

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**1590th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 13 October 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
Speech by Mr. Kabanda (Rwanda)	1
Speech by Mr. Khandji (Syria)	6
Speech by Prince Souvanna Phouma (Laos)	9
Speech by Mr. Hasluck (Australia)	10
Statement by the representative of Cambodia	16

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

In the President's absence Mr. Kjartansson, Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) (translated from French): The delegation of the Rwandese Republic associates itself with previous speakers in congratulating the President on his election to preside over this twenty-second session of the General Assembly.
2. Our congratulations extend also to all those who have the honour of assisting him as Vice-Presidents in his arduous task.
3. With the wisdom and the diplomatic and political experience of its President behind it, the General Assembly will no doubt take a step forward in the search for a solution to the complex problems it will have to deal with.
4. My delegation likewise pays a very special tribute to Mr. Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, who presided with both skill and wisdom over the work of the twenty-first session and the two special sessions that followed it. It was a pleasure for my delegation to hold one of the Vice-Presidencies under the leadership of such a capable and experienced President.
5. My delegation would further like to pay a very special tribute to Secretary-General U Thant for his untiring dedication to the Organization and to the cause of peace.
6. Since its accession to independence and sovereignty as a nation just over five years ago, the Rwandese Republic has steered its international policy towards the attainment of the goals of the United Nations, namely co-operation among nations for peace and security in the world and the economic and social development of the less prosperous peoples.
7. We have always declared our faith in the principles governing the United Nations, and in the light of those

principles we have taken our stand on the issues included on the agenda of the General Assembly; and we firmly believe that these issues can be settled only if all States Members of the Organization undertake to approach them in a spirit of co-operation and sincere solidarity.

8. For the past two years, and particularly during the twenty-first session and the two special sessions which followed it, we have detected an atmosphere of solidarity among certain Member States belonging to the same geographical or ideological blocs when dealing with situations involving their own interests. Thus in respect of the question of South West Africa or that of Rhodesia, economic and social interests have consolidated the Western bloc and caused the measures envisaged by the General Assembly and the Security Council to fail. We are convinced that if the Western bloc acted honestly in regard to these problems, southern Africa would recover its dignity.

9. The same attitude is displayed by these Powers in respect of colonialism in the countries where the Western Powers still practise the "art" of exploitation of man by man; I am referring to the anachronistic policy of the Government of Lisbon with regard to Angola, Mozambique, the Territory of Cabinda and Guinea (Bissau) cynically baptized Portuguese Guinea. I am referring also to the attitude of the United Kingdom on the question of Rhodesia.

10. I have said already, and I repeat: this attitude will remain suspect until the United Kingdom takes proper steps to deal with the situation created in Rhodesia under its very nose, if not with its complicity. I trust that the United Kingdom will keep the promises it made last week through its representative in the Fourth Committee [1683rd meeting].

11. The policy of Rwanda on racial and colonial matters has always been in favour of the principle of equal rights for all peoples and sovereign choice in regard to their political régime and their leaders. As the head of the delegation of Rwanda said at the twenty-first session of the Assembly:

"As far as we are concerned, the sovereignty of States and their self-determination are sacred principles which must govern all international relations." [1428th meeting, para. 6.]

12. In the light of those principles the Government of Rwanda has never ceased to condemn the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of Pretoria and the racist policy applied by a white minority to the African people of Rhodesia. Our opposition to that policy is at the same time opposition to the foreign Powers which would turn the southern part of Africa into a land where the white man rules over the coloured

population. We take this opportunity also to renew our support for the Zimbabwe peoples and for all our African and Asian brothers who are still the victims of the atrocities of the outdated system of colonialism. We regret that economic interests in Rhodesia, South Africa and South West Africa have blinded certain Western Powers to the point of making them unmindful of the principles of equality, liberty and fraternity which must govern relations between races.

13. I am no prophet; but if the Western white man insists on helping his fellow-white man in Africa or elsewhere to exploit the black man, it is the white man in general who will have to shoulder the responsibility in the eyes of history. We appeal urgently to the Powers which support the racist policy of South Africa, in the Republic of South Africa itself or in South West Africa, and the policy of the Rhodesian settlers, to cease playing this double game, which in the long run could jeopardize their own survival. At the present stage, what is needed in South West Africa and Rhodesia is not promises or pious declarations but positive acts.

14. I would add that as long as international relations are regarded by some Powers as a means of serving their political or economic ends, and the desire to set men free is not paramount in international relations, the world will continue to be torn by grave tension.

15. The partitioned countries constitute one of the most grievous problems of the day. Our position is in favour of reunification, whether it be Germany or China, Korea or Viet-Nam. In this we are guided by the principle that:

"... every people which through history has formed a single nation, which has participated in the creation of the same culture, must be given an opportunity to remain one nation indivisible, and any arbitrary division of its unity is an unpardonable crime" [*ibid.*, para. 27].

But, in the search for means of reunifying these countries, the principle of self-determination must be scrupulously respected.

16. The Rwandese Republic is happy about the good relations it enjoys with the Federal Republic of Germany, the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea. These three countries have proved their devotion to the principles of the United Nations Charter and have contributed to the development of a great many countries Members of the Organization. They have our encouragement on the road to progress and stability for their peoples.

17. To return to the question of China, we profoundly regret that the leaders in Peking have adopted an attitude which prevents a quarter of the human race from making an effective contribution to international peace and security. The argument of the rights of the majority has often been cited in this Assembly; but there is a tendency to forget that minorities also have their rights and that the majority does not always have the right on its side. It would be wrong to give up the fruits of freedom enjoyed by 13 million Chinese for the sake of the majority principle. One of the guiding principles of this Organization should be to protect and defend freedom and stability wherever they flourish.

18. A year ago, the head of the delegation of Rwanda, addressing the General Assembly, made the following statement:

"... the fact that People's China represents one quarter of the population of the world does not give it the right to preach any alleged revolution in developing countries, or to support subversion in our countries by military training and arming of rebels" [*ibid.*, para. 30].

Thus from this rostrum we condemn the policy of spreading armed conflict throughout the world, as practised by the authorities in Peking.

19. With regard to the question of admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, apart from the fact that my delegation has no reason to assume that the authorities in Peking really want to sit with us here and discuss the problems of international peace and security and the peaceful and harmonious development of nations, we have unequivocally stated our opposition to the theory of two Chinas, and therefore we cannot agree to have two representatives of one and the same people seated in the United Nations. Only the Chinese authorities which have proved their devotion to the principles of the Charter have the right to represent China in the Organization. We regret nevertheless that not all the Chinese people are able to have their voice heard in the United Nations.

20. We are greatly disturbed to learn that the People's Republic of China has embarked on the path of atomic weapons research and development. It gives us serious reason to fear for the security of the world in general and of Asia in particular. Hence we should like to remind China, as well as the great Powers which have set the example and the small countries that encourage China in that direction, that they have a great responsibility towards history and towards the human race.

21. Speaking of matters of concern to the Asian and African continents, the delegation of the Rwandese Republic cannot but reiterate its position in regard to the Middle East situation, a high priority item of the agenda of the present session. There can be no just and lasting solution to the problem unless it is examined without taking sides. Nothing could have prevented the outbreak of 5 June 1967 except respect for the principles of peaceful coexistence and good neighbourliness. But as you make your bed, so you must lie on it.

22. Any attempt to find a solution to the crisis must bear in mind the principles set forth in Articles 2 (3) and 2 (4) of the Charter, which read as follows:

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

23. Rwanda finds it all the more difficult to depart from these principles inasmuch as most of the countries involved in the situation are attached to us by genuine ties. First of all, a number of Arab States

are members of the Organization of African Unity like ourselves, and secondly Israel is a friendly nation with which Rwanda has for a long time had diplomatic relations and extremely cordial co-operation.

24. Thus, having pondered carefully on the problem of the Middle East, my delegation believes that there is only one way to put an end to the state of belligerency and to create the conditions for peaceful coexistence and good neighbourliness. The only way which seems to us realistic is for the United Nations to induce the States of the region to sit down at the same table to study and determine what conditions for the restoration of peace between them would be mutually acceptable. Any agreements emerging from such a gathering would be endorsed and guaranteed by the United Nations or by the four great Powers. My delegation believes that any other solution imposed from outside, even if by a majority in the United Nations, might fail to receive the unanimous agreement of the parties to the conflict and its implementation would thus be jeopardized.

25. I should like to add, moreover, that it would benefit the proposal for negotiations between the States in question—a proposal which my delegation supports—if those States were to give a strict undertaking here and now to renounce any spirit of belligerence, which would of course imply abandoning any aggressive attitude or threat, even verbal, to the security of the other party or parties.

26. Side by side with the situation in the Middle East, which seriously endangers the peace and stability of the world, there are other sources of disquiet confronting mankind. The case of Viet-Nam is most perturbing, and my delegation would like to see the parties to the conflict there show a more positive will to create the conditions for real peace. In this connexion, we are heartened by the statement made the day before yesterday by the new President of South Viet-Nam that he was proposing to seek a way to peace with North Viet-Nam. Since what the problem of Viet-Nam calls for is a political solution, we believe that bombings are not the best way of achieving it. A halt to the bombings would greatly benefit the search for a lasting peace.

