



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> )	
Speech by Mr. Matsebula (Swaziland) . . . . .	1
Speech by Mr. Masmoudi (Tunisia) . . . . .	2
Speech by Mr. Khalid (Sudan) . . . . .	8
Speech by Mr. Benhima (Morocco) . . . . .	12

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. MATSEBULA (Swaziland): Mr. President, I bring to you, and through you to this Assembly of nations, greetings from His Majesty King Sobhuza II, the Government and the people of Swaziland. These greetings come wrapped in the hope and confidence that this, the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, will become a tribute and a service to all mankind. You bring to this august body long and distinguished experience in international affairs, which surely reflects the history of your country, Poland. Throughout the historic session last year, your predecessor, Mr. Adam Malik, presided over this Assembly with originality, skill and charm. My delegation is confident, and happy, that the deliberations of this session of the Assembly under your able guidance will be meaningful and successful.

2. As you take up the reins of this supreme international body, new areas of tension in the world are emerging. Older and sadly familiar areas reveal no change for the better and some are flaring up again; but a few, just a very few areas, troubled of old, are showing signs of real reconciliation and understanding. The very geographical limits which once contained the strife and tension have become diffused so that the effects of disharmony can now be felt instantly, tragically, irrationally and by innocents half a world away from its source. Global involvement is manifest, and the global representation at this Assembly should see this development in its true and fullest sense.

3. This body, this Assembly, epitomizes an international society which reveals, every living minute, the inherent reciprocity and interdependence among nations. Local problems do not necessarily remain localized and we, as a community of nations, would be unrealistic to regard them in isolation. In this regard, then, my delegation views with the utmost concern and alarm the continuing, and indeed the increasing, gravity of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The continuing failure to reach a lasting solution in this matter

clearly requires the urgent attention of all right-thinking men and a strengthening, or perhaps a readjustment, of the apparatus set up by this Assembly to help resolve the situation.

4. It is most unfortunate that the endeavours of Ambassador Jarring in seeking means of finding a positive solution to the Middle East problem, in securing peace and in seeking to enshrine true national sovereignty for all nations in the Middle East have been hindered. The killing of innocent people cannot be justified by any man of good conscience. It is our hope that a solution will be found to end this human tragedy.

5. Swaziland would like to see all the oppressed peoples freed in the shortest possible time as we feel that all people have a God-given right to self-determination. A denial of this inalienable right is not only wrong but inhuman.

6. We believe in majority and in non-racial democracy. Swaziland believes in non-violent and peaceful means for effecting political change. We hope that our neighbours in South Africa, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Angola will follow our example.

7. Swaziland cannot, as we have indicated in the past, support violence in any part of the world. We continue to recommend the application of peaceful methods of non-violent change. But if non-violence is to succeed, non-violent agencies of change or political activity must be allowed. For that reason we regret that the political expression generated by the Pearce Commission in Southern Rhodesia has been suppressed. The Smith régime has once again demonstrated its bad faith towards the African majority, and has sown more seeds of bitterness and distrust, which will some day yield a harvest of violence and sadness for the people of that country. In Namibia we are looking forward to the successful conclusion of negotiations designed to transfer power to the people.

8. After the experience of two world wars, wars which wiped out millions of people, nations and governments; after centuries of parochialism and regionalism; after the gradual growth of international awareness, Swaziland joined the United Nations and subscribed to the high ideals of its Charter. In this regard, the peaceful settlement of disputes without resort to force is paramount. We cannot, therefore, associate ourselves with any form of violence anywhere as a means of settling disputes.

9. So the war in South-east Asia, involving, as it does, forces from outside the area, is wrong and must be brought to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. In the view of my delegation, the people of South-east Asia themselves

can best judge and create the best apparatus for their own livelihood and destiny.

10. We condemn violence in Northern Ireland among the Christians of that troubled British province; we condemn it in Africa, where some groups have used it as a major tool in a short-cut to power. We condemn it particularly in its global manifestation as air piracy or hijacking, wide-spread and often indiscriminate terrorism and political kidnapping. These ugly happenings, which frequently kill and maim innocent people, harass administrations and endanger vital public services, are especially evil and uncivilized. They divert national resources, all of which could have been channelled into means of improving the quality of life for some of the world's less fortunate people.

11. In two important and influential areas of the world, the fabric of national unity, where formerly there was none, can be seen as a bright star of hope for the future of those countries as well as for others still torn by conflict. I refer, of course, to East and West Germany and North and South Korea. This fabric of unity has not been woven easily and its pattern is still being developed. This Assembly, in the view of my delegation, should applaud these processes and in no circumstances take any action which might prejudice their fuller development.

12. The Simla Agreement between India and Pakistan represents a major step towards the normalization and harmonization of relationships on the Indian subcontinent. However, as one of the first countries to have recognized Bangladesh, Swaziland would urge upon this Assembly that the 75 million people of that country should have the right to membership in this family of nations.

13. The sorrow, misery and utter waste of human and material resources in two world wars and many subsequent confrontations have never been banished from our minds. The energies thus directed can be reconstituted and redirected in elevating the quality of man's life everywhere. There is now the technological skill available to translate all this effort into a race for peace and progress. Those areas of the earth and space which have not yet felt the impact of weapons should command all our attention so that no time is lost in their peaceful development for the good of all men. I refer particularly to the sea-bed, the ocean floor, the moon and space. Surely it is within our capacity to create the necessary legal and administrative structures, permeated with the fruits of meaningful human fellowship, to achieve this aim.

14. In this regard, Swaziland's sponsorship last year of the draft that became resolution 2832 (XXVI) declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace bears further examination. The area of this Ocean, up until recently not regarded as a sensitive military zone, is becoming a target for the less peaceful attention of some Powers. The nations that rightly regard the Indian Ocean as being on their own door-step have no nuclear designs or any other hostile ambitions in the area. They are in the forefront in seeing that other Powers regard the Ocean in a like manner. Unless the seas and oceans of the world come to be regarded as areas of peaceful and economic development only, unpeaceful usage will become more and more difficult to stop.

15. Peace, security and prosperity are indivisible. The world economy cannot prosper in insecurity. My delegation believes that true independence derives from economic strength, from a carefully planned utilization of all national resources, material and human. Recently we have seen a détente in East-West relations which has opened up great possibilities for trade and for developmental financing among these countries. My delegation, however, notes with great concern the absence of a provision for developing countries in these arrangements and wonders how the objectives of reducing economic and technological gaps between developed nations and the third world will ever be realized. With this, coupled to the forbidding portents of the European Economic Community, it seems to my delegation the third world ought to be responsible for the control and development of its economies and seek a more rapid integration into the mainstream of the world economy by pressing for a fair share of international trade, by intensifying trade among themselves, by transferring modern technology to their own countries and by securing ready access for manufactured goods to the markets of developed countries.

16. Developed nations ought to liberalize their economic policies towards the less-developed nations and foster deliberate co-operation, combined with a political will, to alleviate some of the harsh external factors over which the developing countries have no control.

17. I now wish to reiterate Swaziland's commitment and determination to maintain non-alignment and our readiness to safeguard the legitimate rights of all men, irrespective of colour, race or creed.

18. Finally, this Organization has one thing to hold most precious: it is the future. We can together, as Members of this unique body, summon enough courage, with the experience of the past 26 years, to release ourselves from the tyranny of the present and, with this earth's wonderful resources, to lift humanity to heights of freedom, justice, peace, happiness and prosperity. That is the destiny to which all of us must strive. And that is the destiny of glory for mankind.

19. Mr. MASMOUDI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I be permitted to greet you as the representative of a friendly nation which served as a model of resistance to all those who, refusing to surrender, followed your lead in the struggle for liberation. We greet you as a leader of that martyred people which, through blood and fire, carried endurance to the very extremes of human limits, and which, by fire and sword, vested the collective and individual dynamism of its sons with the traits of nobility, ethical values and the historic title of what at the time was already called the terrorism of the *maquisards*, although it was in fact your heroic resistance to the forces of evil. We also greet you as a witness of the barbarity and racism that dipped into the Warsaw ghetto to find fodder for the gas ovens. And finally we greet you as the incarnation of the triumph of the spirit of good over evil, a spirit whose manifestations and variations through the course of history have taken the form of nazism, colonialism and zionism. None is better qualified than you to guide the difficult debates of the twenty-seventh session of this General Assembly with authority and serenity.

20. In our tribute we wish to include our distinguished colleague, President Malik, your predecessor. In so doing we also wish to salute the noteworthy steps taken by Europe in its policy of détente and security, and to hail at the same time the glimmerings of political détente, pale though they still may be, that are beginning to be visible in Indo-China and that give us hope that we may soon see dawn, and finally daylight in those countries of the rising sun that for decades have been plunged in the darkness of intolerance and domination. The qualities of heart and mind of both Mr. Malik and U Thant, together with the will for change that was felt by all Members of our Organization, have already allowed us to restore the People's Republic of China to its legitimate rights and its rightful place in our Organization.

