of American States, *Proceedings of the General Assembly, Fifth Regular Session*, vol. I, *Certified texts of the resolutions and declarations* (Washington, D.C., General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, 1975), resolution AG/RES.174 (V-O/75).

⁹ See Organization of American States document OEA/Ser.P, AG/doc.681/76 of 9 June 1976.

136. After reading this joint report the General Assembly of OAS at its sixth session, in a resolution which was unanimously adopted,¹⁰ reiterated with renewed emphasis its hope that during this year, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama and the bicentennial year of the independence of the United States, we would see the final impetus to the negotiations for this new Canal treaty.

137. The present negotiations for the agreement are based on the Joint Statement signed by Foreign Minister Tack and Secretary of State Kissinger on 7 February 1974, which as you know, contains the eight points which are to serve as a guide for the new Canal treaty.¹¹

138. On the occasion of the ceremony held in the city of Panama to sign that agreement, the Secretary of State of the United States declared: "On behalf of the President, I hereby commit the United States to completing these negotiations successfully and as early as possible."

139. We in Panama wonder what degree of credibility there is in the words of the Secretary of State when he expresses his concern for world problems in other areas and engages in much diplomatic activity in southern Africa to ensure that a minority will accept the principle of non-discrimination and of political equality for all the inhabitants of Rhodesia, when at the same time it seems to be difficult for him to prevent the paralysation of all diplomatic activity aimed at solving similar problems in Panama. Can the interest expressed by the United States in South Africa's compliance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on Namibia be genuine when at the same time it ignores the contents of many resolutions on respect for the territorial integrity of countries, the right of all countries to exploit their own natural resources for the benefit of their peoples, and so forth, regarding Panama? What can we in Panama think of all this activity and leadership displayed by the United States to achieve decolonization in other areas of the world when it persists in maintaining a colonial situation in the very heart of our country?

140. The greatest difficulty regarding the new treaty resides in finding an acceptable duration for the parties. While the United States expressed the opinion that the duration should be 30 to 50 years, that is to say during the remainder of the useful life of the Canal, Panama considers that, for all effective purposes, we would be prepared to accept a reasonable duration not going beyond the year 2000. So far the United States has confined itself to emphasizing that all issues are negotiable, and that is why we have expressed cautious optimism.

141. The Political Declaration adopted on 18 August 1976 by the Fifth Conference of non-aligned countries in

¹⁰ See Organization of American States, *Proceedings of the General Assembly, Sixth Regular Session*, vol. I, *Certified texts of the resolutions* (Washington, D.C., General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, 1976), resolution AG/RES.219 (VI-0/76).

¹¹ See *The Department of State Bulletin*, vol. LXX, No. 1809 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), pp. 184-185.

Colombo, Sri Lanka, reads as follows regarding the question of the Panama Canal:

"The Conference noted with satisfaction the unanimous Latin American support for the legitimate aspirations of the Republic of Panama, and associated itself with the desires expressed by the countries of the Western Hemisphere that a settlement of this question be achieved during this year of the celebration of the sesquicentennial of the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama convened by the Liberator Simón Bolívar.

"The Conference reiterated its firm support and solidarity with the Government and people of Panama in their fair struggle for their effective sovereignty and total jurisdiction over the so-called Panama Canal Zone.

"The Conference reaffirmed the support of the Non-Aligned countries for the Panamanian control of the Panama Canal and reiterated their firm support for all efforts that the Republic of Panama will make before international forums, in particular the United Nations bodies.

"The Conference praised the progress made by the Panamanian people under the Revolutionary Government headed by General Omar Torrijos Herrera, offering any support that they may require when facing any action which may cause its destabilization." [See A/31/197, annex I, paras. 110-113.]

142. We have been scrupulous in transcribing literally the above pronouncements in favour of the Panamanian cause made by the vast majority of States Members of the United Nations because we consider that these documents express the feeling of the international community with regard to the new Canal treaty. This will also make it easier for delegations represented here to have all the facts which may be useful in forming their opinions in the event that, as our Head of Government has announced, we should feel compelled formally to submit at the next session of the General Assembly in 1977 a new item entitled "The question of the Panama Canal".

143. During the debates of candidates Ford and Carter on Wednesday, 6 October on matters of foreign policy and defence, the Head of Government of Panama, General Omar Torrijos, made the following statement:

"This superficial approach to the most explosive subject in the United States' relations with Latin America is extremely irresponsible. President Ford claimed credit for having no young American fighting in any part of the world. But in Panama, 20,000 soldiers of the Southern Command of the United States Army each night sleep on alert with combat boots, rifles and water bottles within reach, ready for the contingency of Latin America's claiming the sovereign rights of Panama denied to it in negotiations.

