

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**1567th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 26 September 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Luisi (Uruguay)</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Valdés (Chile)</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Brown (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Nigeria .</i>	<i>11</i>

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. LUISI (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Uruguay shares the satisfaction expressed at the election of the President for this session of the General Assembly. His personal qualities, which have been justly praised, confirm our confidence in his wise guidance.

2. The many problems to be discussed in this forum place a grave responsibility on us, for the hopes of a world thirsting for solutions to the many and increasingly urgent problems besetting it are centred on us. It is, we believe, essential that these hopes should be put into proper perspective and balanced against the possibility of fulfilment; otherwise we risk causing frustration, for the world is understandably impatient to see concrete results.

3. It does the cause of humanity no good when disenchantment comes through loss of faith in our rulers. As we see it, the road to progress lies in joint action combining the untiring efforts of the developing countries and the generous co-operation of the developed nations.

4. This space-age generation is witnessing the birth of a new North Atlantic civilization consisting of highly industrialized nations on the shores of the Atlantic and their outposts in Asia and Australasia, just as previous generations witnessed the development of the Mediterranean civilization.

5. We sincerely hope that this civilization will not suffer the fate of so many others which ignored the fact that the existence of a peripheral proletariat of nations is inevitably a destructive factor. We hope too that as a result of the concerted co-operation of developed and developing nations the latter will not become the proletariat on the periphery of this new civilization, an element of unrest and backwardness. I use the term "proletariat of nations" not in the sense given to it by economists but in the sense

it has for philosophers of history, namely, elements cast aside or excluded from a civilization.

6. We know of many examples of blindness to these facts; but we also know, and this strengthens our faith in human redemption, of examples of historic vision and generosity, like the Alliance for Progress. We reaffirm our faith in the salvation of mankind through the generous efforts of those who can help combined with the energies and will-power of those who must seek their salvation first and foremost through their own resources.

7. In its mere two centuries of independent life Uruguay has done its utmost not to miss any opportunity to contribute to the furtherance of justice among nations and the development of international law. We have never annexed territories, we have never deprived peoples of their rights, we have never sought to impose ideas by force; and all because we are convinced that peaceful coexistence will be achieved only when no one feels that he has been exalted to a superhuman level, that he has a monopoly of the truth and tries to impose it. Ideas are transmitted, not imposed.

8. We are frankly afraid of the debasing dogmatism of those who, in their blind pride have failed to understand that man's ideas are circumscribed by the limits to what he can achieve. We believe that peaceful coexistence, so vital to the survival of the human race, will never be achieved so long as such dogmatism persists and so long as régimes endeavour to export ideas or forms of government. Our contribution therefore has always been and will continue to be the strengthening of the cause of international law and justice among nations.

9. We have never been a burden on anyone, nor shall we ever be. We have faced difficulties, and we shall continue to do so. These difficulties are partly our own fault and partly due to a system of international trade whose progress, so far as the developing countries are concerned, has so far been more theoretical than practical.

10. The nations are generally aware that in international organizations Uruguay's vote has never been traded for material advantages or conditioned by anything but our idea of justice as the embodiment of international law. I am proud, therefore, to be the spokesman of Uruguay, a country which does not and will not waver, and this will be our contribution to the tasks we have all undertaken together in this great Assembly.

11. Mr. VALDES (Chile) (translated from Spanish): I have great pleasure in congratulating the President on his election to preside over this twenty-second

regular session of the General Assembly. I feel it is a step in the right direction that these debates should be conducted by a member of a socialist country; it highlights the fact that the Organization embraces all ideologies and political systems and is serving peace and international co-operation in the widest sense.

12. It is also a pleasant duty for me to express the Chilean delegation's appreciation of Mr. Pazhwak of Afghanistan who worked so idfatigably and so patiently in the cause of peace as President of the last regular session and of the two special sessions held this year.

13. This new regular session of the General Assembly opens in a difficult atmosphere. Two special sessions have been held this year to deal with matters of vital importance for international peace. In none of the three items discussed during those sessions was any progress made; delegations which made valiant efforts to achieve practical results were left with a mere vague feeling of confusion and disappointment.

14. The question of South West Africa was discussed at the fifth special session, on the basis of a report from the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa^{1/} recommending direct administration of the Territory by the United Nations. The recommendation was approved but it is obvious that it will be ineffective because, for different reasons, all the permanent members of the Security Council abstained. Thus at a time when by an overwhelming majority the international community had withdrawn its confidence from the former mandatory Power, South Africa, this occurred to strengthen the position of the latter and encourage it to continue for many years its mockery of the United Nations.

15. At the same special session the General Assembly examined a report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations,^{2/} a vitally important topic if the Organization is to be provided with the means of intervening effectively in conflicts calculated to endanger international peace and security. Despite all attempts to reach at any rate a minimum agreement, nothing concrete was achieved. The report was approved and the Committee was requested to continue its examination of the problem, bearing in mind the proposals submitted by Ireland and Canada,^{3/} which Chile co-sponsored. Let us be honest: those proposals were thus politely buried.

16. In consequence of all this, the great Powers have regained their former absolute control over questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, and the General Assembly has been denied its erstwhile ability to act in this matter. This same General Assembly whose authority in matters of peace has been undermined was convened in special emergency session to deal with the Middle East question, now aggravated by the recent conflict.

17. Latin America made a serious attempt to secure peace. In line with the principles involved, which we

fully support, Chile considers that there is room for a further approach which could bring about an effective formula for a stable and definitive solution to the Middle East problem.

18. There are at present very few problems as serious as the Viet-Nam conflict. There is no denying that its presence hovers over these debates, and in the last few years we have all expressed our opinions on the matter. Today we once more express our distress at finding the struggle still going on with no end in sight. One wonders whether a process of moral corruption is not taking place when mankind grows accustomed to the daily sight, year in, year out, in the press and on television, of battles, bombings and death as if they were scenes from history having no connexion with morality, law, or life as we know it.

19. It is indeed a cruel paradox that, faced with the most serious problem threatening world peace, the United Nations has been unable to play any significant role. The question is not even on the General Assembly's agenda. A political, not a military solution is what is needed in this war, and it must necessarily take account of the principles in whose name this political Assembly is meeting; I refer mainly to the principles of non-intervention and self-determination.