27. The Government of the Rwandese Republic is particularly interested in the problem of disarmament, and we commend the efforts—slow but we hope sure—being made in that direction.

28. The Government of Rwanda especially welcomed the 1963 Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests, as being one of the main stages in the process of general and complete disarmament. My delegation would like to invite the great nuclear Powers to extend the Treaty to cover underground tests, which unfortunately are still being carried out. The Rwandese Republic was one of the first signatories of the Treaty of 27 January 1967 on the Exploration and Use of Outer Space and Celestial Bodies [resolution 2222 (XXI), annex], which is likewise a guarantee of peace and security to mankind on connexion with future developments in space science.

29. The Rwandese Republic welcomed the news of the agreement between the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States at the Conference of the

Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee on a draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.^{1/} However, my delegation regrets that far from providing an appropriate and final solution to the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the draft seems rather to crystallize the monopoly of what has been called the nuclear club. Our representative in the First Committee made clear a year ago [1450th meeting] the views of the Government of Rwanda on this question of vital importance to world peace and stability.

30. The problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should, in our view, be dealt with from two equally important angles. On the one hand, the nuclear Powers would undertake not to continue the production of nuclear weapons and not to propagate them; on the other hand, the non-nuclear Powers would undertake not to seek to produce or acquire such weapons. But we note that only the latter aspect is covered by the American-Soviet draft which the United Nations is being asked to endorse.

31. By a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons we mean a treaty establishing a procedure for the progressive elimination of existing stockpiles and regulating the purely peaceful uses of the atomic material thus freed, a treaty embodying the ways and means of controlling its implementation, and providing adequate guarantees of security to the non-nuclear Powers—in short, a treaty ensuring that neither the great nor the small Powers would be playing a losing game.

32. Nevertheless, the agreement reached between the Soviet Union and the United States is at this juncture most gratifying, for the Rwandese Republic considers that a treaty touching on either aspect of the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is of itself an important stage in the disarmament process, for each stage is individually important. But we would like to see the treaty regarded only as a partial treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons until such time as a new agreement is reached on the other aspect of the problem, the ban on the production of nuclear weapons. The door would thus be left open for further negotiations. My delegation at the same time trusts that the General Assembly, after endorsing the draft treaty we have called partial, will ask the eighteen States Members of the Disarmament Committee to continue their study of all aspects of the question.

33. The question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons must be considered as an integral part of disarmament. If, therefore, we are seeking disarmament of a genuinely general and complete kind, there must be prohibition of the manufacture and the propagation of atomic weapons. Last year in the First Committee we made the following statement:

"... in order to be effective, general disarmament will have to be carried out in stages, beginning with the progressive reduction of military budgets and, particularly, the budgets for the manufacture of atomic weapons."

"Furthermore, the treaty should contain certain elements which, in our view, are essential for the

^{1/} See documents ENDC/193 and ENDC/192.

very effectiveness of the treaty. They are, among others:

"1. The parties should designate or recognize an authority (a) that would be entrusted with the task of drawing up an inventory of existing armaments and weapons to be destroyed; (b) that would ensure control over the destruction of such weapons, and (c) that would be recognized as a depository for fissile materials derived from the destruction of nuclear weapons.

"2. That authority, whether it be the International Atomic Energy Agency or any other, should undertake not to receive orders or instructions from either of the parties separately or without a mandate from the other parties.

"3. A definition would be given of the fields to which the fissile materials would be assigned by the agency designated to use those fissile materials for peaceful purposes.

"4. The question of the compatibility of the provisions of that treaty with national security measures, which we believe will continue to be necessary, even after the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament since—man being what he is—it is better to take minimum security measures."^{2/}

34. Before leaving this subject I must express satisfaction on behalf of my delegation at the agreement concluded between the countries of Latin America on a treaty for the denuclearization of that region.^{3/} We are equally happy to recall that Africa has been declared a "nuclear-free zone" [see resolution 2033 (XX)]. We hope that other regions in the world will be inspired by these two examples.

35. The armaments race is not the only threat to world peace and security; the independence and the development of the new nations are likewise threatened by subversion, which takes a variety of forms.

36. The delegation of Rwanda has branded year after year the attitudes of certain countries which spread subversion and unrest in other countries through refugees. Here the Organization should remind countries which shelter refugees of their obligation not only to treat them with humanity, but also to keep them out of harm's way, and hence not to place at their disposal part of their territory or weapons with which they can be trained for subversion.

37. We welcome the efforts made by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to render assistance to refugees. He should spare no effort not only to relieve their wretchedness but also to promote the peaceful return to their countries of origin of those who wish to return. The High Commissioner should see to it that the aid he furnishes to refugees is not diverted from its proper ends and used to provide logistic support and supplies for subversive groups.

38. Another threat to the independence and security of Africa is the type of banditry and international

subversion which, if I may coin a word, I shall call "mercenaryism". The problem of mercenaries must be examined in our institutions with the proper attention due to all problems bearing on world peace.

39. Countries or organizations aiding and abetting the recruitment and training of mercenaries call for the strongest condemnation from this Assembly; but the Security Council too should consider the application of the sanctions designed for use against those who seriously endanger international peace and security.

40. The United Nations should urge Member States to promulgate laws or regulations prohibiting all recruitment of mercenaries within their territories and penalizing any alien or national participating in "mercenaryism".

41. The General Assembly should likewise take over the resolution adopted by the fourth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Kinshasa last September—a resolution concerning mercenaries which seems to us to embody the basic points needed to cope with the danger.

42. Turning to the problem of development, allow me for a moment to recall the position of the Government of the Rwandese Republic regarding the use of funds freed by disarmament:

"The world economy could advance infinitely more rapidly if the vast resources diverted from economic channels towards sterile armaments were returned into those channels in a useful and dynamic form. Such reintegration should be effected, not only within national economic channels but also within the international economic system.

"The reintegration of these resources into national economic systems can be achieved by giving military establishments, even when considerably reduced in size, a more important social and economic role. Armies can be transformed increasingly into schools for general and technical training. They can also be called upon to a greater extent for carrying out national infrastructure projects. In the case of the developing countries, it is particularly in their interest, once the requirements of maintaining order and public safety have been met, to entrust civil engineering tasks to their troops.

"The reintegration of armament expenses into the international economic system could help to give the latter the balance which it now sorely lacks. The Geneva Conference on Trade and Development has shown that the international market, considered from the standpoint of trade between the industrialized countries and the developing countries, constitutes a highly inorganic circuit. The system of trade, as well as the international system of economic and social assistance, must be completely overhauled. This reform must obviously be undertaken as a matter of urgency, independently of the slow negotiations towards disarmament. Disarmament, however, will provide timely means of assisting the rebirth for which the developing countries had been hoping for so long.

"...

^{2/} Statement made at the 1450th meeting of the First Committee, the official records of which are issued in summary form.

^{3/} Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, signed at Mexico City on 14 February 1967 (see A/6663).

"Two objections are generally raised to proposals for diverting a proportion of expenditure on armaments to assistance to the under-developed countries. The first objection is that any reduction of the armaments industries would result in the unemployment of many members of the national labour force. The second objection is that the financial aid which would be granted to the developing countries would endanger the balance of payments equilibrium. Those two objections may reasonably be raised in the present circumstances, but they can and must be overcome.

"The conversion of armaments industries to industries for the production of peaceful goods and the allocation of such goods as aid to the under-developed countries would provide a solution to each of the above-mentioned problems."^{4/}

43. Thus the enormous sums of money, material resources and human energy squandered today on armaments should be used for the salvation of the two thirds of mankind threatened by hunger, disease, slum conditions and illiteracy. We have always said here, and we repeat today:

"For the rich countries there can be no salvation or progress without risk and without the great struggle which the world must now wage against hunger, disease and poverty among the less favoured nations."^{5/}

44. We appeal to the great Powers to give more thought to the magnitude of their responsibility toward a world suffering from the threefold danger of perishing either by the sword, or from the aftermath of colonization, or from under-development.

45. My delegation notes with some concern that the development of the new nations is handicapped not only by the decline in world prices for primary commodities and the parallel rise in the prices of manufactured goods, but by the shortage of technically skilled personnel. Certain countries, and certain international organizations, seem to give preference to development aid for projects of a regional nature, and show little interest in projects of national character.

46. The Government of Rwanda recognizes that regional economic integration justifies this concern; nevertheless I believe that sound regional development presupposes national development, and hence to neglect the latter is the right way to impede and even to wreck the former. For this reason the Government of the Rwandese Republic considers that multilateral and bilateral aid are both necessary and complementary, and that national projects must not be pushed into the background in favour of regional projects; instead the resources and the attention given to each should be proportionate.

47. In any event, the organization of regional development calls for the modification of existing structures. For example, in the African countries, the communications network developed during the colonial era was designed to link the country's hinterland with the ocean, that is to say directly with the

metropolitan country, so as to facilitate the flow of manufactured goods into the colony while the raw materials were drained off from the colony to the metropolitan country. Thus the economy of the African territories was closely bound up with that of the administering Power, so that the former had no independent existence. Here we see the source of many of today's difficulties.