21. With you, Mr. President, and with Mr. Kurt Waldheim, our new Secretary-General, with what you represent in terms of imagination, strength of character and creativity, and in the light of the demands for change expressed without exception by all our colleagues—with greater or lesser success, with greater or lesser clarity, occasionally with a certain touch of weariness and concern, more indicative of frustration than rebelliousness, more indicative of a will to change than of sterile scepticism—with you presiding over us, we expect even greater and better things than were accomplished by your predecessors, whose record showed positive accomplishments that do honour to them and to all of us.

22. How can we assist you in your efforts? What can we do amid all these recurring storms, in the face of all the obstacles and difficulties that crop up along your way, and despite the super-Powers that are not always helpful, despite the small and middle-sized nations as well that often take a defiant stand, and despite all the budgetary hindrances that go on forever and that add to the daily cares of our Secretary-General?

23. How, I say, can we help? As far as Tunisia is concerned, the way we can provide genuine and effective assistance is by making our modest contribution first of all by informing you of our feelings, of how we can see our world and its evolution, and by making it our duty to tell you what we believe to be just and true, without circumlocutions, without any trickery and at the risk of hurting the feelings of some colleagues whom we have no reason to refer to and whom with your indulgence we beg, in advance, to pardon our statements to the extent that they believe that our comments are directed to them.

24. We have not come here as people go to an election meeting, to outbid each other, nor are we here as spectators in a theatre who attend to support their champion or the star of the day. No, we have come with a desire—mark my words—to conspire, in the best sense of the word, in the sense of Charles Maurras when he said, “We conspire in order to decide upon a state of mind”. This state of mind we translate basically in the form of suggestions, proposals, follow-up action, enthusiasm, moral blows, those which put an end to coups d'état and acts of force and which smash the barriers between men to smithereens, which propose other procedures, as for example in the case of the excessive use of the veto, whose survival in its present form runs counter to the spirit of our times and to the need for

equity, harmony and fluidity that we all aspire to see prevail in human relations everywhere. True, the survival of the veto met the needs of the post-war period, immediately after that terrible war in which victory was won by the great Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union—and we reiterate our thanks and appreciation to them for that—these countries were granted the veto—and regretfully so—in order to reach agreement between themselves. However, the world has changed since then; other realities have been created, and therefore new forces and new problems and new requirements too, among which the defence of peace and of the United Nations like common sense become the task most widely shared today.

25. It is somewhat difficult for a man of our times to admit, as the practice of the veto would seem to imply—and we may well be mistaken on this point—that there are major nations and minor nations. We understand full well that each country carries its own specific weight with the authority and the ramifications flowing therefrom. The weight of the Soviet Union or of the United States has nothing in common with that of another less powerful country. Their contribution to the safeguarding, or for that matter to threats to peace, their contribution to aid and co-operation like their contribution to the daily life of our Organization cannot be compared.

26. We do not propose expressly to do away with the right of the veto, but rather to consider the number of countries that should perhaps eventually exercise that right as well as how to moderate the exercise of the veto so that its use will more validly and effectively serve the common objectives of our Organization. We propose that in any consideration of this issue, or in any research that we may call for, heed will be taken of this trend towards democratization, to which most of my colleagues have referred here—and how many cogent, pertinent and deeply felt and pondered things often expressed in eloquent terms have been said from this rostrum, or will be said during the debate on this issue!

27. If today this current of change through democratization appears more and more widespread and increasingly imperative it is precisely because it encompasses realities and truths which have emerged slowly, gradually and sometimes almost unnoticed both in the shadow of the United Nations, as well as with the help of the United Nations. The realities, these truths that are entangled together today—and which appear complex—we believe fall into two main categories. The first category of comments would cover what we might call the already established and accepted order. The second category would contain what is in the process of being, developing, seeking the trend towards a new order.

28. In what is established, in what already exists, we have a stage dominated by two great actors with a reservoir of economic force and power, and technological, political and military strength that has never been equalled in the history of mankind. Because of their decisive contribution to the victory over the Axis Powers, because of the many and specific circumstances that had divided them, ideologically, politically, economically and strategically but, fortunately never militarily, and also because of the remarkable competition they have waged in space exploration research

and science and, finally, because of the balance of atomic terror that they have had the wisdom to respect, so that today we know a balance of caution, those two Titans have monopolized the international diplomatic chess game—which was only natural—by taking a wise initiative here, getting involved in a misguided move there and often this would lead here, there or elsewhere to trends that finally turned into acts of hegemony or *faits accomplis*. Thus the super-power of one or another of the Titans is very often projected thousands of kilometres beyond the borders of its own territory. The will to control, through economic or technological means, through military bases and by means of the fleets that plough the seas and oceans—and we have some first-hand knowledge of this in the Mediterranean—by sophisticated weapons and even by war itself: all these attest to an excessive tendency to hegemony. All these acts, whether innocent on the surface or overtly aggressive, have been characteristic of the international situation, and still are today. So much for what already exists and is obvious, that which we might call the order of hegemony.

29. Regarding the second type of comment, you have man's desire to be free, strengthened by the wave of decolonization movements which in a torrent of fresh, new ideas bubbles with enthusiasm and new values and seeks its equilibrium in a new order.

30. We wonder if, with time and with the will of men to free themselves, which like the sea is ever-renewed, the order that was created in the aftermath of the Second World War is not being affected today by the evolution in these orders, some of which we read about in history, such as Athens, Carthage and Rome in particular and which crumbled as a wall weakened by time and adversity crumbles. Colonial Europe had already had its experience, which could have been much more painful were it not for the healthy reactions of some enlightened minds such as Mendès-France and General de Gaulle to whom we are pleased to pay a tribute, men who having learned the lessons of history, were able to find in their culture, in their past and in their patriotism the necessary strength to avoid their country's suffering a decline in its influence and to transform a sense of exhaustion into a new, galvanizing breath of life which became a fountain of co-operation and mutual assistance.

31. I would restate from this rostrum the question solemnly posed by President Habib Bourguiba at the last Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, which met at Rabat in June, when he spoke of whatever still survives as the shameful remnants of colonialism and when he also addressed himself to all those in Europe who want to put an end to colonialism. He said:

“Is it possible to consider that the European Community, inspired by the example of France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Great Britain, which have all decolonized more or less successfully, will find the ways and means that will permit Portugal”—a country which is bogged down in a sorry business and which, since it is a Mediterranean country should be able to rely on our means of assisting it to decolonize—“to repatriate its last soldier, its last settler, while reserving to itself a place and a status still to be defined in the European Community?”

We believe that is the only peaceful way to put an end to the bloodshed. It seems to us that this is the road we must follow in seeking what has been termed a dialogue; furthermore, this would perhaps be the only form of useful dialogue which could generate further dialogues that may mark the beginning of a new era, an era of reconciliation among Europeans, an era of friendship between Europeans and Africans, and lastly an era of solidarity among all men in a single order which must be worked out and put into force. Europe, having regained its rightful form, should deal with this problem—Europe which symbolizes man and his dignity and freedom, man being in our opinion the means and source and end of all action, man, the brother of all men; that Europe we hail more as a force for research and investigation, as a potential element of decolonization, as a new force working for a new equilibrium, rather than a Europe committed like the super-Powers trying to set up a new hegemony.

32. Just as we welcome the demands for peace, progress and peaceful change which are emerging in Asia, Africa and Latin America, so do we consider encouraging the impressive efforts to enter and participate actively in international life made by great industrialized countries, Tanaka's Japan, Trudeau's Canada, and Australia, so bubbling with energy and industry at home, and heretofore acting in such a discreet manner beyond its frontiers. All these countries have lent an attentive ear to the third world and their minimum requirements for a decent life.

33. How can we also overlook the impressive and important role assumed by the People's Republic of China, fascinating and mysterious China, only yesterday outside the Organization and today impressive in its dialectics, force and new virtues. In the trends developing towards a new balance, the history, geography, the dimensions and genius of the Chinese people, the wisdom and seriousness of its leaders, their obvious readiness to abide by the rules of the game in their international relations, no one can doubt and all this evidence leads us to believe that the People's Republic of China, with its tremendous active assistance, hopes to inject a breath of fresh air, signal a fresh approach and make a substantial contribution towards the development of a new public spirit, dedicated to the cause of peace and progress, in other words, to the strengthening of our Organization.