20. We have followed the Secretary-General's personal intervention with sympathetic interest; but its results have highlighted the utter inability of the Organization, as such, to assume responsibility for this problem. There is no doubt that one of the causes of this situation lies in the fact that the United Nations still falls short of universality and that many important actors in the drama are absent, vacillating between a Messianic role and chaos, isolated and menacing.

21. As a last confirmation of this picture, I would draw attention to the stagnation at Geneva in the task of interpreting the principles of the Charter. It is paradoxical that twenty years ago the world experienced a feeling of relief at seeing general agreement reached on fundamental rules and principles, and yet today there is no real agreement on the meaning of those rules and principles.

22. It would not be fair, however, to blame the United Nations for the failures and frustrations to which we have drawn attention. They are due not so much to what goes on within the Organization as to the policy of power that is developing outside it. Side by side with the United Nations a system of blocs has been built up which divides the world into two centres, each of which has strengthened its defences with political, ideological and military instruments. The vertical separation of the two was prejudicial to a large number of small States, while the introduction of political, ideological or economic alternatives, such as those expressed by the so-called non-aligned countries or third world, did not substantially change this polarization on a world scale. This has seriously affected the work of the United Nations. The Organization has, however, helped to prevent these two blocs attacking each other.

23. In the last few years this cold war has decreased in intensity. Economic, technological and military development has brought about relationships of com-

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Special Session, Annexes, Agenda item 7, A/6640,

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Agenda item 8, A/6654.

^{3/} *Ibid.*, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, Agenda item 33, A/6603, paras. 4, 6 and 25 and draft resolutions A and B.

mon interests and balance among the great Powers which have robbed the previous ideological differences of their meaning. The more rapid rate of development attained by the countries that do not belong to the blocs, as also their political self-government, have been a strong inducement in that process.

24. This has given rise to ways of thinking and to forces which, realizing the danger of division, build bridges in the matter of thought, ideologies, religion and economic development, creating such fruitful relations that today we are witnessing increasing co-operation among nations that ten years ago seemed to be hostile and aggressive. And thus it would seem, to our great joy, that peace among the great Powers has been preserved.

25. At this point I must mention the armaments problem. Up to a few decades ago armaments represented only a fraction of a country's activities and were simply the power it kept in reserve for any military emergency. Today the production of armaments absorbs such a large share of the resources available for scientific and technological research that it prejudices and distorts all the economic activity of the great nations and, by a strange paradox, it mobilizes the greatest effort in the use of natural resources and of intelligence that mankind has ever made throughout history. It is tragic to realize that while Pope Paul VI, the highest moral authority in the world, has said that "development is the new name for peace", the production of armaments has today become the greatest expression of development.

26. A few weeks ago, the two greatest Powers, showing a promising ability to co-ordinate their policies, submitted a joint draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The world cannot but welcome this effort to decrease the possibilities of nuclear destruction.

27. Nevertheless, I must refer here to a fact that is precisely in line with the phenomenon already described of the horizontal separation of the great Powers, above, and the rest of the world seeking development, below, that has replaced the vertical division brought about by the cold war. In fact, the Powers in question, by proposing by themselves alone the solution of a problem that is of such serious consequence to the small countries, have shown clearly the vast abyss existing between the power of decision and the influence of some as compared with the power and influence of others.

28. In the picture I have drawn, it is imperative that real progress should be made in the conversations of the great nuclear Powers on the practical means for their own disarmament, since the renunciation by the small States of any attempt to develop their own nuclear weapons will be of no avail unless it is accompanied by the nuclear disarmament of all States without exception. Yet we see no progress being made in that direction.

29. The rapid development of countries like my own, or indeed the majority of the international community, makes it necessary for all possible national and international resources to be available for that purpose. Consequently, our concern for non-proliferation cannot make us overlook the importance of the

measures of conventional disarmament, which is closely connected with the releasing of resources for economic development.

30. At the Meeting of American Chiefs of State held at Punte del Este in April 1967, the subject of the limitation of expenditure on armaments was expressly considered in connexion with the discussion of ways and means of overcoming the present economic situation in Latin America. At that same Meeting the Chilean delegation put forward the idea of abandoning certain types of military devices, within that framework.

31. My delegation considers it essential that a study should be made of the security needs of the countries of Latin America as a whole, their legal and political obligations and their internal constitutional and institutional requirements. For this reason we urge that this point should be given consideration and that a specialized preparatory meeting, exclusively Latin American, should be convened, with general approval, to consider these problems one by one, keeping in view solely the interests of the Latin American region.

32. In this way Chile shows that its essentially pacifist policy, based on absolute non-intervention, does not in any way call for armaments that affect the security of other countries of the region, and far less for the acquisition of arms or military devices that impede the harmonious economic and integrated development of the region.

33. Unless a certain measure of peace prevails among the great countries, the perils of war increase in this human frontier zone, where the break occurs between well-being and poverty, between development and the lack of science and technology, a frontier which coincides with the periphery where the historically white man meets men of another colour. It is here, in this frontier, that tensions build up.

34. I am not trying to condemn some nations in order to extol others, but simply to show the existence of a concealed racism that operates in increasingly manifold and complex imperialist forms.

35. Among the developed countries that tend to unite their efforts in defence of their interests, ideologies and nationalism lose their virulence. It is the peoples that are farther beyond the frontier of well-being that are a prey to extremism, nationalism and even international political terrorism.

36. Wars—at present local wars—break out in this periphery. Terrorism is let loose among the peoples which have been colonized and which suffer social injustice. It is here that we find the great perils and problems that the United Nations will have to tackle if we wish to fulfil its purposes.

37. This violation of human rights on a world-wide scale is due to an underlying racism that is foreign to us Latin Americans. The historic importance of Latin America is that of constituting a human manifestation in which all races have had and still have equal opportunities of integration in our national communities. We do not, however, claim to be a symbol, but we do believe that we are a synthesis.

