

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**2368th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 30 September 1975,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*):

Speech by Mr. Sipraseuth (Laos).....	305
Speech by Mr. Allon (Israel).....	307
Speech by Mr. Keutcha (United Republic of Cameroon).....	311
Speech by Mr. Al-Sabah (Kuwait).....	315
Speech by Mr. Ahmed (Sudan).....	318

President: Mr. Gaston THORN
(Luxembourg).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. SIPRASEUTH (Laos) (*interpretation from French*)* It is for me a great privilege to represent Laos at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, a country which is undergoing a profound historic evolution towards genuine peace, independence, democracy, neutrality and prosperity, and to speak from this rostrum for the entire Laotian people.

2. I should like to convey my most cordial greetings to Mr. Gaston Thorn on his election as President of this thirtieth session of the General Assembly. I should like warmly to congratulate Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika, the representative of the glorious People's Democratic Republic of Algeria and President of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, who has tirelessly and effectively worked for world peace, social progress, the democratization of international relations and the cause of the third world, which includes three fourths of the States and two thirds of the population of the globe.

3. I am also pleased to congratulate warmly Mr. Kurt Waldheim for his efforts to implement the ideals of the United Nations.

4. The United Nations this year has admitted to membership the Republic of Cape Verde, the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, and the People's Republic of Mozambique, which we should like to congratulate cordially. However, the delegation of Laos profoundly regrets not to be able to convey the same cordial congratulations to those delegations which, according to international law, are entitled to be in our midst: the delegations of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and Republic of South Viet Nam. These delegations are unfairly kept outside by the United States which, once more abusing its veto power, has prevented their admission to the United Nations.

* Mr. Sipraseuth spoke in Laotian. The French version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

5. We are convinced that the vast majority of representatives here present will express their view on this action by the United States, which once more has shown its contempt for the right of peoples to self-determination and the goals of the United Nations, particularly the principle of universality.

6. The world is a "planetary village". Each great world event has unavoidable international repercussions in various countries. Thus, the delegation of Laos would like to sketch a few characteristics of the present world situation.

7. The inexorable decline of American imperialism is the turning-point of the present situation in a world already fraught with decisive events. It is indeed a decline, an irreversible decline, whatever may be said by American officials, a decline which cause the whole imperialist system to be mired more deeply in a new general crisis.

8. This decline, however, is not without its dangerous convulsions or its perfidious attempts to adapt to new world realities.

9. As we witness imperialism sink into decadence, we see the socialist countries flourishing through vast and stable economic development, a constant improvement in the standard of living of their populations and an increasing support for the national liberation movements and peoples struggling for their independence, peace, democracy and social progress in the world. Despite the difficulties which socialist States have to resolve by the suffering they have undergone and have overcome, they are sharing the force and the vitality of socialism.

10. The third world continues to be the relentless battlefield of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are politically aware and united throughout the world, resolutely joining in a common front against imperialism and neo-colonialism for their liberation, for their national independence, for sovereignty over their economy, for the realization of democracy and for social progress.

11. National liberation movements have increased in number and have obtained or are obtaining many great victories. In this connexion we welcome the internationally significant historic victories of the Vietnamese and Khmer peoples. These victories are also the victories of the Lao people. This triple victory points to a striking truth: today a small, sparsely populated country, determined in its struggle to win, united on a just political path and firmly supported by all peace- and justice-loving peoples, is in a position to vanquish aggression by any kind of imperialism, however powerful, including the leader of imperialism — American imperialism. This solidarity makes the victories of the three peoples of Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos also the victory of the forces of the world struggling for independence, peace and social progress.

12. The victories of the peoples of Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos, and the success of their national liberation movements, opens up a new era, an era of destruction of colonialism, neo-colonialism and an era where peoples are the masters of their own destinies.

13. This era, when peoples are becoming masters of their own destinies, is also noticeable in Western capitalist countries. Equally obvious is the struggle of the workers and democratic forces against capitalism—particularly in Portugal—a struggle which is expanding and finding deeper roots in a manner hitherto unheard of. This struggle is so powerful that it can strike successful blows against imperialism.

14. In the present international situation, when socialist States have obtained striking successes, the world of the courageous and victorious struggle for national independence and freedom, the relentless movement of workers in the capitalist countries have forced imperialism to give way. Extremely important changes are taking place. These are favourable to peoples all over the world who are fighting for peace, national independence and social progress. Imperialism and neo-colonialism, obstinate by their very nature, have not renounced their goal of aggression, domination and exploitation. The peoples of the world are watchful in order to unmask the evil plots of imperialism.