48. The developing countries in one and the same region should today work together on their economic and social development with a view to specializing in this or that sector of industry. Thus regional co-operation machinery is indispensable for organizing production and creating markets of viable dimensions. Rwanda is prepared, for example, to co-operate in the development of the middle-African region, the region of the Great Lakes; and any aid for regional development in this area will be welcome.

49. Decided efforts have been made to improve the economic and social standards of living in the developing countries. But there is still a great deal to be done to cope with poverty, hunger, illiteracy, the population explosion and under-equipment.

50. We are hoping for a great deal from the conference at present being held at Algiers,^{6/} and from the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to be held during the first quarter of next year at New Delhi.

51. The development of the new nations is greatly handicapped by the lack of technically skilled personnel. In this connexion my delegation would like to suggest that the appropriate services within the United Nations should consider the possibility of setting up an international technical assistance fund to enable all developing countries to engage technicians, the fund guaranteeing their salaries on the basis of their qualifications and experience.

52. Such a fund would obviate the developing countries' difficulties in finding sufficient technicians for want of adequate resources to guarantee their salaries; but it would also help to reduce certain risks inherent in the actual system of technical assistance, as for example the risk that in the countries where they are working technicians may play the political game of the countries or organizations supplying them.

53. In this connexion I should like to cite a passage from the Encyclical Populorum Progressio of Pope Paul VI. Speaking of technical assistance to countries in need, Pope Paul said:

"We are happy that experts are being sent in larger and larger numbers on development missions by institutions, whether international or bilateral or by private organizations: 'They ought not to conduct themselves in a lordly fashion, but as helpers and co-workers.'

"A people quickly perceives if those who come to help them do so with or without affection, whether they come merely to apply their techniques or recognize in man his full value.

^{4/} See document C/4042, mimeographed part (Replies of Governments).

^{5/} ibid.

^{6/} Ministerial Meeting of the Group of Seventy-Seven, held from 10 to 25 October 1967.

"Their message is in danger of being rejected if it is not presented in the context of brotherly love."^{7/}

54. While on the subject of the economic development of the new nations, I cannot end my statement without paying a public tribute from this rostrum to the various United Nations bodies, and to the Member States and Observer States, which have contributed or are still contributing to the economic and social development of my country, whether directly on a bilateral basis or indirectly through their participation in the development programmes of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

55. The Government of the Rwandese Republic attaches paramount importance to international co-operation, being convinced that it is only in this way that the world will attain stability and peace.

56. Mr. KHANDJI (Syrian Arab Republic):^{8/} The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to associate itself with all the delegations which have preceded us to this rostrum in addressing to the President our heartfelt congratulations on his unanimous election to the Presidency of the General Assembly at its twenty-second session at a crucial time in the life of the world Organization. Our congratulations and thanks go equally to the outgoing President, Ambassador Pazhwak of Afghanistan, for having presided so ably over the deliberations of the previous session, as well as the special sessions of this Assembly.

57. This session is different from previous ones in two respects: first, in that the Middle East witnessed during the month of June a savage aggressive war, in which the most modern arms were ruthlessly used against our people, killing and driving out hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians, destroying their towns and villages, looting their property, and occupying vast areas of three Members of the United Nations Organization; secondly, in that Syria, like the other Arab victims of this aggression, has resorted to the world Organization, requesting the application of its Charter, in letter and spirit, to solve the present crisis by condemning aggression and by liquidating its consequences.

58. Unhappily, we have found ourselves on the international level, as we found ourselves in the battle, victims of a premeditated plan, devised and executed by Israel and the imperialist Powers which supported it before, during and after its aggression. That is why we are impelled now to concentrate our greatest attention on this tragic and explosive situation. For the crisis of the Middle East, and the subsequent inability of the United Nations to act fully to liquidate the results of aggression, reflect the weakness of the existing international order. Consequently, unless the forces striving for the good and peace of mankind are united, and unless the peoples of the Third World, threatened as we are threatened, combine their efforts to stop this deterioration we shall find ourselves ruled by the law of the jungle, to which the Secretary-General has referred in the introduction to his annual report [A/6701/Add.1].

^{7/} On the Development of Peoples, Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Paul VI (Vatican Polyglot Press, 1967), p. 48.

^{8/} Mr. Khandji spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

59. What do the peoples of the world expect from this Organization? They ask for no more than the full implementation of the Charter to enable them to defend themselves against the onslaught of imperialism, old and new, direct and indirect. Be it an open attack, as is the case now in Viet-Nam, or an onslaught through an instrument of imperialism and colonialism, as is the case of Israel, the obligation of the United Nations remains the same: that is, to undertake the defence of the victim and to uphold the rule of law.

60. We have heard the overwhelming majority of speakers denounce from this rostrum the Israeli military occupation of Arab territories and the attempt to impose solutions by force. We also heard pleas for peaceful solutions to the crisis of the Middle East. But what is beyond contestation is the fact that the search for peaceful solutions is incumbent upon the international community, not upon the occupied countries, victims of aggression. In fact, the problem we are dealing with goes beyond the area and involves the whole of the international community. When the Arab nation resists aggression and occupation, it exercises its elementary and legitimate rights to safeguard its freedom and dignity. The Arabs are victims of the combined forces of world Zionism and imperialism, and they are justified in refusing to submit to any pressure ultimately aiming at the alienation of their fundamental rights.

61. The battle of the Arab people against neo-colonialism is the battle of the Third World. Should our front lines of resistance crumble, it would deal a deadly blow to all national liberation movements, and would necessarily lead to the encirclement and destruction of the progressive forces of the world.

62. The Assembly has heard appeals for peace from Israel speakers. The greatest affront that could be made to the very dignity of this Organization would be to give any credence to Israel's false show of peaceful intentions. For how can Israel speak of peace, stability and progress in the Near East when its very existence has been based from the outset on violence and expansion, culminating in the aggressive war of 5 June and the occupation of vast areas belonging to three Member States of the United Nations, three times larger than the area it already occupied before 5 June? How can these expansionist and racist policies of Israel differ from nazism in Europe—Europe, which saw the armies of Hitler occupy areas far exceeding the area of Germany? At that time, also, attempts were made to impose conditions on the victims, but were fiercely opposed and rejected. Would the case of the Arab people be any different?

63. The legend which the powerful Zionist propaganda machine has created is that Israel is a tiny area in which a persecuted people has found refuge. Yet the shocking series of events of the last twenty years have exploded this artificial myth. The Arab countries have fallen victims to an unlimited number of military operations across the demarcation lines and three all-out wars waged by Israel forces. To use the words of the Secretary-General in his report, "that is more than enough war in any one area" [A/6701/Add.1, para. 42]. Despite this bloody record, Israel finds it fitting to advocate peace from this rostrum.

64. As long as this fundamental injustice persists, there can be no durable peace in the Middle East. Pursuing its defiant and aggressive policy, Israel, through its Foreign Minister, is now asking the United Nations to desist from discharging its responsibilities in this problem. It is indeed ironical that Israel should come now and ask the United Nations to play no role whatsoever in the solution of this problem. No doubt, the United Nations responsibility is organically linked to the Palestine question, and any attempt to bypass the United Nations is a flagrant manoeuvre which would weaken the authority of our Organization. Reason and justice, therefore, impose upon every statesman looking for a solution the task of investigating the roots of the problem. Thus the first principle to be maintained is the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination, a right which can never be the object of bargaining. This simple truth has been recognized by all fair-minded people, and the Secretary-General is no exception when he states in his report that:

"people everywhere, and this certainly applies to the Palestinian refugees, have a natural right to be in their homeland and to have a future" [*ibid.*, para. 49].

65. As for Israel's demand to have direct negotiations with the Arab Governments, it is nothing but an Israel manoeuvre purporting to achieve a dual objective: first, to prevent the people of Palestine, the main party to the issue, from being heard; second, to ignore the United Nations. In so doing, Israel attempts to obliterate scores of United Nations resolutions calling on it to permit the Palestinians to go back to their homeland.

66. As for the fate of the new refugees, our Assembly has received the report^{2/} of the Secretary-General's personal Representative regarding the plight of these innocent victims of Israel's recent aggression, who have been refused the legitimate right to return to their homes.

67. In this connexion, we would like to quote only two statements. On 16 June Mr. Abba Eban stated that "even if the United Nations votes by 121 votes to one, we will not withdraw from the territory we have occupied" and as recently as 2 October General Dayan is quoted in the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin, which stated:

"In an interview with the Army weekly, Bama-chaneh, published today, General Dayan spoke enthusiastically of the cease-fire lines, as 'ideal' and expressed doubts that anyone could establish 'more ideal borders than the present ones'. He pointed out that, 'after all, crossing the Suez Canal means that we are in the outskirts of Cairo; crossing the Jordan, we are near Amman, and just proceeding somewhat north of Kuneitra, we shall find ourselves in Damascus.'"

68. These two statements, among others, clearly indicate that Israel is practising belligerency in deeds and advocating belligerency as its official policy. Contrary to all norms of international law, Israel is exploiting its conquest and military occupa-

tion of Arab territories to impose its own terms and conditions.