38. The international community, aware of the dangers and the injustice that the horizontal division of the world between satisfied peoples, on the one hand, and deprived peoples on the other, entailed, proclaimed the decade of the 1960s as the Development Decade. Four fifths of that period have already passed and none of the targets for economic growth set at that time have been reached; indeed, today, it is frankly admitted that this aspiration has been a failure. There is no appreciable improvement in the indices of the levels of living of the developing nations and the transfer of technology and financial resources which was essential for the achievement of those targets has not come about. The terms on which international trade is developing are still conspiring against more rapid development and we are in the midst of a world food crisis which is due to the inability of the developing world to increase its agricultural production to keep pace with its population explosion. What, then, is strange in the fact that it is precisely in this periphery that wars, conflicts, violence and tension originate that imperil international peace? We cannot think about preserving peace and security if we are not able boldly to transform the problem of under-development in order to ensure a decent life for every human being.

39. National efforts are, and must be, the basis; they cannot be replaced, but only supplemented, by international co-operation. Thus development will be achieved with the national characteristics and genius of each nation and for its own benefit, without, however, any disregard of the general interests of mankind which are consistent with it.

40. In the interdependent world of today, international collaboration has become a necessity, because the sphere of action of each country is becoming more and more limited. The structure of world trade is, however, making the efforts of the developing countries fruitless. With all the means at our disposal, and particularly through UNCTAD, we are seeking a drastic change in that structure. Until that comes about, and as a means of arriving at a system of equitable world trade and reciprocal benefits, we think that the developing world should increase its economic and commercial relations within its own frontiers, whether within each region or among the various regions.

41. An example of how developing countries can co-operate with each other through political decisions is provided by the agreement reached by four of the largest copper producers of the world, the Congo, Peru, Zambia and Chile, working out concerted action to increase their negotiating capacity in the trade and use of this basic metal and designed to make the interest of the producing countries coincide with those of the consumers.

42. In our opinion, however, the most complete demonstration of this policy of increase and of economic and trade complementarity among developing countries lies in economic intergration of regions or sub-regions. In Latin America we have chosen this path of integration in order to make the utmost use of our countless natural resources and our great human potential, to produce massive quantities of capital goods and to introduce technologies and

industries of high technology that can only survive with ample markets within a vast economic region.

43. The Meeting of American Chiefs of State, held at Punta del Este in April 1967, gave a political definition, at the highest level, to the need to create a common market grouping 240 million Latin Americans. This act is not only of great significance for the development of Latin America; it will very soon be of significance for the whole world, that cannot disregard the potentially richer continent, in which the population is increasing more rapidly. Within this context, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, and recently Bolivia, have agreed to accelerate their integration in order to form a single economic region during the forthcoming decade.

44. These integration processes require financial and technical assistance from outside. That is what happened in the case of the European integration, which has been of great benefit to the people of that continent. We, for our part, are seeking integration as a way of establishing our own development on autonomous bases with regard to decisions and in order to obtain the benefits of progress. For this reason, external co-operation, which is necessary, can be neither exclusive nor excluding.

45. It can be asserted that the diagnosis of the economic and social situation of the developing world has been completed. It has also been possible to start laying down the broad lines of an international policy designed to change the present state of affairs. In the Trade and Development Board, which completed its session at Geneva a few days ago, there was a clear consensus on some of the central points of this policy, which might give rise to constructive and fruitful negotiation.

46. We feel that among those points none is so worthy of mention as that of the transfer of modern technology to the developing world. The technological revolution is leaving the developing world—which harbours two thirds of the human race—behind in the matter of scientific and technical progress, for the gap which is increasing daily between the economic power of the two sectors of the world is obviously the result of the technological imbalance. Let us therefore not hesitate to say that it is of the utmost urgency that the process of transferring that technology should be speeded up, by the granting of patents on favourable terms or by the granting of facilities for the local improvement of applied, and in some cases also basic, research.

47. Next in order of importance is the transfer of financial resources to the developing world, which has manifestly weakened. It is therefore clear that the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which is to be held at New Delhi from 1 February to 25 March 1968, will have to take up that question in no uncertain fashion and establish the machinery and the methods for increasing the earnings in foreign currency of the developing countries, basically through their exports of primary commodities and manufactures and through financial assistance that will be able to help in the mobilization of domestic resources and in the better utilization of a labour force which at present is for the most part wasted.

48. I wish to point out how important it is that the New Delhi Conference should draw up a global development strategy in which internal, regional, sub-regional and international efforts will all have their place and will be brought into harmony. Some preliminary meetings are to be held shortly, one in Paris and another at Algiers. We hope that the industrial countries will emphasize the spirit of understanding that began to appear at Geneva. We are also confident that the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 at Algiers will reflect the same sense of realism and of positive construction that characterized the conduct of the Group on that occasion, and we are sure that the countries with a socialist economy will have fixed the broad lines of their position before the New Delhi Conference and are preparing to collaborate in the common task. We are under an obligation to change the structure of international trade and economy, because it is that structure that is today working most actively against peace.

49. We recognize the coexistence in the world of different types of ideologies and of political, economic and social systems as an incontrovertible fact. Such pluralism in the world, within the principles of the Charter, is not and cannot be an obstacle to peace; on the contrary, it is part of the process of man's maturing and, with the risks inherent in any creation, it enriches the process of construction of a varied human race which is forever improving. We see no reason why this plurality should not also prevail in Latin America, where there are different experiences and ideological forms that reflect various ways of conceiving coexistence within national communities. This must be recognized and respected.

50. Latin America was born under the sign of freedom for ideas and for races and of liberation from injustice. We should like the fundamental worth of the human person always to be protected in America, but we have not yet achieved that goal, mainly because the very conditions of its economic development have affected the realities of power and of law and have impeded free and healthy expression by the people. But although this is not yet possible despite the fact that the vigilant conscience of the people is working seriously in that direction, there is one principle that is essential: it is the principle of non-intervention.

51. Our concept of ideological, political and economic plurality, and at the same time the process of integration, obliges us to keep this principle of non-intervention, which is a historic basis of our country's international policy, in full operation.