15. The Lao people are proud to have contributed to this new world, through 30 years of long and hard struggle. To recover their fundamental national rights and to establish a veritable peace, they had, within a single generation, to defeat the old French colonialism and conquer American neo-colonialism. That great and heroic victory of the Lao people led to the Vientiane Agreement of 1973, which stipulates respect for the national fundamental rights of Laos, the withdrawal of American military personnel and the cessation of foreign interference in the internal affairs of Laos.

16. To establish their national independence and democracy, to implement the Vientiane Agreement, the peoples continue their mass political struggle which will end in victory, signifying a radical change in the situation of the country. The instruments of war and exploitation of neo-colonialism have been dismantled. The rightist reactionaries, the lackeys of imperialism, have fled abroad; a popular revolutionary administration prevails throughout the country. At last the patriotic peace-loving forces and supporters of national concord, along with the Lao people, have become masters of their country's destiny. The unification of Laos is coming true, which is the first and necessary stage in the construction of an independent, peaceful, democratic, neutral, unified and prosperous Laos.

17. This victory over American interference in Laos opens a new era of independence, democracy and prosperity for the Lao people, and is a victory heretofore unknown in the annals of the struggle of the Lao people against foreign aggression. This victory is an active contribution to the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress in South-East Asia and in the entire world.

18. However, this victory of the Lao people is inseparable from the militant efforts, in all areas, made by all peoples of the world working for peace,

independence, democracy and social progress. May we then, from this rostrum, on behalf of the Lao people, voice our deep gratitude to those peoples who, we are certain, after having given their invaluable support and generous aid to the Lao people in their patriotic war, will continue to accord them the same assistance and support in their efforts for the strengthening of peace and for national reconstruction.

19. The foreign policy of Laos, within the present world situation and the internal situation in Laos, is based on a watchful awareness and safeguarding of its hard-won independence; it represents a tireless effort in the cause of peace and a constant search for neutrality and for the building of a prosperous economy.

20. The scrupulous protection of the fundamental rights of each people seems to us an appropriate means to establish peace among nations. This is implemented, on the one hand, by a struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism and, on the other hand, by active support for the national liberation struggle; for peace; for the social progress of all peoples of the world through the establishment and development of friendly relations with all countries, regardless of their political system, on the basis of mutual respect; and for independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity, excluding any foreign interference in internal affairs, and based on equality and mutual advantage in trade relations and economic co-operation.

21. This is also particularly true of our relations with our sister countries of Viet Nam and Cambodia, with which we are always united in the struggle against the common enemy. Laos will continue to increase its solidarity and constantly develop co-operation with Viet Nam and Cambodia, and assist them in the protection of their national independence and in the building of each of those countries according to their specific capacities and needs. Thus we warmly support the candidacies of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the Republic of South Viet Nam, and we will work for their admission to the United Nations until our efforts are successful.

22. We are pleased to lend our active support to the legitimate efforts of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to secure the withdrawal of all foreign troops—American troops in particular—from South Korea. The Lao people whole-heartedly approve of the struggle of the Korean people to secure the peaceful reunification of their country and to become masters of their own destiny.

23. Similarly, Laos will also broaden friendly relations and step up co-operation with the socialist countries, which provide a solid and firm support to the national liberation movements and to peoples struggling for their national independence. Our relations with the peoples of South-East Asia, and particularly with our neighbours, will also be intensified. Laos fully supports the present struggle of the peoples of that region against United States imperialism in an effort to put an end to its policy of intervention and aggression, to dismantle its military bases and to bring about the withdrawal of all its military personnel.

24. As for the Governments of the South-East Asian countries, Laos is ready to establish with them normal relations based on the strict respect for the

five principles of peaceful coexistence. It is through the strict application of those principles that we have defined relations between Laos and Thailand. Now, inasmuch as former Thai Governments were notorious accomplices of the United States in its aggression against Laos, they should bear the heavy burden of responsibility emerging therefrom. At present, in view of the new situation, and in the interest of the peoples of both countries and of peace in the region, Laos is ready to improve its good-neighbourly relations with Thailand. But it is essential that the Thai Government put an end to its interference in the internal affairs of Laos, that it stop entertaining on Thai territory reactionaries from the Lao extreme right, and that it reject the use of Thai territory by United States imperialism for aggression against Laos and other countries in the region.