34. Thus we believe that the hegemonic order of the post-war period cannot be maintained as rigidly as it has been, with this tendency to monopolize the fund of knowledge, will and power, while aspirations to diversify, to introduce fluidity, complementary relationships, harmony and a new balance are becoming more evident day by day.

35. Everywhere we hear voices which must be heeded as a fact of life, expressing refusals and challenges, refusals to condone domination, occupation and aggression, challenges to control and manipulation from afar. On all sides and even within the hegemonic order we hear the same demands being voiced: we want to be free, really free, politically and economically, free to enjoy our culture, free to enjoy our ethos. We would like to recreate man, cure him. We want to bring man to man.

36. True, this is still only a plea, a cry, but it is a significant plea and a somewhat prophetic cry. History has heard cries which have finally set men and events on a new course, and each time a new and better order has finally seen the light of day and each time mankind has taken a giant step forward, towards more justice, freedom and progress. The process is a familiar one. Appeals in various forms come from the humblest of our people, which set forth pressing needs, confirm trends and help to revitalize the fabric of international relations by bringing men closer together, reducing antagonisms and strengthening the obligation to achieve détente and solidarity.

37. It is significant to note that the war which has been ravaging the peoples of Indo-China, particularly the Viet-Nameese, even in all its most terrible and ghastly aspects which are repugnant to all who love justice and freedom, has made a significant contribution to a degree of détente between Washington and Peking and to a greater understanding between Moscow and Washington. It is unfair that the valiant people of Viet-Nam—which was one of the first to take up arms to win its freedom, which has contributed so significantly to the decolonization movement, and which continues to contribute despite, or perhaps because of, its present suffering, indirectly to encourage a détente between Washington, Peking and Moscow—it is unfair, I say, that his people should be the last to taste the fruits of peace when it was the first to act to achieve peace by dint of its struggle for its own independence, for the dignity of the peoples of the third world and, to a certain extent, for international détente.

38. We are saddened by the fact that the great American nation, our friend of all time, should be waging a most atrocious war against the valiant people of Viet-Nam, to which we are linked by so many ties and with whose Government we have already decided to establish diplomatic relations, although our ideologies and political systems differ.

39. Is it not encouraging to note that, because of our demands to both sides for development, because of our quarrels, our tensions and our wars, and thanks to our desire for non-alignment and co-operation, we who belong to the group of smaller and medium-sized nations do in fact constitute in the eyes of the great Powers just so many forces of opposition which must be reckoned with, just so many channels of communication which cannot easily be ignored, just so much new blood that feeds the tissues of international life, just so many currents of feeling and also just so many sources of pressure applied to the super-Powers and calling upon them to strengthen their understandings with one another, to encourage the dialogue between their own protégés, their clients and friends, and, finally, to resign themselves to a more balanced and equitable reorganization of the world.

40. Let us pay a tribute to our Secretary-General for his comment of great historic significance, in the introduction to his report:

“The interests, the wisdom and the importance of the vast majority of medium and smaller Powers cannot, at this point in history, be ignored in any durable system of world order.” [A/8701/Add.1, p. 2.]

Does that not refer to the type of order being sought in this trend towards democratization, and the drive for freedom?

41. We hope, and in fact we believe, that the hegemonic order set up at the end of the Second World War is in the throes of transformation, that it is being transmuted into an immense wave of solidarity and universal co-operation just as colonial Europe has evolved and worked towards the type of entity it is today: an assembly of desires and strength which is being built up to ensure security and co-operation among the Europeans themselves and to promote solidarity and mutual assistance with others.

42. It is in this direction, it is for this new reign of man, for this new community more concerned with the quality of man's life than his level of living, a more generous or in other words a more just and fraternal community, that this Organization can do a great deal.

43. We know that this new community, this new balance, will not be achieved through any wave of a magic wand. Instead it will be the result of the long and difficult meditation, organization and efforts undertaken by the specialized agencies, intergovernmental as well as non-governmental organizations, regional organizations and the various manifestations of the attitude of the non-aligned countries, a group of countries to whom we should like to pay a tribute for their unremitting efforts and the sound work they have done.

44. The old clichés are becoming increasingly threadbare and shopworn. The old concepts of East and West, capitalism or communism, class struggle, management, collectivism, liberalism, republic, monarchy—all are concepts that have generated misunderstandings and squabbles with regard to which we must be reconciled as a matter of urgency so that we can devote ourselves to the sole task of solidarity and mutual assistance with a clear understanding of the options, it being clearly understood that any economic systems that are going to be adopted are deemed to be tools in man's service, the only objective that counts.

45. Following U Thant, our Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, has forcefully raised the key questions confronting mankind which the United Nations can and should be resolved in the next few years by setting aside our quarrels and giving the impetus necessary to a fairer and more balanced type of growth.

46. If we, rich and poor, are aware that our world may become physically uninhabitable, that man's life is in mortal danger, that our planet seems too small to cope with the growth of population and its needs, why is this pressing feeling of solidarity not given top priority, so that it can be channelled and organized in the form of plans and instruments for effective, planned programmes of work?

47. The problems of the environment haunt the highly industrialized nations; the question of population growth is the particular obsession of the poor nations; and the problems raised by certain aspects of technological and scientific development, such as communication by satellites, are of concern to those who cannot have them and who therefore must be satisfied with the information,

guidance, and slogans which the possessors of communications satellites may wish to broadcast to them. All of these problems are really of concern to each and every one of us as a community.

48. Is it not high time therefore for us resolutely to tackle these problems in the spirit of the United Nations Conference on Human Environment, held at Stockholm from 5 to 16 June 1972, and in accordance with the recommendations of the World Bank and the various specialized agencies that deal with development as well as—and this should be our primary aim—by redoubling consultations and agreements, by questioning one another and by exchanging the results of our experiences first at the regional organizational level and then at the level of our own United Nations.

49. Unfortunately, in our community dangerous contradictions persist and tensions are constantly being renewed. I am thinking of the Israeli-Arab confrontation on Palestine, the racial confrontation between blacks and whites in Africa, the confrontation between Greeks and Turks over Cyprus and the confrontation between brothers in the Indian subcontinent. I am thinking of all these aberrant pressures which threaten to jeopardize all our efforts and searching to achieve a more balanced world.

50. I am frankly and sincerely wondering whether, outside the manoeuvres of the great Powers, sheltered from their games of what was yesterday the cold war and is today the hot détente, if left to ourselves, to our common will for freedom, justice and progress, we might not be able to overcome our differences through dialogue and communication, seeing what each one discovers or develops and seeking to bring together those things which fit together, to bar what divides us and to compose the living synthesis that will help to solve our problems and to sustain our public spirit, in other words, our necessary solidarity.

51. With your leave, Mr. President, in this spirit I should like to address myself to Mr. Abba Eban—and I am sorry that he is not in the seat where he ought perhaps to have been—who spoke here on the situation in the Middle East. I should like to mention the situation in the Middle East, which, if it grows worse, may destroy the people and the countries of one of the most sensitive regions on this planet.

52. For half a century Zionists and Arabs of Palestine and elsewhere have been in a state of war tension, one side defending its latest conquests, the other awaiting its imminent revenge, alternating between arrogance and hatred—the Palestinians, the Arabs, repelled but not vanquished, and the Israelis, carried on the waves of their weapons and their myth but not victorious, continue in the face of the uncertainty of the future, to brood on violence and to generate despair, create an impasse and, as a consequence, brew terrorism and its blind effects. In the past it was the Israeli organizations of the Irgun and the Stern gang; today it is the Palestinian organizations like the Black September group.

53. While words evolve as do men and reality, it is significant that when dealing with the problems of the Middle East we are open to suspicion if we do not use certain language. We are constrained to use certain words as

we use a particular currency, a currency battered by years of war, a currency that serves only to deal in hatred, a counterfeit currency that nevertheless continues in use and distorts discussion, deceiving men and falsifying events.

54. Let us not forget that in this region, where the heavens joined the earth to fertilize it with grace, rivalries have long existed and still exist, misinterpreting the spirit, committing crimes against men and sacrilege against God. In each undertaking and at each stage of a proposed solution, the density, intensity and complexity of the problem become apparent. Thus, the methods used and the very approach to the problems involved run amok when they touch that sensitive region of the world; they may seem in disarray, always impassioned, often skin deep, and sometimes they are more metaphysical and mythical than real.

55. It is also true that the Arab nations give an impression of chaos, with extreme affluence in some countries and extreme poverty in others accompanied by the annoying tendency of turning to the great Powers to seek openings or protection to support their quarrels, or perhaps to protect themselves against fate. It is equally true that the great Powers believe they can assure their domination by having protégés or clients, and today we see evidence of this in that the great Powers take each other's measure and gauge themselves through "small country" intermediaries, while at the same time they get rid of their surplus outmoded weapons or try out new so-called conventional weapons on them.