52. In recent times this principle has been systematically violated in Latin America, seriously affecting Latin American nations again and again. These facts, which we have recently denounced at the meeting of our regional body, violate the explicit terms of resolution 2131 (XX), which was unanimously adopted at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, and operative paragraph 2 of which states that "No State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State".

53. Any violation of this principle should be brought to the notice of the United Nations, because it corrupts international life, generates opposing attitudes that also tend to violate that same principle and creates dangers for the small nations which the international community should prevent. It also gives rise to tense situations into which the great Powers are dragged, thus endangering world peace.

54. My country was not acting out of expediency when it supported that statement condemning intervention, nor shall we agree to any weakening or alteration of its terms. Those principles serve to defend us from others, but they also serve to make us use control with regard to others.

55. Fortunately the contemporary world, on which science and technology are leaving their mark, has another characteristic, which is the understanding by the masses of their right to participate in the benefits of civilization. It is no longer possible, either at the world level or within each State or in smaller communities, for privileged groups to exist whose power and wealth are often based on the subjection and poverty of vast sectors of population. The demands of justice and solidarity should bring about the rapid and radical change that all social structures require. To bring about this change in freedom, with full respect for the entire human person, is the great common task before us all. Chile's domestic life is guided by those same principles of respect for human rights, plurality and economic and social development that it advocates for international coexistence.

56. The Chilean people have decided, by democratic processes, to carry out far-reaching social and economic reforms within the broadest political freedom. It is no easy task to eliminate the causes of internal dissension in each country, as we are doing in ours. There are the international factors that I have mentioned to contend with, as also the extremists with opposing views, who, when they feel that their interests are harmed or their intention to use violence is frustrated, try in vain, by all internal and external means, to weaken the will of the people.

57. In Chile we have already, in three years, obtained great results in the fields of education, health and housing; we have changed social and economic structures that were hampering and halting the increase in production; we are carrying out agrarian reform; and, above all, we have made our people participate in this gigantic effort, as the subject and the chief practitioner of the development policy.

58. We are confident that our domestic programme will be successful, for we are attaining the goals that we set ourselves; we are collaborating in a historical process of unity in Latin America, where, too, we see substantial progress and where violence must not be tolerated. But we also feel that everything that happens in the world concerns us, for, as I have said, the principles that Chile would like to see applied in international coexistence have their roots, as far as we are concerned, in the free and voluntary determination of our people.

59. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I, like all those who have preceded me to this rostrum, would like to start by saying how very glad I am to see you occupying that Chair. You and I have come to know each other very well indeed, and you know how much I value the degree of warmth that has entered into our personal relations. You have a very difficult task before you, and, if it needs saying, let me say at once that you will have all my support in carrying out that task.

60. I would also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor. In the past year, the Assembly met three separate times. Rarely has such a heavy burden been placed upon a President. I believe, with all my friends, that we were very fortunate indeed during that year to have our Afghan colleague in the Chair, and he has earned the warmest thanks of all of us.

61. At the opening of each year's session of the General Assembly, we have a unique opportunity to take stock, and I want, if I may, to use this opportunity to talk pretty frankly about our Organization. I will try to say where I believe we succeed. I will also have something to say about what I regard as our weaknesses. I have some suggestions to make as to what all of us should do to remedy those weaknesses. As the Secretary-General reminded us in his Annual Report on the Work of the Organization [A/6701], and as others have said before me, when we are talking about our Organization, we must not speak of something that is detached from ourselves. Our United Nations Organization cannot be more effective than we, its Members, make it. Its successes are our successes, its failures are our failures, and no one can contract out.

62. When I spoke here last year [1436th meeting], I proclaimed the firm belief of my country and of myself in our Organization and all its stands for. I said that we were determined to work in a most practical way for the fulfilment of its ideals and its aims. I solemnly repeat that pledge here today. It binds my country and it binds me as much today as it did a year ago.

63. Let me turn first to the achievements, as I see them. First and foremost, of course, is the fact that this Assembly provides the only real forum for continuing discussions between the nations. At this opening stage of the General Assembly, foreign ministers from all over the world meet and talk together. I find this immensely valuable, and I believe my colleagues feel the same. Therefore, I say that however difficult are the problems we face, it remains true that the world is a safer place because of the opportunities which this Organization provides for all of us here to have a full and free exchange of views.

64. Springing from all this the United Nations Organization has acquired what I called last year "a certain intangible supra-national moral strength" [1436th meeting, para. 45]. The Office of the Secretary-General has acquired a prestige over the years which can enable both him and his staff to exercise a real influence in the danger areas of the world. He and they, with the United Nations peace-keeping forces and the observer group working in widely

different areas of tension, have much to their credit in containing and avoiding conflict.

65. The work of the Organization on the economic and social fronts is vitally important and much too little recognized or emphasized. The Secretary-General has said that something like 85 per cent of our total effort in men and in money goes into the economic and social fields and the field of human rights. In my view that is the right direction. Moreover the great specialized agencies have established habits of co-operation, and they provide invaluable assistance in all their many technical and economic fields. They allow assistance to be given and to be received by nations in proper dignity. This is the work which in the long run will create the conditions for a peaceful world.

66. I am proud that Britain plays such a full part in this political, economic and social work; we shall continue to do so. The fact that we are represented here by Lord Caradon, who is a Minister in the British Government, underlines the direct day-to-day consultation that takes place between New York and London. Other Ministers and other Members of our Parliament take an active part in the discussions in the General Assembly.

67. In the economic and social fields, Britain is still the second largest over-all contributor. In 1965 we raised our contribution to the United Nations Development Programme, to whose work I should like to pay a special tribute. To UNRWA and the High Commissioner for Refugees we are also among the largest contributors. We have maintained the level of our contributions, and we intend to increase our overseas aid during the coming year. Over and above the aid programme we had planned, we shall make a contribution of £5 million to the Food Aid programme resulting from the Kennedy Round. We intend to contribute to the Population Fund. We work closely with the International Bank and its affiliates, and we are ready to play our part in replenishing the funds of the International Development Association at a substantially higher level than in the past. And now we look forward to playing an active role in the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to be held at New Delhi early next year.