69. Here a basic question arises. Should the withdrawal of occupying armies be made subject to any condition? If we accept this principle, are we not implicitly and explicitly recognizing the right of conquest and the deriving of benefits from it? In other words, should the conqueror be permitted to benefit from the fruits of his conquest? My reply to this question is two-fold: first, the objective judgement rendered by international law and practice, and, second, the facts concerning the Middle East crisis.

70. For, as is well known, one of the fundamentals of contemporary international law, at the stage in which we are engaged now, denies to the aggressor any right to benefit from his aggression or to impose any condition resultant therefrom. To mention one instance only out of many I cite the following, as an illustration of the concrete implementation of this fundamental principle, from the declaration, contained in the Final Act of the Conference, on Non-Recognition of the Acquisition of Territory by Force, approved on 22 December 1938 at the Eighth International Conference of American States at Lima:

"That it reiterates, as a fundamental principle of the Public Law of America, that the occupation or acquisition of territory or any other modification or territorial or boundary arrangement obtained through conquest by force or by non-pacific means shall not be valid or have legal effect."^{10/}

71. I come now to the second aspect of the state of belligerency as it applies to the Palestine question. I maintain that a basic distinction ought to be drawn sharply between belligerency as a legal stand subject to international judgement, which could be invoked as a right of self-defence, and acts of belligerency and war such as Israel committed in 1967, and before that, in 1956 and in 1947-1948. Let us recall here that Zionism is in itself an aggression and declaration of war, because it has justified to itself, on a false ideological basis, the right to occupy another people's land and to drive that people completely out of its territory.

72. Furthermore, the war which Israel started on 5 June is not an isolated incident. It is but an implementation of the Zionist scheme to occupy by force of arms what Israel and Zionist leaders consider to be Eretz Israel. Here I shall let the Israel leaders confess their own guilt.

73. During the Zionist conference held in Jerusalem in January 1967, the Jerusalem Post, in its issue of 12 January, reported the following:

"Mr. Sh. Z. Shragai, head of the Immigration Department, told the Zionist leaders yesterday morning that 'the great tragedy of our generation and of Zionism is that, despite the fact that part of the Land of Israel has been returned to the Jewish people as a sovereign State, we have not yet succeeded in bringing the people back to the State'."

Notice, Mr. President, the word "part".

^{2/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1967, document S/8146.

^{10/} The International Conferences of American States, First Supplement 1933-1940 (Washington, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1940), p. 255.

74. In an interview to the Israel paper Haboker on 1 March 1964, Ben Gurion said: "The boundaries of the Jewish State would have been larger had Moshe Dayan been our Commander-in-Chief in 1948." In answer to this statement, Yigal Allon, who was the Commander-in-Chief in 1948, said:

"Had Ben Gurion not ordered a cease-fire, then our troops would have occupied the Litani River in the north (Lebanon) and the Sinai Desert in the south (Egypt) and also liberated the whole of our homeland."

75. So, if there is any doubt in the minds of some members of the international community that we are witnessing the execution of the historic expansionist plans of Zionism, this must be enough to convince everyone concerned as to which is the real belligerent party. The Arabs have done nothing but exercise their right of self-defence, in order to defend their homeland against aggression and occupation.

76. We have so far reviewed the situation obtaining in the Middle East as a result of Israel's aggression and its occupation of Arab territory. We have also demonstrated that Israel's attempt to bypass the United Nations is nothing but a manoeuvre to delay its withdrawal from the occupied areas. In addition, the Assembly has witnessed an almost unanimous disapproval of Israel's conduct and the theory it is trying to build regarding the so-called rights which an aggressor can derive from military occupation.

77. Now, what is our Organization to do? We believe that when the Member States aim seriously at the restoration of peace in our area, they achieve this when they implement the spirit and letter of the Charter and refuse to be carried away by pressure. This Organization could and should play its constructive role in condemning aggression and calling on the aggressors unconditionally to withdraw from occupied territories to their positions prior to the aggression. Consequently, we call on all Member States, and especially the smaller countries, to join hands to resist aggression and to strive to restore peace built on justice and the rule of law.

78. This is the only valid response to the challenge our Organization is facing. If it discharged its responsibility, the peoples of the world would be able to continue trusting the United Nations. If, on the other hand, our Organization failed to uphold the Charter in the face of aggression and conquest, as it has so far, then those States that were mainly responsible for this failure, and especially the Government of the United States, would have shattered the only hope our present international community holds for a society ruled by law. The tragic consequences would be a repetition of the primitive way of life where the weak had to yield to the will and whims of the strong. Let international public opinion then decide which are those States which would bring that calamity on the human race.

79. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, speaking from the rostrum of this august body of the United Nations, that was created mainly for the purpose of saving the world from the scourge of war and assuring respect for the right of peoples to self-

determination, appeals to the universal conscience to consecrate the following principles:

(1) Rejection of policies of provocation and faits accomplis. This is a requirement of the very principles of right, justice and international law;

(2) Implementation of the almost unanimous will of the delegations here as to the rejection of the occupation and annexation of territory by force and aggression;

(3) Necessity of solidarity among all peace-loving forces in the world;

(4) Consecration of these principles as a prerequisite to a firm stand against imperialist ambitions and conspiracies aiming at obstructing the liberation movements, and the friends of progress and independence in the world, and

(5) Responsibility of the international Organization in condemning aggression and eliminating its consequences, so as to safeguard the trust of peoples in the Organization.

80. Let us now turn to another drama in this bloody struggle opposing two sides: on the one hand, peoples eager to build their life in freedom and dignity, and on the other colonial oppression based on material superiority. This is what is taking place in Viet-Nam.

81. The heroic struggle of the Viet-Nameese people against the most devilish instrument of destruction and devastation ever known in the history of mankind is a source of pride not only to the heroic people of Viet-Nam, small in number, but to all struggling peoples. Indeed, they draw from this epic struggle a stronger determination to stand up to forces far superior to themselves.

82. We wish to join all other delegations which called on the Government of the United States of America to stop the operations of extermination which it is carrying on against the people of Viet-Nam. The Government of the United States, in persisting in its present policy, is defying international public opinion and putting itself in complete isolation. In addition, it is facing an ever-increasing opposition on the part of the American masses.

83. This obstinate attitude of the United States Government, in imposing its will by iron and fire on this struggling Asiatic people, is paralleled only by the blind obstinacy of the same Government in attempting to ignore the existence of the great people of China in the international community. My delegation has again joined with others in requesting the inscription of this item in the agenda of the twenty-second session. We hope that reason will prevail at last and that the great people of China will recover its legitimate right to exercise its natural role in this Organization. Indeed, our Organization will never be able to achieve any tangible and lasting progress in the solution of world problems such as peace, security and disarmament unless this great Power, representing one fourth of mankind, is integrated within the international community.

84. Finally, we wish to seize the opportunity of this session to express to the people and Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the best wishes

of the Syrian Arab Republic on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the glorious October Revolution. That revolution marked indeed the beginning of an evolution in the history of mankind which is among the cardinal events in the annals of its contemporary history. The great energies of the peoples of the Soviet Socialist Republics have exploded, and new limitless horizons have opened for contributing to a reconstruction in the political, social economic and cultural fields. Thus the path of developing peoples has been illuminated in their struggle for a better and more dignified life—for their own benefit and, indeed, for the benefit of all mankind.

85. Prince SOUVANNA PHOUMA (Laos) (translated from French): I should like to add my delegation's sincere congratulations to those already offered to the President on his election to preside over this twenty-second session of the General Assembly. We are particularly happy that this annual session has as its President, for the first time, an eminent figure from a socialist country. We would like to feel that this election is a sign, and even more, an augury, of harmonious understanding and closer co-operation between countries with different political systems.

86. For some years the Organization has been much criticized, and harshly criticized, because of certain amenities which in our opinion are in fact distributed satisfactorily. The presence of Mr. Manescu in this high office may lessen the effects of this to some extent—at any rate we sincerely hope so—since this session is likely to be dominated, more than any other, by the fundamental problem of war and peace.

87. I must also take this opportunity to pay a tribute to Mr. Pazhwak for his valiant efforts and for the skill with which he presided over the most recent sessions of the General Assembly; for this he deserves our thanks and our gratitude.

88. The past year has been marked by outbreaks of violence and hatred everywhere in the world. The escalation of war is paralleled by an escalation of hate, resentment and distress. Violence, as Secretary-General U Thant pointed out in his annual report [A/6701/Add.1] is no longer the exception but the rule. Millions of human beings are worried about their future. The sacred principles of the United Nations Charter are abused and flouted to the point where the Organization, as it enters upon its twenty-second year of existence, has become a weak vessel surrounded by malevolent forces. Pollution, disorder and violence have thus for three years poisoned the international atmosphere and hampered any inclination to act and to seek compromise solutions for the many complex problems troubling the conscience of the world.