56. While it is true that in the past, the Arab countries racked up mistakes and stalemates it is equally true that their camp today is the camp of reason, loyalty and the will to self-determination as a result of the operations of the rules of the international game.

57. Let people have the honesty to note and say that it is Israel's lack of reasonableness which blocks the decisions of the United Nations and develops a sort of dialectics of despair that pushes some persons to commit the reprehensible folly of hijacking civil aircraft and others to mortgage the development of their countries by devoting the largest portion of their moneys and their abilities to weapons, and still others to change régimes by a coup d'état, for lack of the power to change the course of events and the present system which oppresses them now and blocks their prospects for the future.

58. The Arab nations of the Middle East and the Palestinians have never felt as oppressed, as misunderstood and as hedged in as they do today. The Jews of the Warsaw ghetto could have, would have, understood this. The world could have, should have, understood this. For the people of Palestine, while the worst is never certain, the better life seems always to recede farther and farther from their grasp.

59. Yet in Israel's position there is such a margin of unreasonableness, so much excessive arrogance and defiance, such a will to flout the United Nations, its Secretary-General, its Security Council, its General Assembly, its various organs, the four great Powers and each Member State that all of this is more than enough to remove mountainous barriers of indifference and "hands-off".

60. That the great Powers, who are otherwise so touchy about matters of pride and prestige, have allowed the authority of the United Nations and public spirit to be degraded to such an extent is really food for thought; this is shocking, and where Israel is involved, this is what is the last thing to be expected. When Israel is involved or when it is a question of South Africa and Rhodesia, some great Powers forsake the United Nations and its moral authority floats away and depreciates like any common currency. But the fact that the Israelis behave as they do to the United Nations, which brought Israel into being in 1947 by arbitrarily imposing it on the Palestinians in a land that was, it is true, under British mandate but which had its own nationals, the Palestinians—Moslems, Christians and Jews—and the fact that the Israelis, the favourite children of 1947, today consider the United Nations as the graveyard of aborted resolutions—and this was said quite clearly—while the Arabs, yesterday's victims, agree to abide by the recommendations and the resolutions of the United Nations, these facts speak volumes about the evolution of the thoughts and habits of both sides. In the case of the Israelis, I cannot help thinking of that group of nursing infants, of whom Montaigne spoke, crammed full, spoiled and plump, who spit in their mothers' face and spit out their bile in the faces of those who watched them being born, in the faces of those who assisted at their birth.

61. Allow me to say to Mr. Eban, whose ability is equal to his oratory: you know, Mr. Eban, that we in Tunisia feel no hatred towards you. You know how the Jews live in Tunisia. You know that in our Parliament there is even a Jewish Tunisian parliamentarian of whom we are proud. If we tell you this it is because we are sincere in our thinking and because we feel very deeply what we see. Neither we nor the Palestinians whom you despoiled of their country and their homes and whose national cause you relegate to the status of the eternal refugee problem, to a minor squabble, nor the Arabs whose land you seized, nor the Christians, nor the Moslems towards whom you became guilty of violence when you continued to attack Jerusalem have any resentment of you as a Jew or as an Israeli. Thanks to the conduct of President Bourguiba we make a constant effort to do away with hatred which stifles all growth, to avoid bypaths which lead us astray, and to set aside false warlike attitudes which only inflame the mind.

62. "What about Munich?" you will say. Let us speak then of Munich. Let us speak of the facts and the true sequence of events. Munich, transformed for a time into the Olympic capital of the world—after having been one of the citadels of nazism—Munich where the champions took each other's measure and competed free from political and military passions, a few Palestinians felt they had to go to Olympic Village from which, as you know, they were excluded as they are excluded from all international affairs, and where, among others, the flag of Israel flew in the place and in the stead of the one that in their view should have been there: the Palestinian flag. They succeeded in taking certain distinguished Israeli champions as hostages in order to exchange them for some common *fedayeen*. To be sure, the practice of taking hostages is detestable at all times and even more detestable when the athletic stadium is chosen as the field of operations. But—and I apologize for speaking parenthetically—I would merely observe in passing that I am not sure that this practice of taking hostages is not

followed very often today in Gaza, in Jericho, in Jerusalem and in the holy places of the Moslems, Jews and Christians, but we won't talk about that today. So far nothing tragic had happened in Munich. Certain cold minds, trained, perhaps, in the computer schools and inspired by the gods of sport, probably even talked about a sporting performance. The Palestinians even said that they might take the Israeli champions to Tunisia. They even telephoned a Jordanian personality living in Tunisia, probably to stress, and rightly so, that, despite the black September repression of the Palestinians by the Jordanian authorities, the brotherhood between Palestinians and Jordanians still existed. But it was not up to the Tunisians, nor the Jordanian personage, nor the Palestinians, nor, I believe, their Israeli hostages, to organize the reception in Tunis for this extraordinary cargo of the strange visitors. Had they come to us, they would of course have been well received, and we would have undertaken a dialogue with you calmly, convinced, as we always are, that it is better to talk, to exchange views, than to bomb and kill. The opening of a direct dialogue between us on this subject would even have been more fruitful. It might have become a starting point; it might even have allowed the two irreconcilable antagonists, the Palestinian *fedayeen* and those who are called the Israeli hawks, to start a debate, to open up prospects for the future, and even to envisage certain solutions. In short, we would have talked, and no one knows exactly what might have happened.

63. Mr. Eban, it is most regrettable to have to tell you, who have always called sincerely for a dialogue, according to information and indications we have, that it was you—not you, personally, or course, but you, the Israeli leaders—who insisted upon killing, instead of speaking to, the *fedayeen*.

64. Does this mean that you would speak to other Arabs, but that you plan to kill Palestinians directly or through a particular other European country or by Arab countries, who themselves are intermediaries, whom you often call upon to contribute to your security by asking them to liquidate Palestinians with the threat of terrorizing them, as you have recently done in Syria and in Lebanon.

65. Mr. Eban, mark these words:

"A few months ago, I said what I thought about Palestinian terrorism. I spoke out freely. Inevitably, you provoke terrorism when you reduce fanatical believers in a just cause to a hopeless situation.

"But the people I am talking about are not terrorists. They are simply martyrs. They will die with their weapons in their hands as heroes, as did the martyrs of the Warsaw ghetto. Like the Christian martyrs in the Coliseum, they have no weapon but their faith, but their decision to stand without flinching and accept the supreme sacrifice. In making this act of faith, this willingness, this act of will to sacrifice themselves, they are not humbled; they grow in stature. True, the Palestinian problem still stands in all its complexity. Rebellion cannot solve it. Terrorism will not solve it. Obstinate repression cannot solve it either. This problem, like so many others, is now in the lap of the United Nations.

"This delay has already cost too much suffering and created too much hatred. In Palestine, as in the rest of the world, we must have peace, and there is no lasting peace unless it is a just peace.

"Why does that Government stubbornly maintain its position? I know it is not its responsibility alone, and that more or less consciously or unconsciously, almost all the Governments of the world and the United Nations itself have at one time or another been its active or passive accomplices in this ghastly drama of Palestine. Why fall into recrimination? We must put an end to this. The universal appeal for justice is irresistible. We must ask mercy on these unhappy persons who, after so many tribulations and sufferings, legitimately and naturally seek the refuge of a homeland, their homeland. It is natural that in emerging from so many trials they dream of an asylum in a land which would be theirs, where they would find themselves among their equals with other free men and where they might at last be able to count on breathing, working and seeing their children grow up in a secure and brotherly atmosphere.

"That is my position. I never touch on this question without some qualms. I ardently hope that circumstances will allow this to be the last time I have to deal with this matter."

66. Mr. Abba Eban, all those noble words are not mine. They are not the words of an Arab, some impassioned speaker or some stranger. They are the words of a great man, a great mind—dead now. You know that. You know all this, but perhaps you do not know whose words they are. I have said they were the words of a great man—Léon Blum. I have quoted them at length because they very clearly express the views of the Palestinians of today, having in their day expressed the feelings of the Jews of the Exodus in 1947. These words were written in 1947.

67. So, Mr. Eban, you see the danger that hangs over you, that threatens us all, is perhaps your tendency not to see facts as they are and not to link them with the future, and above all to keep from thinking about the future as clearly as Léon Blum did and as he asked others to do. Or perhaps you think of it too narrowly. You are keeping yourself down, torturing yourself by not wanting to change, by forbidding yourself to move, by setting yourself up, by stiffening your posture in formalism and the mould of procedure. By holding occupied territories as a direct surety, by creating a *fait accompli* elsewhere, by encouraging flight in other areas, by organizing the repression of Palestinians everywhere, you obtain for yourself, for us all and for the region a guarantee of unhappiness in the future.