68. Perhaps this is the point at which I should say a few words about the shortcomings of our Organization. In the long run the national interest of every State lies in strengthening this body. The division of military power between two opposing blocs has in fact prevented it from playing a significant part in major issues of peace and war. That is true in Europe, it is true in South-East Asia and it is true in the field of nuclear policy. In those circumstances we can understand why the policies of States are determined more by their own vital interests and their own ideologies than by the collective will of the international community.

69. But this is a disappointing situation, one we cannot change, at any rate in the short term. The balance of power is not maintained, not preserved through our Organization. Peace depends largely on alliances and on the multilateral arrangements which each country makes to ensure its own security.

For the time being, it is only through those alliances and arrangements that the clashes between ideologies and interests can be accommodated without conflict. Indeed, regional groupings are specifically provided for in our own Charter.

70. But I am not a believer in rigid blocs as the basis of a permanent security system. However, for the present, the machinery, resources and power of our Organization cannot by themselves provide a reliable security system. We must all, including the smaller nations here, work very hard to enable us to be able to do so. In the long run, the constructive efforts of alliances to achieve a détente can pave the way to a system in which our Organization plays a larger part. We all heard Mr. Gromyko refer in his speech the other day [1563rd meeting] to the disbandment of military blocs. I repeat, there is no question in my view of military alliances becoming set in a rigid mould. But those who advocate the immediate dissolution of those alliances are proposing, I fear, to remove the scaffolding before the arch has been completed.

71. These are the present limitations in the role of our Organization. In order to make progress towards the ideal of an effective world-wide United Nations authority, we have a tremendous amount of work yet to do. One place to start is in peace-keeping and in the peaceful settlement of disputes. The United Nations still lacks the ability to get to grips early enough with major international problems before they reach a critical point. I shall say something a little later about a number of the biggest immediate problems that face us. But meanwhile, another year has gone by without any debate at all on how to improve our machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes. A year has gone by with only a fruitless debate on peace-keeping itself. Proposals that we and others have put forward—practical proposals for carrying out the provisions of our Charter—have so far got nowhere.

72. Our proposals may be in advance of their time. They are clearly in advance of many of our fellow Members. But they are not in advance of events. There could surely be no more frightening proof of the need for sound machinery for peace-keeping and, even more, for the peaceful settlement of disputes, than that which we had this spring. The United Nations Emergency Force was for ten years the key to peace between the United Arab Republic and Israel. Within three weeks of its disappearance the whole area was at war. We could have had no clearer warning of the need for effective peace-keeping machinery. It is not the Charter which is defective. But some still lack the will to make it work as it should and could.

73. We shall get nowhere on peace-keeping arrangements or on the work of this Organization in general until we do something much better about our financial arrangements. Unhappily, we have made no progress towards solving our deficit problem. Two years ago the Assembly asked for voluntary contributions to meet the gap.^{4/} Britain came forward with a voluntary and unconditional contribution of \$10 million, a con-

siderable sum. Some other nations have more than played their part. But the general response, let us admit it, has been terribly disappointing. Pathetically little has been volunteered since 1965. May I say to my colleagues, those who have not yet helped, that they should consider urgently the need to make their voluntary contributions now. It is our common need, it must be our common purpose, to put the Organization on a sound financial footing. Only in this way can we enable it to meet the calls which we make upon it.

74. Now I turn for a moment to a problem of a different kind. The ordinary Briton feels puzzled, indeed resentful, when he hears that we of all people are being attacked about our attitude towards the great issues of freedom and independence. This is something which could seriously erode the strong support which exists in my country, and has always existed in my country, for the United Nations.

75. The fact is that we in Britain are great believers in freedom and in the right of all countries to choose their own future. Moreover, we put these views into effect; we do not just talk about them. And we believed in this long before this Organization was created. There are 750 million people in the world today whom we have helped to reach and maintain their freedom. The most recent examples are Mauritius, which is soon to be a fully independent nation; the new States of the Eastern Caribbean, which have chosen a free and voluntary association with Britain; and, of course, South Arabia, which despite its special and complex problems is soon to be independent, and where we have sought to work with and through the United Nations in the form of the Special United Nations Mission.

76. Having this proud record, I cannot see why, nor can my fellow countrymen see why, we should now be thought to want to depart from our firmly held beliefs. In our view every Territory has the right to be freely consulted about its future. It is only natural that those which remain in our responsibility today should contain some of the most difficult problems. We cannot simply just cast them adrift. We cannot, if I may say so, accept the simple dogmatism that seems so often to be heard in the Committee of Twenty-Four.

77. In our efforts to deal with these problems, we look for understanding from this Assembly and its Committees. But what at times have we found? Both in the Committee of Twenty-Four and in the wider forums of our Organization, it seems to us that there has too often been a reluctance to hear, willingly and without pre-judgement, the freely expressed views of the people of the Territories themselves. There has sometimes been a refusal to recognize and accept the full and thorough processes of popular democratic consultation.

78. Examples of this lie in recent decisions by the Committee of Twenty-Four on Fiji and on the Associated States of the Eastern Caribbean. These have illustrated, I believe, this reluctance on the part of that Committee to heed the voice of the colonial peoples themselves. But an even stranger example has been the case of Gibraltar. The Committee's recent resolution on Gibraltar^{5/} seems to me to have

^{4/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 21, document A/5916, para. 2 (c).

^{5/} For the text of the resolution, adopted by the Committee on 1 September 1967, see document A/AC.109/266.

been thoroughly bad. It ran directly against two principles which surely the Committee should have been the first of all to defend.

79. First, what the Committee calls decolonization cannot mean handing a people against their will to another Government. Is that what the Committee really wants to see done to the people of Gibraltar? Why?

80. Secondly, in handling these grave matters, we must all ask two questions. One is, "What is best for the people?" And we certainly cannot begin to answer that question until we ask the other, which is, "What do the people want?" But the Committee of Twenty-Four seems to us to take a startlingly different approach. It showed no enthusiasm at all when it heard that the people of Gibraltar were going to express their own views in a referendum. The rather extraordinary message which it sent to the people of Gibraltar was, "Do not express your views about your own future". I simply cannot understand this attitude. Nevertheless, I believe that on this matter Britain and Spain should continue to talk. I trust that we both share the wish that Gibraltar should not be a barrier between us. And for my part, I look forward to an early resumption of our discussions.