"As regards Mr. Carter, I should like to remind him that the word 'never' is one that has been deleted from the political dictionary with the era of the struggles for liberation."

144. Without wishing to interfere in the internal policy of another country, I should like at this point to say that after Mr. Gerald Ford was chosen as the candidate for the presidency of the republic of the United States by the Republican Party on 18 August and after Mr. Jimmy Carter was proclaimed candidate for the presidency of the United States by the Democratic Party, there are no serious reasons for not renewing the discussion which had been held uninterruptedly until May last, when the present North American electoral campaign brought the negotiations to a standstill.

145. In the meantime, we believe that the announcement made yesterday by the Secretary of State of the United States was a timely one, namely, that negotiations are to be resumed within the next two weeks.

146. Both the Democratic Party platform and Mr. Ford under the Tack-Kissinger agreement, as well as the military authorities of the United States, affirm that they agree with the idea of a new Canal treaty. We therefore affirm that if the United States genuinely wishes to negotiate seriously and in good faith, this is the time for the North American Government to return not only towards Panama but towards Latin America, the third world, and the vast majority of the countries that are a part of the United Nations.

147. Panama believes that between now and 2 November, election day in the United States, there is time to move forward considerably in the negotiations and we should not lose such precious time.

148. Now I should like to refer to the problem of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Mr. Henry Kissinger, the Secretary of State of the United States, in his speech before this forum [11th meeting] rightly insisted on the danger of armed intervention to economic and social progress and, above all, to world peace. But he limited his apprehensions to the particular situation of southern Africa. He was, in fact, speaking of military forces exclusively in the immediate, obvious and violent form of intervention.

149. My country believes that the principle of non-intervention should be extended to all forms of intervention, regardless of semantic disguise, because there are other forms of intervention—far more effective than the armed variety—that are carried out surreptitiously at economic and social levels.

150. We must therefore insist on the validity of the principle of non-intervention not only when it refers to armed struggle in southern Africa, in the Near East or on the Asian continent, but also throughout Latin America, including the Caribbean. We do so because foreign intervention in almost every case is contrary to international law, to the principles of self-determination of peoples, of national sovereignty, and, it should be emphasized, to the very principles of the United Nations Charter that is the origin and justification for this Assembly of the nations of the world.

151. For all these reasons, Panama declares its unflagging faith in the United Nations and reaffirms its desire for

effective sovereignty and independence which, when achieved, cannot be pawned in the interests of any given Power or group of Powers, but, free from political commitments, will serve Panama and all its friends among the peoples of the world.

152. We agree with the statement made by the Major of Miami, Mr. Maurice Ferre, at the Democratic Party Convention that we must put an immediate stop to the political manoeuvres that have blocked the course of positive action on behalf of a new Panama Canal treaty.

153. *The New York Times* was emphatic in its editorial of 27 September 1976:

"It would be an unspeakable tragedy if a new Panama Canal treaty—an imperative for future United States relations with Latin America—should become a casualty of the American Presidential campaign... It is up to President Ford to send Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker back to Panama..."

154. *The Washington Post* of 3 October 1976 said:

"Gen. George S. Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, publicly urges the President to get on with negotiations. Otherwise, he warns, there could be trouble. 'You'd be fighting men you can't identify at a time and place of their choosing... That's not the way, in my judgment, to assure the continued maintenance and operation of the Canal.'"

Elsewhere, the editorial states:

"In fact, Panama has been remarkably patient and understanding. It merely wants to negotiate the treaty that the U.S. has solemnly promised to negotiate."

155. That negotiation is essential to put a peaceful end to the lacerating colonial situation which exists in the heart of Panamanian territory before the national feeling of our people wrests the solution to the problem from the hands of the diplomats.

156. Given the vacillation and the confusion of the two North American presidential candidates on the question of the Canal, I am certain that in Panama my fellow citizens will present a united front so that the world will continue to support us in our inflexible will to recover effective sovereignty over all our national territory.

157. The PRESIDENT: As there is some time available and as the afternoon meeting has a crowded schedule, may I suggest to the Assembly that we permit those delegations that are ready to exercise the right of reply to do so now in the time available. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees.

It was so decided.

158. The PRESIDENT: I shall call upon the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic to exercise their right of reply.

159. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I feel confident to take the floor to correct the various misconceptions that

are evident in Mr. Allon's statement of yesterday [22nd meeting]. In so doing I will shun using foul or obscene language as was done last year by our colleague, Mr. Moynihan—erstwhile colleague, thank God—and to a lesser degree by Mr. Allon himself by mentioning hypocritical behaviour—I am paraphrasing—and things like that. Everybody can indulge in such language. I think we should try to avoid it. I will endeavour in a few minutes to separate the facts from fiction and to identify the truth from what is left.

160. Zionism is a Khazar ideology formulated by the late Mr. Herzl at the end of the last century. You might say, who are the Khazars? Are they heathens? No, they were heathens between the first century and the eighth century, when they came from the northern tier of Asia and skirted the Caspian. They were a hardy people. They settled in what was known as Bessarabia and what today is southern Russia. Both Byzantium and the Moslems in the eighth century courted them to become either Christians or Moslems; but then on second thought they wanted to maintain the balance of power and they converted to Judaism. The Khazars' ancestors never saw Palestine. They are not our Jews, who are as Semitic as I am. These were converted Jews, just as the British, who were pagans, were converted by St. Augustine to Christianity. That does not make them a Semitic people. They have a Semitic religion just as our Indonesian brothers or Nigerian brothers who became Moslems. They have a Semitic religion which is Islam, but that does not make them Arab or Semitic.

161. I do not blame the Jews of Europe, who were maltreated for many centuries by the Europeans, for the fact that finally Mr. Herzl towards the end of the last century thought there could be no salvation for the Jews unless they had a State of their own. But unfortunately the Zionists picked the wrong territory, Palestine. And they claim since the days of Mr. Eban that God gave them Palestine. I am sure Mr. Eban is not of the Jews who are my brothers and cousins. He is descended from the Khazars. Therefore what is Zionism but a colonial movement that was motivated by Judaism as a religion for political and economic ends? I do not say Mr. Herzl maliciously wanted political Zionism. He thought there was, as I said, no salvation. But that Utopia, that dream of his, turned into a nightmare.

162. And what business had our British friends of those days to partition part of the Ottoman Empire and put it under mandate, whereas they declared that they were fighting for democracy and mandates were nothing but colonialism in disguise? Palestine and Iraq were placed under a British mandate, Syria and Lebanon under a French mandate. You will recall—or those of you who are students of history—the secret Sykes-Picot-Sesanov Agreement. Sesanov—they forgot about him after 1917, when there was the outbreak of the Russian Revolution.

163. These are the facts. The myths are that there is no religion that can constitute a nation. A nation needs the cultural background that is based on tradition, on customs, on common interests. There is no such thing as Jewish blood, Arab blood, American blood. What makes these nations are a common culture, common way of life, sometimes food. They need not have the same language.

but their common interests cement them together. And the Zionists wanted to create a political entity in that part of the world, the Middle East, which is neither viable nor based on truth. What business had Mr. Balfour to promise them Palestine in the Balfour Declaration? I tell you what business he had. The Zionists railroaded this country of the United States in 1917 into the First World War. The United States through Mr. Truman in 1947 had no business to support partition of the land of Palestine. Mr. Truman, when he was approached by the experts of the State Department who told him that it would not be wise to antagonize the indigenous people of the region who happened to be Arabs, said: "How many Americans of Arab origin do I have in my constituency?" Mr. Balfour created this Palestine imbroglio because, as I told you, and I repeat it time and again, the British were being beaten and the coming of the United States into the war saved them.

164. The PRESIDENT: May I say to the representative of Saudi Arabia that his statement is not in the nature of right of reply. It is a substantive statement. By the rules of the General Assembly, the right of reply is limited to 10 minutes. I intend to enforce that rule.

165. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): All right, enforce that rule, but you cannot draw a hard and fast line between what is substance and what is form and what is right of reply. I am coming to the right of reply and I have ample time to develop my thesis, but there are many newcomers here, and it is my duty not to be formalist, but to let the newcomers here know what the situation is as a background.

166. Mr. Allon mentioned terrorism—Arab terrorism. Who was terrorist in Palestine? Who blew up the King David Hotel? Who killed 250 or so at various scenes? Who hanged British soldiers from the trees? He talks about Arab terrorism. I do not condone terrorism. Nobody condones terrorism. It was those Khazars, who had nothing to do with the land, who came and perpetrated all the injustices and the tribulations from which the area is suffering.