68. Have you not thought that hatred is now reaping its twenty-fifth harvest? That in the course of three wars were fought and won, all the Palestinian families were dismembered, dispersed, separated and strained and many other Arab families as well. And how many seeds of revolt have been sown in the region? What scale of values do you speak of? To what precedents do you refer? Tell us if you are ready to leave Jerusalem. Are you ready to accept a Palestinian homeland, a Palestinian State. Tell us what form of coexistence with the Palestinians you choose, and

precisely what frontiers you would like. Are you for these objective arrangements for peace?

69. Mr. Eban, we believe you are sincere in what you say, and it is that that concerns us so much, because we must then wonder if in the final analysis it is in your régime's nature to be able to make peace. Above all do not say that the Arabs, the Palestinians themselves, avoid dialogue aimed at peace. Propose valid conditions for peace and you will be astonished by the sense of responsibility and the constructive spirit of the most intransigent of the Arab leaders, including the Palestinians.

70. In a state of war there can be talk only of war.

71. I apologize for having spoken heatedly and at such length. However, when we see the international situation evolving and among the shadows, there are pale glimmerings of light. The United States is engaged in useful dialogues with Peking and Moscow and even with Hanoi in order to reduce tension in the world. When we consider that the thorny question of Berlin is solved; when we see Germany and its neighbours embarking on a process of co-operation; when, finally, we see European countries working together to try to achieve a fresh climate of confidence and security among themselves; when the international community becomes more and more insistent in its demand for peace, it is a shame to note that there still exist vestiges of colonial era, racism or even zionism, casting their shadows over the map of Africa or parts of the Middle East.

72. Sooner or later the frontiers of disapproval and isolation will close round these islands of hatred and racism. May this wish become a message, the one which resounds in Jerusalem, that of the one God, the God of the Jews, the Christians and the Moslems, calling men, all men, to brotherhood and concord. We will be worthy of Jerusalem, God, man, the United Nations and ourselves if we work to make this message a reality.

73. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): Mr. President, at the outset I wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the stewardship of this session of the Assembly, a responsibility upon which you have embarked with tact and dynamism. Our congratulations also go to the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, who is approaching the close of his first full year with us. To you we pledge unflinching co-operation, to him unflinching support.

74. There have been two recurring themes in the general debate this year, terrorism and *détente*—two seemingly unreconcilable phenomena. In this statement I wish essentially to address myself to those two questions.

75. Since the Second World War, which gave man the impetus to organize along international lines in the hope of controlling dangers to peace and security at various structural levels, the world has witnessed radical changes which have revolutionized concepts of time and space and therefore given new dimensions to the global interdependency of man. What happens in another country, even in a village of peasants, is no longer the isolated concern of those immediately involved but is the concern of all.



76. The world has also witnessed the awakening of man to his birth-rights and the realization by nations that no people is good enough to be another people's master.

77. But in spite of this awakening and interdependency, violence is still rending the world. This violence in the world only constitutes a small part of a much more pervasive problem of disorder resulting from human indignities and tragedies that now afflict the larger portions of mankind across the globe but which rarely find adequate representation in media that are often motivated by self-seeking ends exclusively. Indeed, only when remote problems leave a sign on our door-steps do we seem to realize that we are not on an isolated island of peace and security, that we are in the midst of a sea of human indignity, suffering and tragedy.

78. The world is plagued by terror—terror within and terror without the bounds of our countries; terror by individuals as well as terror by groups of individuals and States. Within, it is often a reaction against inequities of birth or inequalities of worth or repulsion against the moral asphyxia of a decaying civilization. Without, it is a revolt against colonial servitude, territorial aggression or national humiliation. In all those cases, terror is motivated neither by an innate disposition to violence nor by a propensity for spite. Instead it is a response to inner torments born out of inequity and frustration. In all those cases nothing is wanton. Wanton terror by individuals or groups of individuals stands condemned. At the national level it is a grievous affliction; at the international level, an unmitigated disaster. No Government that believes in a better world order and the well-being of man can wink at the former or license the latter.

79. If we are genuinely seeking to deliver mankind from violence in all its forms, we had better address ourselves not only to its consequences but also to its genesis. The failure to realize fully the interdependency of the local, national and regional interests of the world community has generally resulted in the inability of the world Organization to appreciate the root-causes of problems often grounded on the lower and intermediate levels of the world structure.

80. If we have opposed, therefore, the inclusion of this item [*item 92*] in the agenda of this Assembly, we have not done so because we are challenging either the initiative of the Secretary-General to deal with a universal adverse phenomenon or the duty of this Organization to handle wilful actions that threaten the very fabric of civilized society. What we have wished to guard against is the exploitation of the item and the occasion by those whose convictions are suspect and whose virtue is questionable. The way in which this debate has unfolded has borne us out.

81. It is revealing that of all those that have spoken on terror the three countries that have chosen to make the subject a major theme of their statements are those that have flouted every single resolution relating to them passed by the competent organs of this Organization, including the supreme peace-making organ, the Security Council, in their efforts to establish peace and order. Need I say that the unholy trinity I am referring to is South Africa, Portugal and Israel?

82. South Africa devoted one-quarter of its statement [*2046th meeting*] to telling the world that terrorism derives from the rejection of dialogue and must be condemned whatever the motivations leading to it. Portugal, with one-third of its statement [*2048th meeting*] on the subject, chose to preach to the world that no desire for justice or reform and no eagerness for liberation could justify the use of force. Israel, with over half of its statement [*2045th meeting*] on terrorism, tried to talk this Assembly into believing that the most rampant terror in the world today is that which has its roots in Arab hostility to Israel and that in the rest of the world all is milk and honey. It is declarations such as those that explain the position of many of us who advised caution; and it is declarations such as those that make us ask whether words really mean what they say. The term "terrorism" becomes overloaded. In fact it is so overloaded that it has become vacuous. Perhaps it is here that we should start: by defining the meaning of "terrorism". Wisdom, in the words of Socrates, begins with the definition of terms. Oratorical virtuosity, consummate fabrications and insolent demagoguery cannot lead us very far.

83. Yes, let us deal with terrorism. Let us deal with it as we see it: in the pestilence of colonialism that pollutes our continent; in racialism, that defiles our societies; in the tragedies suffered by the innocent peoples of Asia, where bombardment is incessant and armies, despite all the peace overtures, are still marching on with drum and fife; in the wilful attacks from the air and land on the peaceful hamlets and innocent women and children of Lebanon. The speakers who have decided to try to keep this Organization during this session in a spasm of anxiety cannot tell us that individual deaths are tragedies and mass murders are only statistics.

84. It is colonialism, racialism, territorial aggrandizement and the wanton use of force by States that are the mortal enemies of peace and the conduct of civilized human intercourse among peoples and nations.

85. In Africa, for example, if the United Nations were to be judged only on its record in questions of decolonization and racial discrimination there would be little reason for gratification over its achievements. It is now exactly 26 years since the Organization became involved with African problems, when India in 1946 raised the question of racial discrimination in South Africa.<sup>1</sup> Since then the General Assembly and the Security Council have between them passed about 130 resolutions, while the International Court of Justice has delivered not less than half a dozen opinions, all on questions of decolonization and racial discrimination in Africa. Many of those resolutions and opinions have disappeared into the morass of good ideas that "might have been". For all its involvement in those questions, spread over a quarter of a century, the United Nations has not been able to improve the lot of Africans and thereby halt the now accelerating drift towards a major conflict and the escalation to more violence; and the extent of this spiral is anybody's guess.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second part of first session, Joint Committee of the First and Sixth Committee, annexes, annex 1 (document A/149)*.

86. In Rhodesia a rebellious white supremacist clique representing only 4.9 per cent of the population is growing in arrogance and revelling in repression. Its racialism is too deeply implanted to abdicate its place to charity and reason.

87. In the Portuguese Territories about one half of the still dependent 30 million people of the world live. Portugal has yet to learn that the invariable purpose of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] was the hastening of independence.

88. All these are not isolated incidents and the United Nations has not failed to relate them to world peace and order. The Security Council and the General Assembly have since 1961 resolved that *apartheid* would endanger international peace and security and requested all States to consider such steps, singly or collectively, as were open to them to get South Africa to abandon its policies.

89. The United Nations has also committed itself, since 1968, to economic sanctions under Articles 42 and 43 of the Charter, having determined that the situation created by the Rhodesian rebellion "constitutes a threat to peace". If Africa resorts to force, as indeed it has, and with the blessing of its heads and elders who decided at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] at Rabat to double their support of the liberation movements, it is doing so only to rid the world of an affliction which is insidiously undermining civilized society and to lance a festering sore that is about to pollute its whole body.