81. I said at the beginning that the United Nations can only be what we make it. It seems to me that it is clear that the United Nations can only take effective action when a wide measure of agreement has been reached among those directly concerned. Enough members must be convinced in frank discussion that the path suggested is the right one. Only then can that path be followed purposefully. No faction of this Assembly can impose its will on the rest if positive results are to follow.

82. Sometimes I think we fail to see the warning lights. The Assembly, or its Committees, are then tempted to think that a resolution is a substitute for action. But sweeping declarations which take no account of facts and of significant sections of United Nations opinion do nothing, I suggest, to further the aims of the Charter. On the contrary, they set them back. They destroy confidence in the right-mindedness of the United Nations, and then that confidence has to be laboriously recreated. Resolutions of this kind produce no results. I think the Assembly's action on South West Africa [resolution 2248 (S-V)] last spring illustrates clearly what I mean. I should like to come back to that in a moment.

83. Let me turn to another matter first which my Government believes is of concern to our Organization and to all its Members: that is the question of violence against diplomatic missions which is now endangering the relations between so many nations. This, the world's greatest diplomatic assembly, must be concerned, I think, when centuries of diplomatic experience and practice are put wantonly at risk.

84. This past year has seen a new rash of mob violence, of blatant disregard for the immunities which are essential for the civilized working relations of diplomatic representatives. Worse than all this, these acts have been condoned, if not promoted, by governments. The attack and burning of our diplomatic mission in Peking, the manhandling of our Chargé

d'Affaires and his staff were matters of grave concern. The wives and families of our people in Peking have still not been allowed to leave, although I am hoping for an early and favourable decision on this.

85. Nevertheless, having said what I have, I want to add that, despite the serious effect which all these recent events have had on Anglo-Chinese relations, we still hold firmly to the view that the Chinese People's Republic should be seated in this Assembly. Its continued exclusion from the international community will benefit neither the people we represent here, nor, for that matter, the Chinese people themselves.

86. But it is not only in China that embassies have been attacked and diplomatic representatives subjected to indignities and worse. Nor can any of us be happy when private nationals of one country are held in detention by the government of another country for months without charge and without justification. We have been among the victims of this kind of disgraceful behaviour, though, of course, we are by no means alone. But are we the real victims? Is not the real victim the structure of international confidence and understanding which has been built up so patiently over the years? It is impossible under these conditions to get our real business done. It is no good our meeting here, with proper protocol and politeness, if damage and destruction to diplomatic establishments is being condoned outside. And let me add this, if I may. The world is subjected to a mass of constant, deliberate and sometimes malevolent propaganda over the radio and television. This too destroys the trust and work between peoples. I believe we should express our condemnation of this perverted way of doing business.

87. May I now say a brief word about a quite different matter—the problem of the balance among all the different countries of the world. At present there are two giant States. The gap between these giants and the rest of the world is not good for the world; it is not good for the two super-States themselves; it is not good for other countries that are sensitive about what they believe to be their weakness. For this reason, we in Britain welcome the regional groupings which have grown up everywhere—in Africa, South America and other parts of the world. This is also why we believe in a wider European grouping than exists at present.

88. It was for this reason, above all, that Britain applied earlier this year for full membership of the European community. This great decision has been endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the British people. I believe that, as a result of our joining the European community, Europe will be able to speak with a much stronger voice in the counsels of the world, and I believe it will also enrich and strengthen thereby our ability to support the United Nations Organization in its many activities.

89. I said earlier that I would talk about the specific conflicts which face this Assembly. As I said, many of the problems have been caused by unwillingness—on the part of all of us in the United Nations—to become actively involved in major international prob-

lems before they reach a critical point. When the inevitable crisis comes upon us we often seem content to apply a palliative which cures the symptom without attacking the root of the complaint. The great international problems of the world do not solve themselves. Time is not, in this respect, the great healer. These problems can be solved only when nations and peoples bestir themselves and really work for solutions in a hard-headed and practical manner. Let us bring this courageous practical approach to the world problems which I want now to comment on.

90. First, the Middle East. It is deplorable that over three months after the end of the Arab-Israeli war we in the United Nations have not been able to agree on a constructive resolution tackling the main causes of the conflict. The debates in the fifth emergency special session this summer and the proposals discussed privately at that time showed clearly that the weight of international opinion was for a balanced approach from which stability might emerge. Let us now build on this common ground.

91. I should like to repeat what I said when I was here before: Britain does not accept war as a means of settling disputes, nor that a State should be allowed to extend its frontiers as a result of a war. This means that Israel must withdraw. But equally, Israel's neighbours must recognize its right to exist, and it must enjoy security within its frontiers. What we must work for in this area is a durable peace, the renunciation of all aggressive designs, and an end to policies which are inconsistent with peace.

92. As I suggested in June [1529th meeting] and as the Secretary-General has himself recommended [A/6701/Add.1, para. 48], there should be a special representative of the Secretary-General in the area, charged with making direct contact with the parties to the dispute. His would be no easy task. But that makes his appointment, we believe, the more necessary and the more urgent.

93. Without delay we must tackle the question of ensuring the free use of international waterways. The denial of this right was one of the root-causes of this summer's trouble. As things stand, no country enjoys the use of the Suez Canal. Unless this route is quickly available again, there must inevitably be damaging changes in the pattern of world trade. The economies of the world would permanently reduce their dependence on routes of communication which can be blocked or interrupted for a long time.

94. A perhaps even more urgent problem, if that is possible, is the problem of the people—the individual people—who have suffered personal loss and the disruption of their lives. The Assembly rightly expressed urgent concern for the refugees during its fifth emergency special session. Last month a limited step was taken towards the alleviation of the problem when some former residents of the West Bank were allowed to return there. It is a matter of great regret to my Government and to myself that there has not been more progress in the return of innocent people to their homes. I heartily endorse the Secretary-General's plea that the humanitarian

aspects of the refugee situation be divorced from the political and military aspects.^{6/}

95. Looking to the future, imagination, co-operation and resources—all will be needed. I believe that this Organization can play a decisive part in launching a constructive scheme for development in the Middle East which could show the way to wipe out that human misery which we call the refugee problem. What we need is a new and comprehensive and imaginative approach to the whole problem.