25. Laos fully espouses the cause of the non-aligned countries and will bend every effort to step up its militant solidarity with them in the courageous battle against colonialism and neo-colonialism and in the bitter struggle to conquer and defend their national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and their natural resources. Laos reaffirms its full and firm support for the resolutions contained in the Lima Programme for Mutual Assistance and Solidarity [see A/10217 and Corr.1, annex], and we are pleased to note that the vast family of non-aligned countries has again shown its great solidarity in the work of the seventh special session of the General Assembly on development and international economic co-operation.

26. Those countries, we are convinced, will manifest the same solidarity on the Middle East question. The Palestinian people, a people that has been forced out of its national homeland, are struggling tirelessly to recover their fundamental national rights. Laos would request the General Assembly to make every effort to ensure the implementation of United Nations resolutions by the State of Israel, which is an aggressor against the Arab peoples. Laos will continue to lend unstinting support to the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their struggle against the Israeli invaders supported by the American imperialists.

27. Similarly, it will maintain its vigorous support of the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and other countries of southern Africa struggling for their self-determination. Laos severely and categorically condemns, in all its forms and manifestations, the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination pursued by the Pretoria régime. We also reject with equal vigour the illegal régime of Ian Smith, which, defying international public opinion, makes a mockery of the rights and aspirations of the majority of the Rhodesian people.

28. Laos is ready to establish and develop friendly relations with all Western countries without exception, as long as they respect our fundamental national rights and sincerely wish to help us develop our economy, preserve our independence, and allow us to determine our own destiny. As for the United States, it must bear responsibility for the war of aggression that it conducted for long years in Laos. However, since we wish to live in peace and harmony with all nations, the Lao Government envisages establishing friendly relations with the United States on a new basis.

29. The Government of the United States should act on its statement that it wants to participate in the healing of the wounds of war. It should renounce its policy of interference in the internal affairs of Laos. Laos would like to avail itself of this opportunity to send its sincere greetings to the progressive people of the United States, who supported the people of Laos in their long and heroic struggle.

30. Laos is on the road towards a new chapter in its history, towards the consolidation of its independence, towards realizing the deep-seated aspirations of national liberation of its people and the building up of its national economy.

31. Thanks to the historic victory of the Lao people and strengthened by the impartial assistance and the devoted support of the socialist countries, the non-aligned countries and other peoples of the world, Laos is convinced of its ability fully to achieve the goals it has set. It will not fail to make its contribution to the cause of peace and independence of all the peoples of the world.

32. We express our best wishes for the success of the work of this session of the General Assembly.

33. Mr. ALLON (Israel): Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I join the many representatives who have spoken before me in congratulating you most warmly on your election to the presidency of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. You bring to this high office qualities of integrity, intellect and experience which have already carried you to the summit of political responsibility in your own country as well as on the wider European stage. The General Assembly is indeed fortunate that its leader for the coming 12 months will be a statesman deeply loyal to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

34. The annual general debates at the General Assembly provide an occasion for a survey of the working of the international system during the preceding year, and for the public expression of the hopes and fears, the expectations and anxieties, of the Governments representing almost the totality of the population of the world. The present debate seems to me an appropriate opportunity to go a little further—to look back at the 30 years of the life of the United Nations, and to try to appraise its achievements against the standards set by the founders of the Organization when they adopted the Charter in San Francisco on 26 June 1945.

35. The United Nations was born amidst the ruin and devastation of the most terrible war experienced in the recorded history of mankind, a holocaust in which tens of millions of men, women and children lost their lives, among them one third of the Jewish people. Its primary purposes, therefore, were to save succeeding generations from similar catastrophe and to build a better society in which fundamental human rights, equal justice before the law and economic and social advancement would be universally assured.

36. As is inevitable in human affairs, the record is uneven. The most spectacular achievement of this period is unquestionably the virtual disappearance of the classic colonial system. More than half of the present Members of the United Nations, including Israel, were colonial dependencies before 1945; four

—Cape Verde, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, and Papua New Guinea—achieved independence in 1975 and have been or are being admitted to membership at this session. On behalf of the people and the Government of Israel, I am happy to wish them well.

37. The United Nations system, through the United Nations Development Programme and its forerunners and through the specialized agencies, has also registered noteworthy achievements in many branches of economic development, in agriculture, health, labour, transport and other practical fields. The new impetus in the development and codification of international law would hardly have been possible outside the United Nations framework; while the financial and economic organs of the United Nations family, among which one might include the recent seventh special session of the General Assembly which may well presage a new era of international economic co-operation, have become almost indispensable for the proper conduct of the world's business. Those are all positive contributions to the welfare of mankind, even though it is clear that there is still a long way to go.