89. Distinguished representatives speaking before me at this rostrum have expressed their apprehension and disquiet in the face of the increasing danger. A war which should never have broken out has just recently played havoc in the Middle East, causing profound dismay for several days throughout the world. My delegation had occasion to express its views on this grave episode during the emergency special session. It returns to the subject today, not with any intention of laying the blame and responsibility on any particular State, but to ask the Powers concerned not to retreat

into a verbal and legal jungle but to silence the hymns of hate, so that the area which in twenty years has seen hostilities three times may at long last enjoy peace. For experience has shown that if grievances are stifled or approached from the wrong angle or patched up by temporary expedients, they will frequently break out at the slightest tilt in the balance of forces caused by the whims of some and the stubbornness of others. In our opinion, this burning issue, pregnant with the seeds of lust for power and racial fanaticism, which United Nations bodies have had before them for twenty years, must necessarily find a solution within the Organization and not outside it.

90. The United Nations, a stronghold for the small States and a factor tending to consolidate their interests, must guarantee the territorial integrity of all States and more especially all Members States, and not tolerate the occupation of the territory of one State by the military forces of another. We feel that the right of every State to exist should be recognized by all, that every State must be able to live in complete security within its frontiers without interference of any kind. Otherwise, the law of the jungle would prevail.

91. Recurrent quarrels are dangerous; we are nevertheless convinced that peoples born in the self-same land, nurtured in the self-same cradle, whence the noblest of all messages of peace and love have come, can reach understanding within the framework of the principles embodied in the Charter. Settlement of disputes by force, and military conquest, are poisoned dead sea fruit. In an age when the indivisibility of peace is evident, only dialogue and political negotiation can lead to fruitful understanding and co-operation. Otherwise international morality, which U Thant has spoken of so often, would be only a publicity slogan.

92. The problem of war or peace concerns us all, whatever we are, great nations or small, since we are destined to live together on this now shrunken planet. The United Nations, which has to its credit so many peaceful settlements, so much progress, achieved in the course of its twenty-two years of experience, must adapt itself to the complex realities of today if it is not to disappoint the hopes of millions of men for long acting as if in obedience to conditioned reflexes. Its work will be what we wish it to be; either it will flounder in the mud of the sterile past, or it will prove that it is still a useful tool at the service of mankind. In this connexion my delegation is pleased to see that the United States and the Soviet Union have produced a joint draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This event, the outcome of years of patient effort, is a miracle of achievement and understanding.

93. My delegation is not given to undue pessimism, but we are also not afraid to look things in the face, however disagreeable they may be. If there has been war in the Middle East, it is a warning. If Laos has not known peace for twenty years, in spite of solemn treaties and international guarantees, that is another warning. If the disastrous war in Viet-Nam goes on, that is a third warning—of something which I fear could lead us all into a catastrophe of world proportions.

94. My delegation has no inclination today, any more than at previous sessions, to lecture anyone. But it

must be recognized that we have some cause for complaint and bitterness, when for more than twenty years we have been the victims of subversion, violation and armed aggression. For years we have seen treaties concluded with us violated, agreements trampled underfoot, our neutrality challenged, our soil invaded. For years, in the name of a so-called national war of liberation, a neighbouring State, in its revolutionary and ideological zeal, has been sending troops into the Kingdom of Laos to back a many-sided rebellion, sometimes doffing the mask, sometimes in disguise, but always like a robot activated from abroad. It is again through this "revolutionary doctrine", which actually hides a will to expand and to dominate, that our people is torn by prolonged strife, our country atrociously mutilated and our national conscience disturbed. The war in Laos is forgotten by the world's Press, but its ravages nevertheless go on in my country, creating unrest, causing more and more bereavement, bleeding the economy white. As I speak here, skirmishing, ambush, battles, are going on in the north of my country and all along the famous Ho Chi Minh road, over which from north to south move the convoys of men and war material, and all this panoply bears the escutcheon of death.

95. The Laotian people, for years the victims of a war imposed from outside, longs fervently, not for an uneasy peace, a peace between two cease-fires, but a real peace. More than anything else, the Laotian people wish to break out of the circle of stagnation in which for years they have been forced to live. They have no desire to pay the price of other people's quarrels with the blood of their own sons, even in the name of an ideological crusade. The neutral people of Laos only want to solve their own problems, which some people insist on linking with those of Viet-Nam; for their fate was settled as far back as the Geneva Agreements of 1962.^{11/} As I have stated more than once here and elsewhere, Laos, whose spokesman I am, is always ready to engage in talks with its errant compatriots, whatever their political labels, with a view to reaching a modus vivendi through which peace in national reconciliation and concord can gradually be rebuilt. The Royal Government over which I have the honour to preside is ready to seek with its neighbours, especially with North Viet-Nam, ways and means of safeguarding and maintaining the neutrality status patiently worked out, recognized and guaranteed by thirteen Powers. If this will exists on the other side, the Laotian question will be settled without any change of instrument; if the will is lacking, then the question will remain unsettled however perfect the instrument.

96. As with the Laotian problem, the road to peace in Viet-Nam must necessarily pass by way of the negotiating table. This conflict, the aftermath of the war in Indo-China and the Geneva Agreements compromise of 1954, must find a solution within the framework of those agreements, which as the parties involved in the war have themselves stated on various occasions, could provide a sound basis for negotiations. Collective common sense calls for a political and not a military solution. A military victory would be a pyrrhic victory, since it would bring us an unreal peace. It is

^{11/} Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos and Protocol, signed at Geneva on 23 July 1962.

inconceivable because it would destroy the principles of peaceful coexistence and the balance of forces in South East Asia. The interests of peace demand that the broken links be mended and the bridges of reconciliation built so as to create the climate of confidence needed for political negotiations. Deafness here, obstinacy there, merely prolong needlessly the unspeakable sufferings and ordeals undergone by the Viet-Nameese people generally for more than two decades. They merely feed the propaganda of those who advocate all-out war. Hence prior conditions and false pretexts are obstacles to initiative and prevent the cooling of passions.

97. For all the outbursts of passion, for all the clash of arms and the bitterness of the fighting, my delegation is convinced that the statesmen, on whom the fate of the world hangs will not sign their own death warrant by acts of folly and despair. History has too often left a trail of blood behind it. The time has come to tackle the major problems of hunger, disease, ignorance and under-development. It is high time to turn our full attention to the distressing and tragic episode of Rhodesia, and apartheid, and to destroy the last strongholds of backward-looking colonialism in Angola and Mozambique.

98. It is the duty of all of us, great and small, rich and poor, to treat the peoples who have endured such suffering, lived through such hope and such despair, to something else besides words. It is by acting in this fashion that "We, the peoples of the United Nations", will be able "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", and remain true to the oath that those who wrote the Charter proclaimed at San Francisco.

99. Mr. HASLUCK (Australia): I should like first to congratulate the President on his election. This was a tribute to his personal qualities and to the country and the people whom he represents. As I speak late in this debate, I can add to my congratulations a tribute to the President for the distinction of the leadership which he is giving to us in our deliberations. I should like also to voice our appreciation of the work of the outgoing President, Ambassador Pazhwak of Afghanistan, who presided over so many long and difficult sessions.

100. My second duty is to express the continued adherence of the Australian Government to the United Nations Charter, and its intention to do all it can to uphold its principles.

101. I should like to say a cautionary word about the work of the Assembly. Looking back over the past two decades, I observe a tendency to substitute the political views of a majority of Members for any attempt to interpret clearly and to apply uniformly the terms of the Charter. I ask: is this good for the Organization, for its Members or for international relations in general? I also question whether it can be effective. The General Assembly has power under the Charter to make recommendations, but it has never had the power to bind the membership by a majority vote. As the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs said in 1962,^{12/} a resolution of the General Assembly can-

^{12/} See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 8, para. 105.

not be made binding as such upon Member States merely by the device of terming it a "declaration" rather than a "recommendation". The General Assembly may indeed entertain an expectation that Members of the United Nations will attempt to abide by a resolution generally supported by a large majority. But this is still in the sphere of expectation rather than of legal duty.

102. May I also comment briefly on the pretension that international law can be made by resolution of the General Assembly. In recent years the General Assembly has adopted, in performance of its duty under Article 13 of the Charter, a procedure directed towards eventual additions to the body of general or customary international law. I refer here to the establishment of the Special Committee on the Principles of International Law, whose task it has been to study and prepare texts for consideration by the General Assembly as a declaration formulating and elaborating seven Charter principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States.

103. Customary international law consists of that body of rules which have been accepted generally by States as legally binding on them. A rule does not qualify under this heading unless, first, it can be shown to have been accepted generally by the international community and, second, that it has been accepted by members of the international community as law.

104. It is always open to representatives in the General Assembly to make clear, in voting on any resolution, how far these two conditions are fulfilled. The mere adoption of a resolution by the General Assembly will not give its terms the character of law. There have been instances in recent years in which the General Assembly, after considering items of a predominantly political character, has adopted resolutions in terms that could be regarded as interpreting, or making explicit, what would otherwise be only implicit in certain provisions of the Charter. It seems to us to be especially necessary, in such instances, that States should make clear not only whether they accept the provisions of the draft resolution but also whether or not they accept them as law.

105. The Australian Government is even more deeply concerned by the erosion of the principle of respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of States. Throughout the world since the war we have seen the emergence of new States and the re-establishment of old States. We have seen nations in all continents striving to achieve their national identity in accordance with their history and their interest and to establish relationships with one another and to cooperate for mutual advantage. They can only do this successfully in a world in which each and all of us respect the established principles of international relationships. Unfortunately, in our view, this respect has not always been given and some of these new States have been harassed by conflicts which were the result, not of their own internal and domestic stress, but of external pressures and interferences. Subversion, infiltration, foreign intervention to exploit local differences and sometimes even direct attack have added to their insecurity.