167. Mr. Allon mentioned Lebanon. Had there been no Palestinian problem there would be no conflict in Lebanon. I have to tell Mr. Allon that, if the Jews want to remain in our area, including those descended from the Khazars, they have to seek acceptance by adjusting themselves to the area. If they seek acceptance by adjusting and adapting themselves, I, for one, would so counsel the Arabs. They are human beings; we have nothing against any one who happens to be a Khazar. But the Zionists want to lord it over the Arabs and they are living on tension because, if the tension disappears, then they will not receive tax-free money from the Americans and others. They are surviving on the taxpayers' money—American money and other money. Let it be known that it is a question of time. As I mentioned and repeat again, God is not in the real-estate business to give any people a land. God gave us Palestine, Mr. Eban said, and I repeat what I told him—since when is God in the real-estate business? And where is your title deed? And you Americans of yore, and also before you the British, since when did God give you a power of attorney to transfer land that is not your own, when you declare that you fought world wars for democracy and self-determination and you flouted all this. You think you fought

the First World War against German militarism, but it was against German mercantilism. You had to have slogans. And now those poor—I say poor—Zionists sitting there, you are going to have a bad time and I feel sorry for you. If you become a scapegoat because you have made a Jewish problem the whole world's problem, they will make a scapegoat out of you, and I shall be in the forefront to defend you as human beings. We have had enough.

Mr. Montiel Argüello (Nicaragua), Vice-President, took the Chair.

168. If I raise my voice, it is so that I may drive it home that we do not hate you, but we will not be dominated by you. Where is Alexander the Great? Where are the Romans? Where are the Seleucians? Where are those who came after the Seleucians, the Byzantines? And where are the crusaders? And where are the Mongols? And where are our brothers the Turks who had dominated that area, and the latter-day saints—the British—where are they? Their empire crumbled and went down the drain. And you think you are going to survive, you Zionists there. It is a question of years. Either by attrition—if not by conflict, and I hope there will be no war—or by assimilation, you will disappear from history as if you were a pinch of salt in a boiling kettle. You will disappear like a pinch of salt in the boiling kettle of the Middle East. But for your sake, for the sake of the Palestinians, for the sake of the world, because you may push it into a holocaust, you have permeated the Western Powers with your media of information, with your influence. Yesterday, did you not hear, Sir, did you not see—the day before yesterday, was it not? —Mr. Carter and Mr. Ford currying favour with the Jews in this country to get their votes, because they keep the balance. Where is justice? The policy of those Western Powers is predicated on their misguided self-interest. Let there be peace with justice, and if you want to postpone it from year to year, through draft resolutions, the situation will get worse and the tragedy will deepen to both so-called Arabs and so-called Jews. I am trying to drive some sense into you. Mr. Allon, you tell them what I have said—it does not have to be here—nor does it have to be Mr. Herzog, who makes an exit whenever I take the floor.

169. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic): In his statement yesterday, the representative of the Zionist régime merely spoke on and about everything except the real issue, which is, as everybody knows by now, Israel's occupation of Arab land and Israel's infringement of the rights of the Palestinian people.

170. Mr. Allon launched the usual criticism and insults against the United Nations, against the specialized agencies, against nearly every organ and body of the United Nations, the Commission on Human Rights, the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the General Assembly itself, and against nearly all Member States of the Organization, the Arab countries, the third-world countries, the socialist countries. This is very ironical and very strange on the part of someone coming from a so-called State which owes its own existence to the United Nations. As a matter of fact, Israel, to my knowledge, is the only Member State created by a resolution of the United Nations in 1947 [resolution

181 (II)], a resolution which dismembered the territory of Palestine and gave the Zionists most of that territory. And here we come after nearly 30 years of that injustice to see that that very entity is the first enemy of the United Nations and of its agencies.

171. Mr. Allon accused the United Nations of being politicized and he wants the United Nations to confine its activities to mere economic, cultural and other questions, as if the Charter of the United Nations were an economic Charter, a cultural Charter, as if it did not mention anything about human rights, about self-determination, about the right of every people and every nation to live in peace and security. The ridiculous call in Mr. Allon's statement was that (and I quote): "...there must be a return to the Charter..." [22nd meeting, para. 129]. Look who is calling for a return to the Charter! The very country—the very entity—that has been violating that Charter for 30 years, since its existence, because of a resolution which violated that Charter at the very beginning. Yes, Mr. Allon, let us return to the Charter, let us obey the principles of the United Nations and the Charter and let us fulfil the first of those principles and objectives of the United Nations, the principle of non-acquisition of the territory of others by force and aggression, the principle of not resorting to force or aggression in order to control the territory and the fortunes of other people.