90. In the Middle East, where territories of three Member States have been under foreign occupation for over five years, where a whole people has for nearly three decades been suffering the indignation of forced refuge, and where ceaseless bombardments are carried out on the innocent, violence also is rampant.

91. The Foreign Minister of Israel, by the prevarication of established historical facts acknowledged by this Organization and reaffirmed repeatedly by different organs, wanted to relate this violence to what he considers the villain of the play. He asked:

"... is it true that there is a distinct people"—meaning the Palestinian people—"deprived of self-determination, languishing in poverty, squalor and humiliation, dependent on organized violence as its sole prospect of redemption?" [*2045th meeting, para. 109.*]

And without taking a breath Mr. Eban replied, unabashedly, to his own question: "Nothing could be further from the truth." [*Ibid.*] Here again we have an example of the futility of this debate on terror, where words mean different things to different people.

92. But we do not have to quibble with words to establish the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, their existence being a reality denied only by Mr. Eban. Mr. Eban is the last person to be unaware of the reason why the General Assembly resolution of November 1947 [*resolution 181 (II)*]-to which Israel owes its very existence-

was called "the partition resolution". Partition of what? And partition between whom?

93. This very Assembly resolved, by its resolution 194 (III), that the Palestinians had a right to return to their homes or to be compensated if they chose not to do so. That resolution has recurred at every ensuing session. But neither repatriation nor compensation has taken place, because of Israeli intransigence, which Mr. Eban crowned last week with his negation of the very existence of the Palestinian people. Such an outlook is not conducive enough to a rational consideration of the question at issue.

94. The crowning irony comes when Israel requests this Organization to engage in a process of law-making banning international terrorism. And the irony is doubled when this request is made in the very statement telling us, in dealing with the Arab-Israeli question, that the United Nations atmosphere—and I quote Mr. Eban—is not "congenial to the craftsmanship of peace" [*2045th meeting, para. 68*]. That statement is the supreme contribution of Israel to the demise of the United Nations peace-keeping effort in the Middle East.

95. It was therefore no surprise to anybody that the Israeli statement, in addition to its disdain for all United Nations resolutions relating to the rights of the Palestinian people, was devoid of any reference to Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which the Foreign Minister of Israel himself described last year as the only basis of United Nations jurisprudence in the matter [*2015th meeting*]. For the rest of us, Mr. Maurice Schumann spoke lucidly and aptly when he said

"... does any people or country of the Middle East not understand that for its independence to be definitively ensured it must be sheltered from the interplay of outside scheming or rivalries? To this fundamental question there can only be a definitive and sure answer here, not elsewhere." [*2041st meeting, para. 80.*]

96. It takes a lot of courage for a plaintiff to come to equity while engaged in unconscionable practice, one basic maxim of the law of equity being; he who comes to equity must come with clean hands. And it takes a lot of arrogance to seek justice while showing contempt for the bench and ridiculing the jury.

97. On the same theme, the United States has come to this Assembly with a draft resolution [*A/C.6/L.851*]. The basic defect in that draft resolution is that it ends where it should have begun. The main point should be to urge Member States to address themselves to the sources of tension. As long as there is subjugation and inequity people will always resort to violence to reach goals that are unreachable otherwise.

98. Revolutions have never been concomitant with the sanctity of human life. This mode of social behaviour is neither African nor Asian. It was the United States itself that won its independence through violence, years before Robespierre delivered to the world his dictum that in revolution "terror is justice, prompt, secure and inflexible" and that revolution should "conduct people by reason and enemies of the people by terror". And unless flagrant

injustices are removed, unless gross inequities are eradicated, unless bitterness is basically extirpated from the hearts of men, the concept of people and enemies of the people will remain to be determined by subjective measuring rods depending on whom and what you relate to. And unless a better and more civilized system of world order is established, in which states breaking the law of nations are brought to account, incidents of wanton terror can neither be isolated nor adequately controlled.

99. A world organization that does not address itself to those objective realities of multiple yet interdependent and interactive dimensions is likely to be fragmented and preoccupied with the visible manifestations of problems on the international level, while leaving their root-causes embedded in the deceptively remote and even isolated national or regional corners of foreign lands. Such an organization will be not only ineffective, but indeed shaken by the undercurrents of frustrations and discontent in those remote corners.

100. the phenomena of violence as a mode of expressing a grievance or rebelling against an injustice, and that of détente as an outcome of new alignments among States, are not necessarily paradoxical. The dynamics of human endeavour are now revealing new trends of realignment in search of alternative methods of tackling problems. We are witnessing a narrowing gulf between the big Powers in their attempt to solve their problems and promote their mutual national or regional interests, thus averting violence on their soil while continuing it, by proxy, on foreign soil. In other words, violence is being exported to us.

101. Détente and the composition of differences are welcome as long as they do not reflect a preoccupation with problems of immediate national interest, to the exclusion of international problems, or degenerate into a conspiracy of silence. The absence of a single reference to Africa in the Moscow Declaration that mapped out all the problem areas of the world is an example of the former. The irrational position of some western Powers on the issue of Rhodesia in the Security Council is an example of the latter.

102. On the other hand, new alignments among the small Powers are taking place; old ones are being reinforced. The Rabat meeting of the African Heads of State and Government and the Georgetown Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, and their outcome, are reflections of this trend. In so far as those meetings are focusing on regional or selected international problems, where the minds are at one, the trend is positive and promising. But in so far as the trend is founded on the failure of the international Organization to solve problems, it is disconcerting.

103. The new alignments and international syndicalism are duly leading to what the Foreign Minister of Brazil has aptly described, in his open statement here as the "diplomatic marginalization of the United Nations" [2038th meeting, para. 33]. Some of us might be deluded into thinking that our salvation is in clubbism and interdependency of interests.

104. But interdependency of interests implies more than building policies on competitive interaction and interdependence. It requires positive co-operation towards the achievement of the common goal of human dignity in all aspects of life. It requires the global sharing of power, of material wealth, of spiritual well-being and of scientific and technological advantages. And all this requires a change in the fundamental chemistry of international relations.

105. But in all this where does the United Nations come in? The Georgetown Conference, whose final Act is now in the hands of the Secretary-General, precisely addressed itself to this question. We have all reaffirmed our faith in the Charter of the United Nations, but the Charter is not a fetish. And we have all pledged our support to the Organization, but the Organization will have to change with time. We have all called for the democratization as well as the increased universalization of the United Nations. China is now in our midst and we are the richer by its presence.

106. Institutions, like men, grow and become obsolescent. Change is imperative if there is to be a new international order based on justice and fair play; it is only the dead who do not change. To achieve this goal, some modification of the Charter and review of the role of various organs are indispensable.

107. The process is not unknown to the United Nations. Amendments have been introduced to the Charter. Less dramatic, but equally important, is the evolution of the Charter provisions through the various liberal and creative interpretations given to them. The Charter, like all living constitutions, was meant to be adaptive and self-regulating.

108. Such an endeavour must be undertaken with both imagination and realism. And realism might lead us to accept, but not become resigned to, certain facts of life. Article 2, paragraph 7 and Article 27 of the Charter, read together, teach us that there is a two-tier concept of equality. What is to be challenged, therefore, is not the weighted power of some States, inherent in the Charter, as much as the wanton exercise of such power. Power is to be disciplined and its exercise civilized, for, when power is unguided by enlightened principle and high purpose, it can only spell disaster in the end.

109. I have alluded to regional realignments and endeavours which are motivated by the desire of nations and regional organizations to tackle their immediate problems, thus enabling them to come to grips with their own urgent needs. Such alignments may frustrate international co-operation in the tackling of political, economic, social and cultural problems.

110. Fortunately this is not invariably the case. We in the Sudan do not boast of any achievements in this field but we have an experience which, though local, is a microcosm of many problems now faced in many parts of the world. The co-operation we have received from various friendly Governments, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as from voluntary organizations, also testifies to the significance of our example as a microcosm of world problems and the potentialities of co-operation in their solution at all levels.

111. The case in point is our solution to a national problem which has afflicted our country with civil strife—17 years old—which cost us many lives, frustrated our development and fostered resentment and bitterness instead of solidarity and patriotism among brothers and sisters. The so-called Arab North and African South of our country are one people with a lot more in common than the world has heard, but the legacy of colonial isolationist and divisive policies left deep gulf that erupted into hostilities which the successive Governments tried—some genuinely and some half-heartedly—to end, without avail.

112. Our Government realized that the common good of the nation was interdependent with the interests of all its citizens as reflected in their sharing in political power and in the advantages of the economic, social and cultural development of their region. By formulating and implementing a system of regional autonomy, the Government met the political aspirations of the people of the South and has now embarked on an extensive programme of immediate relief, resettlement, and rehabilitation of refugees and returnees.