38. This is unfortunately not the case in other areas. The United Nations has manifestly not saved this generation from the scourge of war. The graves of the millions of victims of armed conflicts in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East and even in Europe bear anguished testimony to this massive failure; while the lofty sentiments and exhortations of a multitude of conventions, declarations and resolutions have had little impact on the flagrant abuse of fundamental human rights and freedoms in vast areas of the globe.

39. It is common form to claim that the fault does not lie in the United Nations system, but in its Members; that the world Organization merely reflects the frailties, the stupidities, the lethargy and the evils of the world itself. This is, of course, true, but it is equally true that a system that encourages contention rather than compromise, extremism rather than tolerance and confrontation rather than negotiation is hardly suited to a world as diverse in race, religion, tradition, geographical circumstances, and social and political practices as is ours.

40. The experience of Israel is a valid example. We belong to no bloc and no alliance. We can count on little support in this Assembly, not because our cause is unjust, not because our views do not meet with sympathy, but because of considerations of unprincipled expediency. We are assaulted every year in language so venomous and vile as to defy all canons of civilized behaviour. In Assembly session after Assembly session in recent years, in conference after conference, resolutions are adopted by automatic majorities, demanding that we submit to this abusive tyranny, that we, in effect, dismantle our State, and that we commit national suicide. No regard whatsoever is paid in these resolutions to truth or to reality.

41. Israel is a democratic State, where, in accordance with our ancient tradition, all individuals and communities enjoy equality before the law and the plenitude of their human rights; yet a resolution of a United Nations body will assert the very opposite as an incontrovertible fact and condemn Israel on the basis of that falsehood.

42. When a World Health Organization expert finds that the medical services provided for the population in the territories under Israeli administration since 1967 are as good as those of any other civilized country and that the people are healthy, a resolution of the General Conference of that specialized agency will declare that they are ridden with disease and bereft of medical attention. When a certified lunatic, not a Jew and a foreigner to boot, sets fire to part of a mosque in Jerusalem, a resolution of the Security Council condemns Israel for the deliberate desecration of that Holy Place. When highly qualified United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization experts establish that Israeli archaeological research in Jerusalem represents a notable contribution to the cultural heritage of mankind, including that of a glorious period of Islamic history, does not contravene the applicable international law and does not endanger other monuments and sites, resolutions adopted by that organization simply ignore those findings and for good measure add sanctions to the routine condemnation. And when Israel, rightly and inevitably, refuses to take notice of these fantasies, as any other Member State would do in its place, it is once again condemned for being awkward and recalcitrant and for flouting the will of the international community.

43. Surely there is something seriously wrong with a United Nations system which is so easily subverted for political blackmail; which, instead of being a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the objectives of the Charter, has become a propaganda battlefield; and where abuse and not reason has become the language of debate. It is surely not beyond the wit of man to arrest this hypocritical and dangerous course before it is too late.

44. In the course of my address to the General Assembly last year, I dwelt on the positive features of the separation of forces agreements which had been concluded earlier that year between Israel and Egypt and Israel and Syria in the wake of the Yom Kippur war of October 1973.¹ I expressed the view that those two agreements represented the first steps, small and hesitant though they may have been, away from the triple negatives adopted by the Conference of Arab Heads of State or Government, held at Khartoum, on 1 September 1967: no peace with Israel, no recognition, no negotiations.

45. Those who sincerely seek peace in the Middle East will surely find cause for satisfaction in the new agreement between Egypt and Israel which was negotiated through the good offices of the President and the Secretary of State of the United States and concluded in Geneva last week. That agreement marks an important step forward. It has much greater political significance than its predecessor.

46. I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to some of the major provisions of this agreement:

“The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Government of Israel have agreed that:

“The conflict between them and in the Middle East shall not be resolved by military force but by peaceful means.

“... .

"The parties hereby undertake not to resort to the threat or use of force or military blockade against each other.

". . .

"This agreement is regarded by the parties as a significant step toward a just and lasting peace. It is not a final peace agreement.

"The parties shall continue their efforts to negotiate a final peace agreement within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference in accordance with Security Council resolution 338 (1973).