172. It is also ironic that the State which was based on terrorism dares every now and then to speak about terrorism. I will not repeat what Mr. Baroody said when he reminded this august body about the crimes of zionism in Palestine and outside Palestine. I will not enumerate them, but I will say only that Israel considers as acts of terrorism only the acts of resistance against its aggression, while it considers its own aggression, its own terrorism—which is a terrorism committed by a State and not by desperate persons struggling for their freedom and self-determination—as heroism and courage. Also Mr. Allon dares to deny that Israel is the other pole of the axis of racism. Facts are there and the third-world countries, the African countries, all the world knows, everybody knows now, about the increase in the relationship between the régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv. Only a few months ago the representative of the ugliest racist régime, Vorster, came to make a pilgrimage to the occupied territory, and the rites of that pilgrimage were visits to the factories of the aeroplanes of the Zionist régime, of the factories of torpedo boats and missiles, Gabriel missiles, and after that pilgrimage, after that religious visit, now we see that the military ties and co-operation between the two régimes are at their summit.

173. I will not take long, but I would like to end by mentioning two very important things that Mr. Allon referred to. First of all, he referred to Syrian Jews. Every time the Zionist representatives and Israel want to divert world public opinion from their own crimes, they mention what is called the Syrian Jews. I will not refer to any statement from Syrian or Arab sources. I will just refer to witnesses and to testimony from American Jews—from a brilliant and very eminent journalist such as Mr. Mike Wallace, who three times presented on American television complete documented programmes about how the Syrians of Jewish faith live like any other Syrians of Christian or Moslem faith. He was attacked the first time he televised his

programme after his visit to Damascus in February 1975. The American Jewish Council raised waves of protest against him. He was threatened; all those who worked with him were threatened. He went again on television in June 1975 to confirm what he had said. The United States Ambassador in Damascus confirmed what Mr. Mike Wallace had said. And then, under the pressure of the Zionists, he was obliged to return a second time to Syria. He took with him a team of reporters and photographers and they came back with a new report on the Syrian Jews, which said not only that the Syrian Jews lived in full equality with their Moslem and Christian brothers, but that they were even more prosperous because they work very hard and they are very clever people. And that television programme is still here in the archives of the American television and Mr. Wallace has those films for anyone who wants to see them. I do not want to take the time of the Assembly to read the documentation, the testimony and the photographs, the picture of how our Syrian brothers of Jewish faith live in Syria.

174. So let the Zionist representative not repeat that now and again. It is now a known fact that first of all the Zionists do not represent the Syrian or the Soviet or the American or the Armenian or any other Jews. We do not believe that any State has the right to represent citizens from other countries only because those citizens happen to follow the same faith and religion. Otherwise, I as a Moslem Syrian representative should pretend that I represent the Moslem Chinese, the Moslem Turks, the Moslem Cypriots, the Moslem Iranians and the Moslem Pakistanis, which I do not do because we do not believe in discrimination according to religion. Everybody knows now that Israel does not really care about the fate of persons following the same religion living in other countries, because everybody reads today how Israel is disappointed that, for instance, Soviet Jews who emigrate from the Soviet Union do not go to Israel, but go to the United States. So that means they

do not care. It is not true that the Zionists are concerned about how the Jews live in the Soviet Union or how they live in Syria. All they want is to bring more people in, to implant them in Palestine and in other Arab territories, in order to expel more Palestinians and Arabs. If this was not the real reason why should they be concerned if the Syrian Jew or the Soviet Jew goes to the United States, or to Latin America, or to Africa or to Europe? As far as they know, he is relieved from mistreatment and from the kind of life he is living.

175. And the last point—I apologize also to my colleagues for being so long—the last thing is about what Israel is pretending about the Middle East and peace in the Middle East. The Israelis say that they have tried to reach peace, they want peace and what sort of peace. For instance, they are suggesting the termination of the state of war and they say that until this moment, no reaction, no answer, has come from the Arab side about this proposal.

176. I repeat what we have stated many times in this Assembly last year and in the Security Council: that Israel is not sincere in pretending that it wants peace because it is proposing the end of the state of war while its soldiers occupy the territory of two Arab countries and of the Palestinian people. The occupation is an act of aggression. The military occupation of the territory of others is an act of war. So how can you pretend that you want to terminate that state of war even when your soldiers are occupying the territory of those parties with whom you want to end the state of war? Very well, Mr. Allon, withdraw your soldiers from our territory and then come to us to speak about the end of the state of war. We want peace, Mr. President, but we want peace based on justice, on freedom and on self-determination.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.