113. The refugee example is noteworthy because it is unprecedented. For over half a century, since Fridtjof Nansen embarked on the first international refugee programme, problems of refugees were solved through either their assimilation in host countries or their return to their homes following military victory. This is the first time in the history of international refugee efforts when refugees, hundreds of thousands of them, are returning to their homes both peaceably and voluntarily, out of their own accord and volition.

114. The international dimension of the Sudanese experience is evident not only in our accommodation of multiplicity and diversity within unity and community of interest, but also in the co-operation and assistance we have received from the outside world—co-operation and assistance from sister countries, joined to us by bonds of brotherhood, and a world family that saw in our experience a fresh breath of sanity.

115. And now, with peace restored, we cannot fail to address ourselves to the other phase of peace-making: social and economic development. Peace and security cannot be fragmented into political, economic, social or cultural components in the vain hope of solving the one without tackling the other. Development is a precondition for stability and expansion and a fundamental prerequisite for international peace and security. As such, the development of the proletarian nations of the world is an international responsibility as well as a national one. The very philosophy underlying the provisions of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [resolution 2626 (XXV)] stems from the awareness that the international community has a global responsibility for the solution of social and economic problems.

116. Our economic and social development is keeping pace neither with our own needs nor with the growth of world trade and development. The results are wide-spread poverty, endemic malnutrition and inadequate education.

117. The present international economic order may not be capable of accommodating the needs and expectations of the developing world, whether because of the wasteful distortion of priorities, the widening gap between the national interests of the affluent and those of the have-nots, or the absence of generally accepted norms. To those questions and others we shall devote our efforts in the appropriate Committee of this Assembly.

118. For many of us this year is the year of the environment. It is the year of man's unity with nature. However, there is an irony in this situation which did not escape the attention of my learned friend the Foreign Minister of Guyana. He said:

“... it would be futile to develop a planetary strategy based on the unity of man with other life forms while ignoring those factors of inequality that frustrate and destroy the unity of mankind, and those realities of tension and conflict that impair the quality and threaten the existence of human life itself...” [2038th meeting, para. 110.]

119. The irony is supreme. But, despite all the alarms on violence and terror as well as all the frustrations and desperations of the afflicted, we cannot but continue our pilgrim's progress. The United Nations will have no choice but to devote all its efforts to those human tragedies that are still awaiting their catharsis.

120. To that end the Sudan pledges its support to the Organization, which remains, despite all its failings, the abiding corner-stone of world peace and stability as well as of the well-being of man.

121. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, in calling upon you to lead the work of this session, the General Assembly has recognized in you the qualities required by such high responsibilities, which your predecessor, Mr. Adam Malik, carried out with competence and distinction. If that election is a tribute to your qualities and your experience, it is also a tribute paid to your country, whose fate for centuries was linked to almost all the painful changes that occurred in Europe through which its sons, generation after generation, did honour to the independence of peoples and the dignity of man.

122. It is also the consecration of the universality of our Organization, because all of the Member States without exception are entitled to assume the highest positions in it. This privilege is all the more deserved because Poland, of which you are one of the leaders, has with courage and equanimity made a signal contribution to the abatement of tension in Europe and to the strengthening of what we already call, with reason I hope, international détente.

123. It is not in order to exercise the demons of the hot war or the cold war that we like to call the present development in international relations a détente stage. Of course, the present state of the world still provides many serious reasons for concern, preoccupation and even anguish, and the road will still be long and difficult before the international community can feel that it is confidently

moving towards that security and peace to which it aspires. But this evolution, timid and problematical as it may be, is already substantially changing the nature and quality of relations among the main Powers, whose antagonisms and confrontation were precisely the main source of the crisis which has marked the last 25 years. A series of events has occurred in the last two years which had been impossible to conceive of, at least not in the near future, in any analysis of the previous international situation.

124. The visit of Chancellor Brandt to Warsaw, the meetings between the leaders of the two Germanys, the Moscow summit and the ratification of the German-Soviet agreements are the most significant stages of this process which has made it possible to substitute dialogue for mistrust, at least with respect to the problems of Europe, a region which was one of the most serious hotbeds of crises in the post-war period.

125. Another series of events has spread the same spirit to Asia and paved the way for making the most striking changes of our times. The restoration to People's China of all its rights and its admission to the United Nations, and the visit of President Nixon to Peking are in fact significant portents that the great Powers have realized the limits of the respective powers and have undertaken from now on progressively to normalize their relations.

126. In Asia again, the visit of the Prime Minister of Japan to China and the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries at one stroke changed all the political considerations to which we had become accustomed and opened a new chapter in their history and in that of all mankind. The agreement between those two countries, the one with all its potential and the other with all its power, promises Asia an international role genuinely in keeping with its size and is a primary feature in the change in the world balance. Moreover, the constant readjustment of this balance, in our view, offers the best chance of safeguarding international peace and security.

127. The non-aligned countries, which had organized themselves during the most crucial years of the cold war and held out against pressure as well as persuasion, can today be legitimately proud of having been able, through the mere force of their conviction, to set themselves aside from the influence of either block. Their principles and their action were to a very large extent important factors in the evolution of relations among the great Powers. If they rejoice in seeing that détente is emerging in one part of the world or has already become consolidated in another, they remain watchful and sometimes apprehensive of the risk that the new balance established among the great Powers might confront those Powers with the temptation of engaging in a simple reapportionment of roles, influences and interests in the various parts of the world. They want this détente to be indivisible and beneficial to the whole of the international community. In this very hall over a full decade they have made of this a profession of faith whose defence was not always without its dangers.

128. In this connexion, I should like to pay a tribute to U Thant, who had felt and shared in this aspiration and who contributed with remarkable patience to the emergence of this new political context which brought us from

the cold war to détente. I also know, Mr. Secretary-General, what esteem and trust have been reposed in you, and I am convinced that with the qualities that you possess which have long since established your reputation that you will be able to lead us from détente to peace.

129. A few minutes ago I spoke of the wish of countries such as mine to see this détente spread to all parts of the world, and despite the most natural feeling of national egoism, I have recorded Morocco's satisfaction at the emerging signs that peace is returning to some continents. But the continent of which Morocco is a part is still outside this charmed circle. The international community, which in the past quarter of a century has undertaken a deep reconsideration of the philosophies and values upon which it bases its behaviour and which succeeded in changing its structure on the basis of a more tolerant ethic, still runs up against the colonial concept which, on the African continent, has assumed its most inhuman and most intolerable form since that phenomenon spread by successive waves over our continent during the last century. These foundations of colonialism, which were none the less solemnly repudiated within the framework of the new morality governing relations among peoples, still persist in Africa, where the process of decolonization which began in the 1950s has not been accelerated as we would have wished. And yet there are still nations with the most advanced civilizations which practise colonialism and others which support it, while both in the past either through their religion or their humanism have played a very important role in the changes brought about in relations among men. How are we to explain the indifference or the inertia shown by some Powers in this very Organization which sometimes, without any reason other than that of an alliance, ignore the courageous and desperate struggle of peoples aspiring to achieve their respect and dignity?

130. Aware of this immobility, if not of this helplessness, those peoples have been taking their fate into their own hands to an ever-increasing extent and have irrevocably chosen the narrow and painful road of struggle. This courage has earned them the sympathy and assistance of a large sector of the international community. But the African States in particular feel that it is their overriding duty to help and support these peoples. During the last summit meeting of the OAU, which my country had the honour of welcoming at Rabat, the member States demonstrated in the most striking terms their wide and effective support of these peoples. The liberation of Africa was the dominant theme of the meeting and practical measures were taken to ensure that the struggle will be supported wholeheartedly. But if they are determined to wage an all-out struggle because it has been forced upon them by their opponents, they know that this Organization, by reason of its Charter and its political action, could shorten that suffering. What can be the power of South Africa or Portugal which allows them to claim that they are and will remain Members of this Organization and sometimes to behave here in an arrogant fashion while they contemptuously and disdainfully ignore the innumerable resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly with the support of most of the great Powers? What is Southern Rhodesia compared to the power of Great Britain in the first instance, and of the international majority

which has condemned its secession and the policy of brutal segregation which followed thereon.

131. It is true that the Secretary-General recently travelled to South Africa and Namibia and that he engaged in difficult talks with the Pretoria leaders. Without underestimating the positive nature of that initiative and of the new mission now being undertaken by the Secretary-General's representative for Namibia, we shall not harbour any illusions until we become convinced that because of these efforts the South African authorities will consent to engage in a dialogue within the meaning of international decisions defining the legal status of that Territory, and within the terms of the resolutions clearly setting out the steps for its liberation. Ambassador Escher, the representative of the Secretary-General, enjoys our confidence. I hope that he will provide us elements likely to make us less sceptical.