"This agreement shall enter into force upon signature of the protocol and remain in force until superseded by a new agreement."2

47. The significance of the agreement does not lie only in the pledge of the parties to continue to observe the cease-fire and to refrain from all military or paramilitary action, or in their undertaking not to resort to the threat or use of force or military blockade, or in their recognition of the essential role of the United Nations Emergency Force and the necessity that it continue its functions, or in the provision concerning the passage of non-military cargoes to and from Israel through the Suez Canal, or even in the renunciation of war as a means to settle the differences between them; rather its significance lies in the belief that it opens a new chapter in the relations between the two countries. Israel for its part will do all it can to ensure that this new chapter will indeed be one of peace. And beyond that we hope that this agreement will pave the way to better relations and peace with all our neighbours.

48. It is a proper opportunity to stress here that the agreement, in all its particulars, was concluded, in response to the free will of two sovereign States. If Egypt and Israel consider that the agreement is advantageous to them—and, moreover, it is a step not directed against any other party—nobody in this General Assembly has the right to censure it or to set himself up as an arbiter of the interests of the parties directly concerned.

49. As I have already stated, both parties to the agreement have recognized the essential role played by the United Nations Emergency Force and I wish to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the officers and men of the Force, who are performing a difficult and delicate task in an exemplary manner; to Lieutenant General Ensio Siilasvuo, who has been identified with the peace-keeping efforts of the United Nations in the Middle East for many years and who has gained the respect and regard of all parties; and to the Secretary-General, who is ultimately responsible for this successful United Nations enterprise. I wish to include in this tribute the commanders, officers and men of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, who also play an important role in the area, and to the Governments which have contributed their personnel to all three United Nations forces.

50. As far as we are concerned, the new agreement is not an end, but the beginning of a process of peace-making. We do not delude ourselves that this will be a simple undertaking, for the making of peace after

so many years of hostility and suspicion will call for qualities of moral courage, understanding and tenacity far greater than those needed for the waging of war. But the beginning must be made—for the sake of this generation and for the sake of the Israeli and Arab children who were surely born to live and create and not to die on the battlefield.

51. Security Council resolution 338 (1973) calls for "negotiations . . . between the parties concerned . . . aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East". From this rostrum I declare that Israel is ready to enter into such negotiations with each and every one of the neighbouring States. I note with regret repeated statements made by the leaders of Syria which reject the whole concept of a genuine peace treaty with Israel. Nevertheless, I should like to hope that this is not their last word. And for our part I solemnly reiterate that the Government of Israel is ready and willing to enter into peace negotiations with Syria without prior conditions, as called for by Security Council resolution 338 (1973), at any place and at any time.

52. In this connexion I wish to emphasize that as far as Israel is concerned the Geneva Peace Conference can be reconvened whenever the parties are ready for it, following adequate preparation. Moreover, in principle, Israel is in favour of any mechanism which will advance the process of negotiation between the parties to the conflict. It will therefore give the idea put forward by the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Kissinger, for an informal multi-lateral consultation most earnest consideration.

53. As I emphasized in my statement at the General Assembly last year, it is self-evident that genuine peace in the Middle East must include a just and constructive solution for the Palestine Arab problem. Israel is fully alive to this problem, probably more so than the majority of those who pronounce freely upon it, and we do not require persuasion of the need to solve it peacefully and honourably. Indeed we insist that this be done. For far too long now the Palestinian Arabs have been used as a pawn on the chess-board of inter-Arab politics; throughout the years they have been the victims of Arab extremism. The solution to their problem therefore demands a change of attitude in the Arab world. The Palestine Arab problem should and can be solved in the context of a peace agreement between Israel and Jordan, which constitutes the major part of the area of historic Palestine on both sides of the river as well as being the homeland of the great majority of the Palestine Arabs.

54. Thus if the matter at issue is a fair and constructive solution for the problem of Palestine Arab identity, Israel's response is emphatically positive. But it is categorically negative about the absurd pretensions of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] to speak in the name of the Palestine Arabs. This congeries of feuding terrorist gangs, whose principal victims are the Arabs of Palestine themselves, and whose primary aim is the annihilation of the State of Israel and the genocide of its people, is neither a valid representative of the Palestine Arab community nor a valid interlocutor for Israel.

55. It should cause no surprise that at the spearhead of the frenzied efforts of the extremist régimes in the Arab world to prevent a political settlement of

the Middle East dispute, and to disrupt the recent agreement between Egypt and Israel, is precisely the PLO.