96. I believe that Jerusalem too requires a special mention here. The British position was made quite clear when, with the vast majority of the Members of this Assembly, we voted this summer for the resolutions calling on Israel to do nothing to prejudice the status of Jerusalem. We stand by what we then said. This is not an issue between Israel and Jordan alone; three great religions of the world turn to the Old City as a sacred place.

97. Speaking of actions tending to prejudice the status of Jerusalem, I am bound to add that I was concerned by the report which I read yesterday in The New York Time, according to which Israeli settlements are to be established in the occupied territories. I feel that the implications of this are clear and disturbing.

98. It may well be that a wider United Nations presence will have a part to play in all this. Under the devoted leadership of General Odd Bull, UNTSO has done so much to restore calm where it has been allowed to operate. Perhaps this should be built upon. We would hope that the need for any such force would be short; we hope that a stable peace and good-neighbourliness will grow in the Middle East. We all know that the Secretary-General is right when he says in the Introduction to his Annual Report that "The essential precondition . . . in the Middle East is an end to incitement to hatred, the achievement of calm and a recourse to reason" [A/6701/Add.1, para. 51]. We think that a United Nations presence could be crucial to the first steps on this path.

99. My own view is that a settlement in the Middle East can come only through the United Nations Organization, and that we, the Members, must without delay seek to agree on the framework within which the Organization is to operate.

100. I turn now to the intractable problems of southern Africa. We have often clearly stated the principles in which we believe, and I restate them now. First and foremost, any form of racial discrimination is totally abhorrent and unacceptable to us. It follows from this that the system of apartheid in South Africa is detestable to us. And on the problem of South West Africa we have stated our conviction that South Africa has forfeited its right to administer the Mandate over that international Territory. We have, moreover, persistently endorsed the principle of self-determination as the basis of any acceptable solution of the problem of the Portuguese territories in southern Africa. And in Rhodesia we have insisted, and will continue to insist, on racial non-discrimination

^{6/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1967, document S/8158, para. 224.

and guaranteed progress towards majority rule and full democratic government. We shall not accept any form of independence for Rhodesia unless it is acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole. I am, of course, firmly against the use of terrorist methods in solving political problems. This is not the way to make progress. But the tragedy is that if certain policies are pursued, they can become, or seem to become an invitation to terrorism.

101. So these are our guiding principles. Our faith in those basic principles is undiminished. It is well that they should be clearly restated; but at the same time as we restate our principles, we must also be honest with ourselves and with others about the limitations that exist on the effective action which is open to us. If we are to arrive at practical solutions to the practical problems which confront us, we must face up to and recognize those limitations for what they are. I do not wish to shirk the task of stating them again honestly and bluntly now.

102. First, in solving the Rhodesian problem, we have said frankly from the beginning that we are against the use of force. Secondly, in dealing with all these problems of southern Africa, we have always made it clear that we cannot and will not now contemplate an economic war with South Africa. There may be honest disagreement with our reasons for holding these positions, but I assure you that as seen by us they are justified and inescapable. It is essential to recognize that those limitations do exist. To call for action in solving the problems of southern Africa without at the same time recognizing the limitations on the scope of that action is to invite at best frustration and at worst a betrayal of the trust placed in us.

103. It is a matter of great regret to us that in approaching the problems of South West Africa, the United Nations Organization has not been prepared to confine itself to action which is clearly practical and positive. We supported limited but constructive proposals for that Territory, including a proposal for the United Nations to have a special representative there, and we continue to believe that such a step might well have led to some progress. I have already spoken of the resolution [2248 (S-V)] adopted at the last special session of the General Assembly on South West Africa. That resolution seems to us to contain what is now clearly impossible of achievement; it thus offers no solution to the problem. This illustrates—let me repeat it—the futility, as we see it, of attempting collective action by this Organization which disregards the real limitations on what we can do.

104. So of all these problems I am now discussing, the top priority for Britain must be Rhodesia. Here we shall continue faithfully to pursue the action we have advocated and to carry out the measures we have put into effect. It may be difficult to measure exactly at any moment the progress we have made, but I should not wish anyone here at the United Nations or in Rhodesia itself to doubt the determination of my country to see the matter through to an honourable conclusion. There can be no going back. We ourselves in Britain have carried out our obligations under the Security Council resolution 100 per cent. Indeed, we have gone much further than the

letter of those resolutions would require. It is only right that Britain, with its special responsibilities for Rhodesia, should set an example. But we are entitled to ask that others should also join wholeheartedly in the mutual effort to which the overwhelming majority of us have set our hand.

105. And now may I turn to an issue which is not formally on our agenda, but which is certainly one of the major problems in the world today, and to which Members of this Assembly can and must help to bring a solution—Viet-Nam.

106. The past year has been filled with killing and destruction and marked by a range of abortive efforts to bring about peace. It is tragic that the North Viet-Nameese authorities have declined to grasp the many opportunities to negotiate which have been offered and still remain open to them. There has been no reduction in the fighting. There has been no progress towards a solution. There has been progress of another sort: the people of South Viet-Nam have shown their determination to follow constitutional processes in the midst of war. They want a régime of their own choice. The need for a solution is more urgent, I believe, than before.

107. Viet-Nam itself cannot afford to let the war continue; and no more can any of us, for the conflict distorts relations among us and hinders the growth of peaceful co-operation. It is the duty, I submit, of all who have influence to use it to find a way of stopping the fighting, and to do that soberly and in full recognition of their international responsibilities. The use of violent and excessive language towards any of the parties in this conflict contributes nothing to the search for peace.

108. In this situation my Government hopes that all concerned with the conflict will acknowledge the need for compromise—not compromise on principles but compromise in moving towards negotiation. We will support any initiative which offers a chance of progress. We have warmly supported the persistent efforts of the Secretary-General and the plan he put forward last March.^{7/} We are ready to meet with the Governments of the Soviet Union, India, Canada and Poland, as proposed by the President of the World Federation of United Nations Associations so very recently. In the same spirit we welcome the desire of the President-elect of South Viet-Nam to try once again to bridge the gap between Saigon and Hanoi.