132. As for Portugal, which is waging a total war in three regions of Africa, it should begin by realizing that, despite the means placed at its disposal, the resistance movements in Guinea (Bissau), as in Angola and Mozambique, have succeeded in establishing themselves in those Territories with a remarkable organization that makes it possible to associate with them all of the liberated populations in a venture that becomes more effective day by day. What indication could Portugal give us to make us understand that this country is finally ready to engage in a dialogue with the United Nations which could progressively substitute politics for war? The nationalist leaders confronting it have proven their courage, their authority and their ability and are able to shoulder all their responsibilities. Africa has also clearly assumed its responsibilities: it supports their resistance, it determinedly and tirelessly pursues its political action at the international level and within this Organization. However, this same Africa which is still plagued by difficulties inherent in its rapid change and which is still confronted, both at home and abroad, with problems that are at times insurmountable, has proved at Rabat that it was capable of overcoming the problems inherent in its evolution and in the clarification of its interstate relations, just as it has shown itself able to cope with its responsibilities at the international level with the realization that it is an important factor in international life and that, for the world to feel concern for its problems, it must, in its turn, join ever more closely in the settlement of the world's affairs. These are the factors which the friends of Africa, as well as its opponents, have called the spirit of Rabat. We hope that next year this spirit will live again in another African capital.

133. But to this analysis which, at the start of this statement, I intended to be a positive one, I must add that Africa is not the only area where the situation obliges us to recognize the persistence of tensions and dangers still threatening security and peace. It has by now become a chronic phenomenon, especially during the last five years, for this Organization to consider the situation created in the Middle East by the Israeli against several States in that region at a pace which does away with the myth of the cease-fire and brutally reminds us that the aggression is continuous and generalized. This Organization has taken a whole series of decisions, at the level of both the Security Council and the General Assembly, establishing a frame-

work for the search for a solution aimed at eliminating the results of the aggression of 1967, and especially at evacuating the occupied Arab territories and recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestine people.

134. Numerous approaches were undertaken both within the framework of these resolutions and among the great Powers in their talks, or through the initiative of one country or another. The Arab States have constantly lent their support to these approaches and have set up no obstacles in their way. But Israel has, invariably, on one pretext or another, blocked all such action and every such initiative. It rejects the resolutions of the Security Council, it refuses to engage in any co-operation no matter how slight with the representative of the Secretary-General, it denounces agreement among the four great Powers, it even opposes the Rogers plan. What is more, while opposing any search for a just and equitable solution, it continues its attacks, on an increasingly violent scale, against Syria and Lebanon, in particular. Convinced that it can rely on the requirements of a particular combination of circumstances in the internal life of a great Power, in one single week it launched two attacks against Syria and bombed and invaded the territory of Lebanon. And when the Security Council meets to consider these deliberate aggressions, the exercise of the veto by one permanent member guarantees the absence of any Council decision against Israel.

135. It is particularly dangerous to international peace that a situation such as the one now prevailing in the Middle East should continue without being given serious attention, as if this Organization and the international conscience that it is supposed to represent had abdicated before a fait accompli carried out with inexplicable impunity. What does Israel hope for? Is it hoping that, once it is assured of this indifference and this impotence on the part of the United Nations, it could, at will, launch its aggression against any country it chooses, for which it is free to define the objective and determine the duration? Well, this is now the fact, and the vetoes in the Security Council will henceforth assure it that it can repeat these aggressions without any risk to itself.

136. On several occasions the leaders of the Arab countries directly concerned have clearly announced their readiness to support any initiative that, with full respect for existing resolutions and while preserving their dignity, would serve to set in motion a process capable of facilitating the restoration of peace to the area. After five years, this show of goodwill and patience has been put to the test and these States, conscious of their responsibilities to their own peoples find themselves constrained to resort more and more to other possibilities that certainly do not bring peace any closer.

137. This situation was vigorously denounced this year by all of the African States meeting in June at Rabat, and by the 62 non-aligned countries meeting in August at Georgetown. The persistence of the crisis and its unforeseeable future course can be laid only at the door of Israel and those members of the international community whose indifference is interpreted by Israel as tacit encouragement. In the face of such a clear-cut situation there can be no alibi. Especially not the alibi called terrorism.

138. We do not hesitate to declare solemnly that we are opposed to all forms of violence, that blood shed by violence must be deplored, whatever the nationality, the race or the religion of the victim. For several decades we in fact have always been on the side of the victim of violence rather than on that of its perpetrators. And if today the explosive power of certain words is deliberately being intensified, it is exclusively for the purpose of adjusting them to their intended use. First of all, what is terrorism? We exclude from the definition that people are now trying to work out any act motivated by the defence of a legitimate and inalienable right which the law has failed to protect. This principle, in our view, applies as much as to an individual as to a group and, *a fortiori*, to an entire people. An objectively violent act, may have legitimate motivations and, speaking of the actions of Palestinians, let us clearly say that this involves the expression of one of the most painful aspects of the crisis in the Middle East, namely, that where there is aggression there is necessarily resistance.

139. The Palestine people was coldly and cynically abandoned in 1948; half of that people remained as hostage to those occupying its country; half was driven from its houses, its lands, beyond its border, to yield its place to foreigners coming from every corner of the globe. That people for a long time hoped that those supposedly assisting it would help in the recovery of its homeland and its dignity. The Arab countries for 25 years have tried to denounce the flagrant injustice committed against their people with the blessing of those who today criticize them. They have failed so far. But a new generation, raised in frustration, often in poverty, has, on coming of age, at least regained the moral and unalterable inheritance of which nothing can deprive a great people: its dignity. To express this thirst for justice and dignity it has tried the only ways and means which the political order existing in the world has left at its disposal. These were ineffectual, since its rights continued to be ignored. This international community, from which it sought justice, apparently did not understand its despair and its cry for help, while like all people in history, it used the sublime recourse which is the gift of life itself to remind the world of its existence. There is no need to seek elsewhere, other than to understand the actions of the sons of this lost Palestine.

140. That truth, which we painfully feel and which we express with the utmost regret, is also useful in our opinion to the search for a true peace in this area, a vital part of the Mediterranean basin. And, we, at the opposite end of the Mediterranean are trying to work out and agree, with our neighbours of the south and the north, on the basis for a co-operation likely to ensure to all of us permanent security and prosperity. The Maghreb, if it has not yet succeeded, is progressing happily with confidence in and respect for that unity which is the deep aspiration of all its peoples.

141. On the shores of Europe, the Common Market is expanding and Europe is working on a political unity which we think could be a positive factor in the stability which Europe has been seeking since the end of the war, the stability necessary to ensure to it its rightful role in the

world. Linked by history, convinced of the similarity of our interests and desirous to the same extent of avoiding falling under the hegemony of the great Powers, we are formulating together the hope of finding around this sea sufficient motivation to strengthen our ties in a solid and lasting way.

142. We rejoice in the possibility, which we hope will come about very soon, of a conference on European security. The peoples of Europe, who throughout history have often had a common destiny, can reasonably expect today to build together a world in which they will recover their true vocation and their common hope. If we greet this conference with joy, we also think that European security would be incomplete and fragile without security for the Mediterranean and for all the peoples living along its shores. That is why we are most interested in having our problems taken into consideration at that conference.

143. If Europe thinks that the Rhine or the Elbe are the axes of its destiny, we believe equally strongly that the Mediterranean is ours, and that we are seriously concerned about this. In Morocco we are gratified by the relationships we maintain with all the countries of the northern coast. There are so many affinities and so many interests binding us together that our will to co-operate with them is an inevitable element in our destiny. I should like to say especially to one of those countries with which we have had a kind of centuries-old historical intimacy, that we are aware of the fact that our positions in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean could in future lead us to establishing closer co-operation than in the past; and while the reservoir of friendship accumulated during that common history is an important factor in any calm consideration of such co-operation, I must say just as frankly that the road towards this common action must be cleared of anything that might give rise to conflicts and misunderstandings.

144. The rather serious dispute which existed between us and Spain has appreciably lightened in recent years, but it still involves fundamental divergencies which continue to be a source of concern. I have in mind the problem of the Sahara. The desire to preserve the potential benefits of the future has consistently led us to seek in frank and loyal dialogue a solution which would redress the consequences of past phenomena which are no longer valid in our present day world, and which Spain has from this very rostrum strongly condemned when it claimed the legitimate return of Gibraltar to its national territory. We have carried forward a dialogue for many years and action at United Nations level in which Spain is no longer facilitating our progress towards a solution, as it did in the past in accordance with our admission.

145. True friends know how to overcome quarrels. Both sides must also be aware of their duty not to sacrifice such important prospects for co-operation to misunderstandings which in the long-run may imperil the deepest friendship.

*The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.*