106. It is against this background that I want to speak of the current conflict in South-East Asia and particularly the aggression against the Republic of Viet-Nam and its resistance to that aggression. I should declare plainly at the outset that Australia speaks as a nation which has made its own decision to support South Viet-Nam, is contributing both troops and civilian aid for that purpose, and is firm in its decision to do so. We have chosen to take a side, but we are certainly no less willing or less capable of joining in a debate about the morality or the purposes of the war than are those who have not chosen to take any side or than those who have chosen to favour some other side. We are no less honourable than those who have made no decision at all. Indeed, we may be better equipped to talk because, as well as having applied a moral test to our own actions, we have a closer and more intimate knowledge of situations and events than those who have no first-hand experience of the war and of the countries affected by it.

107. As well as knowing the war at first-hand, Australia perhaps may also have an advantage in having associations with the Western as well as the Eastern Hemisphere. Australia is linked by history with Europe; by geography with Asia. We have been privileged, and we esteem the privilege highly, to have been accepted by Asian countries as a regional member of organizations in Asia and the Pacific and we work together with our neighbours in many efforts to advance the welfare of all our peoples. In trade, diplomacy and mutual security our co-operation with Asian countries grows year by year. So I believe we can speak with knowledge and some understanding as a result of consultation in depth with them. They are our neighbours.

108. What of Europe? Europe colonized our continent. Over the years Europe taught us. We remember the lessons we learnt—respect for political independence; respect for treaty obligations; respect for territorial integrity. We remember the ideas that Europe taught us, such as that peace is indivisible, aggression has to be resisted or it will grow, the rights of small nations should be respected no less than those of the great; self-determination; the need for mutual security. Indeed in two world wars that started in Europe, Australia sent men across the world to fight and die in Europe for what Europe had taught us was right.

109. But are these truths to apply only to selected regions of the world and to old, established nations? Were we right to stand up for them in Europe but wrong to stand up for them in Asia? Are they not also to be upheld among these newly independent peoples which Europe once ruled as colonies but which have now reasserted their ancient identity and who are now seeking to choose their own life and to establish it in their own territory? Does it cease to be the business of all of us when aggression takes place and freedom of choice is destroyed by force in the lands where the hope of independence is newly risen? Are force, subversion, terror and direct assaults on liberty recognizable only when they threaten a community that has settled down to the stability of a long-protected security, but unable to be seen when they disturb a struggling people which is still beset by fear? Were we right, we Australians, when we

answered a threat in Europe, but wrong when, once again, in the face of a similar threat in Asia, we respond to the call of a neighbour, and face that issue of the overthrow of independence by force in disregard of the will of peoples? Even in the early post-war years it was seemingly good for small countries in one continent to enjoy a guaranteed security with the aid of a Great Power, but somehow it seems to be regarded differently when the same strength is invoked to bring a hope of security to small nations on the other side of the globe.

110. I also ask whether some of us may be forgetting the realities of the world in which we live. Unfortunately, this is still a world in which peace is kept and security is maintained by military power. We in the Asian region, at least, know that the precarious balance of power has recently been disturbed by the centralizing of authority and the growth of strength in mainland China, and we know that countries on the fringe of China from Korea to India have felt the direct effects of Peking's aggressive policies. Are such realities of power as these to be recognized only in one hemisphere and not in another? And are arguments that peace and security are global to be true in European or Atlantic power situations but not true when crises of power arise, as they have arisen, in Asia and the Pacific?

111. Surely we are using double standards and surely we are falsifying the issues if, recognizing the realities of power today, we find it improper or worse for one small nation to be protected by a great ally but unexceptionable for some other small nation to be protected by its ally. Some critics have become vituperative about the United States of America for helping South Viet-Nam to defend itself. Again there is surely a double standard and a disregard of reality if we find it villainous for one Power to carry out its policies and discharge its responsibilities as a great Power but commendable for another one to do so.

112. I would not suggest for a moment that any of us can or should rejoice that the world of power should be as it is, but I submit that we are victims of illusions or of prejudice if we make pronouncements and utter condemnations in disregard of the facts of power and the operations of power politics which the Charter itself recognises as being the condition of the world with which we have to grapple.

113. I say, therefore: let us talk like politicians and diplomats with a job to do, and not like sensation-mongers or propagandists. Let us at least allow patriotism to all of those who are defending what they love and who, because they love it, are dying for it.

114. What is at issue in Viet-Nam? First let me say that as the result of the debate throughout the world, and particularly inside those free and democratic countries which are supporting South Viet-Nam, that question of what is at issue has been kept alive in this struggle in a way that seldom happens in wartime once a conflict begins. For the most part, the debate so far has not reduced itself to the question of winning or losing the fight. It still concerns itself with the question, "What is the fight about?"

115. May I suggest respectfully, however, that the vital question, "What is at issue?" is not the same

question as the one, "What caused the war?". We could go back for many years in time and discuss many different conditions, events and influences which have a bearing on the present situation, and it is true that we will not understand the nature of the conflict, nor will we have a hope of eventually achieving a just and lasting peace, unless we study the causes in that sense. But, surely, the immediate and relevant question arose with the outbreak of hostilities. There was a fire, and the question whether the fire should be fought or whether it should be allowed to take its course without any arm being raised to check its on-rush became the new issue.

116. In some countries—and in my country it is a minority—the debaters take this question of what is at issue and mix it up with the question, "What has this got to do with us? Should we be in it at all?"

117. I think the pragmatic political test on both these questions—"What is the issue? Should we be mixed up in it?"—is the Churchillian one. When Churchill was asked whether Britain should go on fighting after the fall of France in 1940, Churchill answered: "What would happen if we did not?". And his decision to keep on fighting was fateful for many nations represented here today. Apply that question to Viet-Nam. What would happen is clear. The separate existence of South Viet-Nam, temporary though it may be, would end on terms not negotiated freely but imposed by North Viet-Nam. The Government of Hanoi would become the government of the whole of Viet-Nam. The 14 million people of South Viet-Nam would be brought under Communist rule by force, without any chance to exercise their own choice. I say nothing of the suppressive measures that might follow, although the history of the Hanoi régime immediately after the division at the 17th parallel was one of giving very short shrift to those who did not fall into line and of allowing no representative institutions; and since then the methods it has encouraged, supported and directed in the South through its instrument, the Viet Cong, have been the methods of assassination and terror.

118. Should the people of South Viet-Nam have the freedom to choose their own form of government and their own way of life? Should solutions to international differences be imposed by force? Should argument concerning the future of a country and a people cease as soon as one side to the debate abandons the way of negotiation and peaceful settlement and tries to impose its view by unilateral use of force, both hidden and open? Should a small nation yield without resistance when its independence is threatened by force, knowing that it cannot rely on the help of anyone? Now, those are not small and local issues. They are issues that concern every small country that values its own freedom and wishes to maintain its own freedom, in any continent and at any time.

119. Those are the issues which Australia, as a small nation itself, considers important. Surely those who come from distant places and enjoy a sheltered peace can see that. Those nations which live alongside the victims of aggression see the issue more starkly, for what is already happening to one neighbour may happen to others.

120. Australia had no part in the earlier events. We hoped that the Geneva Agreements would lead, with the good offices of all Powers that could play a helpful role, to a new course ending in political stability, security, and perhaps eventually the reunification of Viet-Nam in circumstances that would allow the advancement of the economic and social welfare and the true political independence and liberty of its peoples. We started in 1952 to give the civilian aid which we have been providing, and we have continued to give that civilian aid. It was only when North Viet-Nam created the National Front for Liberation, when it promoted guerrilla war and terror, and when it sent the regular divisions of its own army into the South and organized infiltration and supplies to support the measures designed to master the South by force, that we found a new situation in which the use of force required a response by force to stop it. It was then that Australia answered the request of the Government of South Viet-Nam for support in its defence and gave military aid. We are still giving that military aid, and while that situation remains, our support stands. We do not think our men have died in South Viet-Nam for nothing. We do not think they have died only for us, but for something greater than any single nation.

121. What is happening in Viet-Nam is also of concern to other countries because of its relationship to major questions of world politics. We should all realize that what is happening in Viet-Nam is only part of a condition of international relationships that exists throughout the world. Whether the conflict there ends in one way or in another way, the major difficulties and the major contests will remain both in that region and throughout the world. The ending of hostilities in Viet-Nam will not in itself bring any termination to the greater conflicts, or remove any of the greater dangers that beset the whole of mankind in this nuclear age. But the way in which they end will have immediate consequences for all the nations of the Asian regions, either to brighten their hopes or increase their fears, and sooner or later the way in which hostilities end will make it easier or harder to find any solution to the major problems of peace and security and great-Power relationships throughout the world.