109. Much has been said about the bombing of North Viet-Nam. I join with those who would dearly like it to stop. Therefore, I regret that the leaders of North Viet-Nam have never said what they will either do or refrain from doing to help the process of peace if the bombing is stopped. I am conscious, as we all must be, that there are millions of people in South Viet-Nam who crave for the shadow of killing and misery to be lifted from them.

110. Last year when I spoke here [1436th meeting], I outlined the basis on which I thought a solution to the conflict could be built. This year, Mr. Goldberg has set out [1562nd meeting] the elements of a settle-

^{7/} Aide-memoire dated 14 March from the Secretary-General to the parties concerned in the Viet-Nam conflict.

ment on a basis approaching my own, and I welcome, if I may say so, his clear exposition. In my view, the fundamental principles embodied in the plan I ventured to offer a year ago must still hold the field, and all the parties should be able to recognize and accept them.

111. There must be a cease-fire. There must be negotiations. The final solution must be political. And there must be international confirmation of the arrangements agreed upon by the combatants. I see no reason why a balanced settlement embracing those principles should not be achieved on the basis of the Geneva Agreements. Both the United States and the North Viet-Nameese have said that this basis would be acceptable to them. I cannot see the reason why the power of world opinion represented by this Assembly should not be aligned behind those principles and behind a plan of the kind I outlined so that the combatants may be encouraged towards the conference table. And I see no reason why negotiations should not take place immediately, though, of course, we must all accept that their progress would be immeasurably eased if all hostilities had ceased beforehand.

112. I appeal to all the Governments represented here which agree with me to make that known, in whatever they think best, to those engaged in this conflict who have so far ignored both the need and the opportunities for negotiations. Taking the world picture as a whole, the key-problem is how we stop war and how we make peace. Success or failure will determine not how posterity judges us, but whether there will be any posterity. And I do not say that lightly.

113. The project which has dominated disarmament negotiations in the past year has been the non-proliferation treaty. We have all been, I believe, heartened by the large measure of agreement which has been reached between the United States and the Soviet Union. The tabling by their representatives in Geneva of agreed texts² is the most encouraging step in the field of international arms control since the test-ban Treaty of 1963. It is the fruit of much hard work, both here and in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. To a large extent, the draft treaty reflects the views of the other parties to those negotiations, as well as the views of the two sponsoring Powers. Discussion is proceeding now in Geneva, and I will not make any detailed comment here, except to say that it is the hope of my Government that that treaty will be concluded in the very near future.

114. A non-proliferation treaty is, of course, not an end in itself. Apart from its intrinsic value, it will open the way to negotiations on the central problem of controlling and stopping the nuclear arms race. Unless it is followed by progress in that direction, there is a risk that the treaty will not long endure. But equally this progress is dependent on the successful conclusion of the treaty.

115. I have tried to contribute to the discussion of some of the specific problems which are uppermost in all our minds. But it will be clear from what I

have said that underlying all these thoughts is a grave preoccupation over the future of this Organization. It seems to me that the time has come for all of us to ask ourselves again what the United Nations can do, and how long a time we have in which to try to do it. If we work together and put first things first, we can change the face of the world. The trouble is, I believe, that we are behaving as if there were no hurry and as if we could safely take time to advance our particular national, regional or ideological interests. I believe this is an illusion. We do not have time to spare. We must consider, with a very deep sense of responsibility, whether we are equipped to work for peace with the necessary urgency. Are our procedures the best we could have? Are we making the necessary financial sacrifices? Are we possessed of the consciousness of the dangers overhanging us, and the opportunity we have here to work for their avoidance? If we fail, there is nothing to look forward to but anarchy. If we do not look first to our common interests, we are not doing what we should to safeguard the particular interests of our separate nations. This Organization, as some have said, is what we make it. It can decline into impotence or, if we revitalize it, it can save humanity from disaster.

116. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now call on the representative of Nigeria to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

117. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria): Mr. President, the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria, the chairman of our delegation, will soon be here and it will be his duty and privilege to say what we feel about your election to the presidency of this session and pay the tributes that call for expression on behalf of Nigeria.

118. My present intervention is occasioned by the references to my country contained in two statements made from this rostrum yesterday [1566th meeting] by the representatives of two African countries. Their comments related to the military operations being carried out by the Federal Government of Nigeria to suppress a rebellion in the eastern part of the country. One of the speakers in question confined himself to a reference to the part that members of the Organization of African Unity, and his country in particular, were endeavouring to play in the crisis. Incidentally, we are very grateful for this service. But the other speaker went further and said that, in the opinion of his country, this was a case for some sort of international mediation.

119. In view of the fact that the two countries in question were represented at the recent Assembly of African Heads of State and Government at Kinshasa, in the Congo, their introduction of this matter into the general debate of this Assembly came as a surprise to the Nigerian delegation.

120. The Kinshasa Conference adopted a resolution in which the Assembly of Heads of State and Government reaffirmed their adherence to the principle of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States; reiterated their condemnation of secession in any Member State; went on to express their recognition of the Nigerian situation as an

²/ Documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193.

internal affair of Nigeria; expressed their trust and confidence in the Federal Government; expressed their desire to explore the possibilities of placing the services of the assembly at the disposal of the Federal Government, and resolved to send, in their own words, "a consultative mission of six Heads of State to the Head of the Federal Government of Nigeria to assure him of the assembly's desire for the territorial integrity, unity and peace of Nigeria". There was no question of mediation, and the participants in the Kinshasa Conference, including the country whose representative spoke here yesterday of mediation, know that the resolution did not contemplate mediation as such.

121. We submit, with respect, that raising the internal affairs of Nigeria in the United Nations is incompatible with respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nigeria. The Nigerian delegation has no doubt about the bona fides of the two African leaders whose statements we are hereby protesting. We are sure that they mean well for Nigeria. Their countries have stood firmly by the Federal Government of Nigeria and we know that they will continue so to do. I trust that they will understand the purpose of this friendly protest.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.