122. In this Assembly debate many references have been made to the bombing north of the demilitarized zone. Few, if any, references have been made to the constant movement of regular units of the North Viet-Nameese Army into the territory of South Viet-Nam. The war has been carried into the South and, to interdict this movement and to increase the difficulty of maintaining it, air strikes are being made at selected targets in the North. By its own restraint, the United States of America has already withheld from full use of the power it has. Some critics appear to think that it is not enough for the United States to tie one arm behind its back; they think it should fight with one arm and kneeling, against an unrestrained enemy.

123. More of the speakers in this debate, however, appear to have made the point that bombing should be stopped in order to bring about some form of negotiation. Saying so, they have admitted that bombing itself is not an issue. This is not a war about bombing.

In urging a cessation of bombing, they have recognized bombing as a military activity that, they say, might be handled in such a way as to give to the North an inducement to talk. Presumably, it is not the only possible inducement. If stopping the bombing should not in fact result in talks between the parties, will it then be advocated that some other inducement be offered—say, the withdrawal of some other form of warfare—and if that is not sufficient, will the stripping act continue to the point of total exposure until the opponent is lured away from his devotion to the use of force and is attracted to the method of peaceful settlement? But at that moment the defenders would then stand naked and their enemy might still not have started to talk.

124. Surely those who say that the bombing should cease in order to bring about talks ought to be able to give some convincing proof that the cessation of the bombing will in fact lead at once to the beginning of a process of peaceful settlement. It is true that in this debate some have voiced their own hopes, some have made reports about what they have heard; but none has spoken in this debate with certainty, and none can so speak on such matters. The one place where convincing proof can be given is Hanoi. The one authority that can say with certainty what would happen when the bombing stopped is the Government of North Viet-Nam. The only words that have been heard from Hanoi to date are words of contumely and rejection.

125. South Viet-Nam and its allies have declared their readiness to enter into negotiations without conditions, or to discuss the conditions in which negotiations might be opened. The Government of the United States has offered to stop the bombing as a first step towards negotiations, provided that some reciprocal gesture is made, or some reciprocal restraint is observed, by the other side as an earnest of their good faith.

126. The regrettable fact is that every effort to start discussions has been rejected with scorn by Hanoi. The régime there still believes that it can achieve its conquest of the South through continued violence. North Viet-Nameese leaders maintain that they have the right to continue hostilities in the South while demanding freedom from hostilities in the North. They assert that the United Nations has no role to play in ending the conflict. They claim that agreement could be reached only on the basis of points which call for the unilateral withdrawal of forces supporting the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam and the settling of the affairs of South Viet-Nam solely in accordance with the programme of the so-called National Front for Liberation, which is clearly unrepresentative of the great majority of the population of South Viet-Nam. A revealing statement by a North Viet-Nameese major-general, Tran Do, in a document captured only this year shows that the North Viet-Nameese "basic intention is to win militarily. We mean to end the war through military victories".

127. All of us are deeply moved by the suffering of war. A country like my own looks only for peace and co-operation with its neighbours and hopes for a lasting and just settlement in Viet-Nam. But we have no il-

lusions about the nature of the conflict there and the importance of it not only to the Viet-Nameese people, but to the entire region and to ourselves and to the world. Behind a just and guaranteed settlement, the peoples of the Asian-Pacific region, including Viet-Nam, could go about their task of building up their countries and strengthening their economies. Indeed, great progress is already being made behind the barrier which is opposed to aggression in Korea and Viet-Nam and elsewhere. But if a peace settlement in South-East Asia were not based on just and lasting foundations, all that we could expect in the area would be further propaganda threats, subversion and aggression in accordance with doctrines and principles which we have already seen operating over recent years.

128. The Australian Government has no interest in seeing a particular form of government, a particular ideology or social system established in South Viet-Nam. Our only concern is that no régime, no ideology or social system should be imposed by force on the people of South Viet-Nam without their freedom of choice.

129. For its part, the Australian Government has pledged itself, together with the Republic of Viet-Nam and the other Governments helping in its defence, to pursue any path which could lead to a secure and just peace, whether through discussion and negotiation or through reciprocal actions by both sides to reduce the violence. One possible way to peaceful settlement might be found in a return to the essential principles and provisions of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam. A settlement on that basis could be complemented by a return to respect for the provisions of the Geneva agreements of 1962 on Laos, whose territory, as we have heard this morning, continues to be violated by the regular forces of North Viet-Nam. The Australian Government, however, is flexible as to the means by which negotiations or discussions might be opened, and as to the method of negotiation and participation in such negotiations. The essential point is that a political solution should be sought by whatever means is likely to succeed.

130. Once again, it is necessary to speak in this Assembly of relations with China. In the past year we have seen the effects of internal conflicts inside Communist China. We have witnessed the shameless treatment of foreign diplomatic representatives, and attacks on embassies, the provocative incitement to disorder in Hong Kong and the outbreak of fighting with India along the border of Sikkim. These events must surely reinforce the doubts expressed last year when the General Assembly decided not to make any change with regard to the representation of China in the United Nations. Even if it were assumed that the Peking régime wanted admission to the United Nations—and it has denied this—the effect of such admission on our Organization would be profound. We can only judge from what the Chinese régime has said and done how it would regard the principles of the Charter. We cannot move to a position in which we say in effect that it does not matter in the least whether a Member of the United Nations—in truth a new party to a contract—accepts the principles of the Charter or does not accept them.

131. It is the hope of the Australian Government that, over a period of time, mainland China will be accommodated within the international community. But the admission of Peking to the United Nations would not be a short cut to that ultimate objective. It would not automatically make mainland China accept new obligations, and the great problems of peaceful coexistence would remain. I find it difficult to believe that the mere assumption of a seat in this Assembly would make such practical difference in the conduct of Peking's policies.

132. Those who urge the representation of the Peking régime in this Organization insist that admission would entail recognition of Peking's sovereignty over Taiwan and the expulsion and abandonment of the Government of the Republic of China. No one who has visited Formosa has found anything that would indicate that the people of that island wanted to be ruled by Peking. The Republic of China is a founding Member of this Organization and has participated constructively and peacefully in international affairs and has fulfilled all the obligations of membership of the United Nations. Moreover, over the past twenty years great strides have been made in promoting economic progress which has brought the standard of living in Taiwan to one of the highest levels in Asia.

133. Some have argued that, since the overriding objective is to come to terms with the 700 million people of mainland China, we should allow the 14 million people of Taiwan to be jettisoned in the interest of a settlement. Coming from a country which itself has a population smaller than that of Taiwan, the Australian Government finds this argument quite unacceptable.

134. All these difficulties do not mean that we must abandon the search for an accommodation. Developments within mainland China bring no comfort to those countries in the region which have to share their future with the people of China. No one in the Asian-Pacific area pretends that China can be ignored. But the countries of the region have a real and common problem, which is how to bring about a situation in which they can live alongside mainland China free from the fear of intervention and aggression, from the export of world revolution as interpreted by Peking and practiced by the Red Guards. That remains the major task for the diplomacy of the region and indeed of the world. None of us would be wise to be permanently hostile to a neighbour, but it would be foolish to pay no regard to the terms and the principles on which we could live as good neighbours.

135. I shall have time to touch on only one other topic. Under the Charter the United Nations is directed to promote higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development. Further, all Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of those purposes.

136. In the introduction to his annual report [A/6701/Add.1], the Secretary-General expressed concern that we are not winning the war on want and pointed out that the responsibilities for combating poverty lay heavily upon developing and developed countries alike.

Australia is fully conscious of its own responsibilities in this regard and shares the Secretary-General's concern about the loss of momentum in international aid during the Development Decade. There has been no loss of momentum in Australia's own efforts. In 1960-1961, at the beginning of the Development Decade, Australia was making an annual aid allocation, apart from its efforts in Papua and New Guinea, of \$US22 million. In the current financial year, that figure will be \$US57 million, or two and a half times as much as we were giving at the commencement of the Development Decade. Including assistance to Papua-New Guinea, our contribution runs at over \$US14 per head of the population. Expressed as a percentage of national income, the figure has increased year by year until it now stands at approximately .75 of 1 per cent, or one of the highest percentages of national income in the world. All our aid is in the form of non-repayable grants which are a direct charge on the taxpayers of Australia. Recently we accepted a new undertaking, arising from the Kennedy Round, to make an annual food aid contribution of approximately \$US15 million.

137. But having said that, I want to emphasize that in our view international assistance and relief is not enough and it is quite inconceivable that it should be accepted as the normal condition for economic relationships. Our President, in his address of 19 September, suggested, and I paraphrase his words, that until it has been possible to organize the economic development of the world in such a way that countries themselves will be able to provide for their own populations a decent livelihood from their own resources, there will be no real solution to the development problem which is consonant with self-respect and stability. I agree with that view and I say that already we have some conspicuous examples of countries which have broken through the development barrier as a result of the application of external aid to their own efforts.

138. All this points to the importance of international co-operation over the whole field of economic relations. It means in particular that the provision of capital funds should be in such forms as to allow the development of national resources in ways which do not destroy the objective of the investment by creating unbearable debt and interest burdens. Moreover, it means that countries which begin to develop their resources must have the opportunity to dispose of their production profitably. To help a nation to develop its productive resources without ensuring access to markets is futile.

139. A further crippling problem lies in the hard fact that the goods which developing countries wish to import are largely consumer manufactures and capital goods to develop the industrial sectors. In contrast to the trends towards lower world prices for unprocessed primary products, which are usually the products of developing countries, world prices of manufactured goods and capital equipment have been rising. The developing countries, faced with falling export receipts because of the decline in the price of their products, and a rising import bill, due to the rise in the price of manufactured products, have little to spare to provide capital for their economic development, particularly for infrastructure efforts, such as education and communications.

140. While these problems are clearly recognized and discussed at great length in international circles, little has been done to overcome them. Most of the measures which have been taken are palliatives which can help to deal with the effects of the problems but do little to overcome their basic causes. A 5 per cent improvement in the terms of trade of the developing countries would bring to these countries more usable foreign exchange in one year than they now receive in the form of capital aid.

141. In various national and international organizations, work is going on in these fields and it should, in the view of the Australian Government, be pushed forward with urgency. I am happy to state that in one of them—preferences in favour of developing countries—Australia, by arrangement with GATT, has instituted a scheme of such preferences unilaterally. But although we have an admittedly high standard of living, we are ourselves in many ways in the same vulnerable position as the developing countries, because 80 per cent of our export income is tied to primary exports. We therefore favour commodity agreements which would stabilize the prices of these primary exports, and would bring more in the way of development and security to developing countries than all the aid that is ever likely to be given. Assured and rising income from exports is the sure road to economic development, and I would appeal to the great industrial nations of the world to try to see the problems of economic development in this light and, particularly in North America and Western Europe, to give guaranteed access to the products of the developing countries at fair prices.

142. Naturally the developing countries do not wish forever to have the role of producers of raw materials for the industrialized nations. They want for themselves the spreading of urban employment and the cushion against external economic fluctuations which comes with industrialization. But rapid industrialization is not simple, and there are some recent examples of the waste of resources in attempts to build up for prestige purposes industries which have been inappropriate to administrative skills or the economic environment of the countries concerned. Theories concerning the best methods by which developing countries may accelerate their growth rate are numerous, and no one theory is applicable to all developing countries or even all countries within one region. But most developing countries are primarily agricultural countries, and the most effective method of development would therefore seem to be to work by balanced development between agriculture and industry.

143. The first step in industrialization should logically be the processing of primary products, thus providing domestic employment opportunities and leading to the production of more valuable exportable goods. I emphasize again, however, that this process will come to nothing if the advanced countries erect tariff barriers which make it difficult, if not impossible, for the developing countries to sell their processed products.

144. The overcoming of these problems of trade and development, in our view, is not just a matter of importance; it is critical for the stability of the

world order. There is a two-way relationship. The less developed countries need political stability and security so that they may plan and work for their future with assurance. On the other hand they need economic and social change to give the strong foundations for that peace and stability.

145. These are great tasks in which we should be joined in great common effort, calling for imagination, daring and steady resolution, so that all the peoples in all the lands can see the hope of freedom from fear and freedom from want.

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

147. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (translated from French): I ask your indulgence for taking the floor at this late hour, but the so-called "observation" made yesterday [1588th meeting] by the representative of Thailand forces me to make the following statement.

148. The representative of Thailand contended that my remarks on the hostile attitude of his Government were a rehash of Cambodia's traditional campaign of false and unsubstantiated allegations against Thailand.

149. I should like to say first of all that Cambodia has never carried on a campaign of false allegations against Thailand; but my motive in acquainting the Members of the Assembly with Thailand's traditionally hostile and covetous attitude and policy towards my country was that I wanted the Assembly and international public opinion to know the truth about Thailand's policy with regard to Cambodia.

150. I was anxious to make my statement here in the Assembly, in the presence of the Thai delegation and not like the Foreign Minister of Thailand who as always prefers to launch false accusations against Cambodia outside these walls and make hostile declarations against Cambodia in the American Press or on television. But what Mr. Khoman does hardly surprises me, since all his statements are for domestic consumption in the United States and to back up the aggressive and imperialist policies of his Washington superiors.

151. Let us have a look at what I said about Thailand in my statement [1587th meeting]. I said—and I repeat—that the Thais are the protégés of the United States and that they have mined our roads, our railways and even our farmlands. International public opinion, including that of the United States, knows that Thailand has now become an American colony and base in the Far East and that there are 35,000 American soldiers in Thailand, helping to defend, not the freedom and the rights of the Thai people, but the militarist, dictatorial Government of Bangkok.

152. According to a communication from the Thai Mission itself to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and issued in General Assembly document A/6807 of 25 September 1967 "the Assembly of the People's Representatives was ... dissolved" on 20 October 1958, by the party in power, at the same time as the Thai Constitution was abrogated.

"... the rights of both men and women to elect members of the Legislative Assembly which have

equally been recognized by laws are temporarily suspended ... As regards the rights of both men and women to elect members of the provincial assemblies as well as members of the municipal assemblies, they are temporarily suspended ..."

153. It should be emphasized that this "temporary" arrangement goes back to 1958—that is, it has gone on for nearly ten years. The militarist Government of Thailand, which claims to be defending freedom in South Viet-Nam by sending its soldiers there, would be better advised to restore freedom in its own country, where it has been suppressed since 1958, as the Permanent Mission of Thailand itself confirms.

154. Of acts of aggression and violations of our frontiers by Thailand alone, we counted 153 in 1965—54 on land, 23 by sea, and 76 violations of our airspace. Casualties from these criminal acts committed by Thailand numbered 13 dead, 31 wounded and 5 persons seized, among our population and our defence forces.

155. In 1966 we recorded 290 violations of our territory—130 by land, 14 by sea and 146 in our airspace. These acts of aggression and violation cost our people and our defence forces 23 dead, 64 wounded and 33 seized and held.

156. With regard to the mining of our soil by Thai bands, we have records of 81 explosions of mines, 36 in the province of Battambang and 45 in the province of Oddor-Meanchey. In 1966 alone, these minings by Thai elements left 50 dead and 133 wounded among our population and our defence forces, not counting the serious damage done to cattle and vehicles.

157. I also said that Thailand refuses to respect our common frontiers, thus proving that the policy of annexation applied from 1940 to 1945 with the assistance of Japan continues to be applied in 1967, but this time with the assistance of the United States.

158. Here again it is the simple truth. In 1940, with the help of militarist Japan, which at the time had gained mastery over a large part of Asia as a result of its victories over the Allies, Siam (or Thailand) annexed all the north-west part of Cambodia. After the defeat of Japan, Siam (Thailand) was forced to hand back to the Royal Government the part of Cambodian territory of which the Bangkok Government had illegally taken possession.

159. Soon after we gained our independence, Thailand again illegally occupied the Cambodian region of Preah Vihear, which it was forced to return to Cambodia following the 1962 Judgment of the International Court of Justice.^{13/}

160. I would recall that the present common frontiers between Thailand and Cambodia were established and definitively fixed by international agreements and were confirmed by the International Court of Justice in 1962. Thus, there is in fact no frontier problem between Cambodia and Thailand.

161. This being so, the question must be asked why Thailand refuses to declare its acceptance of the present frontiers. Its refusal shows clearly that it

^{13/} Case concerning the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v. Thailand). Merits, Judgment of 15 June 1962, I.C.J. Reports 1962, p. 6.

still persists in its policy of annexation against Cambodia.

162. I am not simply accusing Thailand of having pursued a traditionally hostile and annexationist policy against Cambodia; I am producing irrefutable proof, because I think that this Thai policy of territorial annexation needs to be denounced.

163. It is ludicrous that the Thai representative should lay claim to know Cambodia's foreign policy, as directed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, better than the head of the Cambodian delegation. It may be that the statements made by the members of the delegation of Thailand do not always represent the opinions of their Government.

164. I have said, and I say again, that Cambodia's policy of neutrality has never changed and that its international relations are always based on the principle of reciprocity. Cambodia continues to reject the neo-colonialism of the United States, to denounce aggression by the American imperialists wherever it is perpetrated, and to give its political and moral support to all countries and peoples fighting against the aggression of the American imperialists. In short, Cambodia is and will remain anti-imperialist.

165. The representative of Thailand, though speaking less pointedly than his Foreign Minister, who in a

recent television statement in the United States accused Cambodia of allowing North Viet-Nameese forces to infiltrate into its territory, blamed Cambodia for the Viet-Nam conflict and the popular uprisings in the north-eastern province of Thailand, even though that part of Thai territory has no common border with Cambodia. For when he spoke of "peace-loving Asian neighbours" he was presumably thinking of South Viet-Nam and Thailand.

166. That fantastic Thai accusation does not even deserve a reply. I leave it to the General Assembly and the International Control Commission to judge.

167. For the information of the Members of the Assembly I should like to stress that there are in Cambodia no foreign bases or foreign troops and that the International Control Commission has always attested to Cambodia's good faith. Only recently, on 11 September 1967, following an inquiry in the north-east region of Cambodia, which the Americans allege is a sanctuary for North Viet-Nameese forces, the Commission declared that there were no foreign troops there and reaffirmed yet again that the Royal Government of Cambodia was continuing to discharge its responsibilities under articles 7 and 13 (c) of the Geneva Agreements.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.