56. There is nothing more fraudulent than the scheme of this faction to establish, naturally on the ruins of Israel, a so-called democratic secular State in which Moslems, Christians and Jews would, as it were, live in amity and equality. This facile slogan, this transparent propaganda gimmick, has somehow found support among naive and well-meaning people. What is the pattern which the progenitors and supporters of this idea propose to follow? For lack of anything more promising they themselves have put forward the example of Lebanon: Lebanon, which since April of this year has been torn apart by a vicious, sectarian civil war between its Moslem and Christian communities. The latest published estimate of the casualties during these past six months is more than 5,000 killed and nearly 18,000 injured. The material damage is estimated at \$2,500 million. The PLO knows what it means when it talks about the democratic and secular State of Palestine. So do we. We have only to look at the more than 800,000 Jews who have left, or have been driven out of, the Arab countries of the Middle East and North Africa since 1948, or at the tortured existence of the 4,500-odd Jewish hostages left in Syria today, to know what the fate of the Jews of Israel would be if the PLO nightmare were realized. But we know and they know that this will never be.

57. It is one of the anomalies of our times that Israel, which is rigorously excluded from the Middle East region in all that concerns the civilian pursuits of the United Nations and its specialized agencies—such as health, education, meteorology, trade and civil aviation—is emphatically held to be a part of the Middle East region when the discussion turns to military matters, including the supply of arms. If one were cynical one might almost suspect that the reason, in both cases, is to weaken Israel—in one case by boycott, and in the other by depriving it of the means of defence.

58. Be that as it may, the problem of arms control in the Middle East is real and urgent. The area is being swamped by a flood of new and sophisticated military hardware, such as it has never known in all its long history. Each month that passes raises the level of technology, and the price. Tens of billions of dollars which might otherwise be spent on economic and social development—and it must be realized that the population of large parts of the Middle East is among the poorest in the world—are drained off to pay for these instruments of human destruction.

59. Israel is forced to take part in this senseless competition because, given the circumstances in the area, if it did not it would invite immediate aggression. But Israel is ready at any time, even before peace is made, to consult with its neighbours on measures to limit the arms race, with all its dangerous consequences, without materially affecting the relative defensive capacity of any of the parties to the consultation.

60. Israel supports the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East and will be ready to enter into negotiations with all States concerned in order to attain that objective. By negotiations we mean a process of

intergovernmental consultation similar to that which preceded the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) and other international instruments of like character. We do not think that so grave a matter can be settled by correspondence through the Secretary-General.

61. Israel welcomes the signature of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which gave formal expression to the spirit of détente. Only the future will tell if this instrument will serve as a guide for the conduct of the nations in the years to come, or whether it will remain a compilation of pious hopes, like so many international instruments which have been adopted since the end of the Second World War.

62. In this connexion we have of course noted the following passage in the address of the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union to this Assembly on 23 September: "Assessing highly the results of the Conference, the Soviet Union believes that the main task now is to translate the understandings reached into deeds . . .". [2357th meeting, para. 128.]

63. As far as Israel is concerned, we have two criteria for judgement: one, that détente must apply to the Middle East no less than to Europe and to other areas of the world—and so far we have seen no evidence of this; two, that the humanitarian provisions of the Final Act signed at Helsinki must be scrupulously applied. The United Kingdom Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson, expressed this eloquently in his address to the Conference in these words:

"Our work here will be judged not only by the spirit of 'live and let live' which this Conference asserts. It will be judged by how that spirit is reflected in the lives of ordinary families, by such issues as the reunification of families . . . I hope that what we have each today committed ourselves to within Europe can apply also to those within our countries who want to go to start a new life outside Europe, whether in the Middle East or elsewhere."

64. None of the noble provisions of the Final Act have yet been applied to the Jewish national minority in the Soviet Union. For them the Helsinki agreement is still a piece of paper, and détente is still far over the horizon. I hope that the Soviet Union will live up to the spirit of this historic agreement and will enable the Jews who aspire to be reunited with their brethren in their ancient homeland to do so without hindrance. For us this is the touchstone.

65. Finally, in addressing the General Assembly I cannot ignore a grave development which affects the Jewish people wherever they may be. This is the mounting of a despicable attack on Zionism by associating it with abhorrent political concepts.

66. Let me state categorically that anti-Zionism is but a euphemism for anti-Semitism. Subscribing to a resolution condemning Zionism means an endorsement of anti-Semitism and the legitimization of aggression against Israel. Let me state with equal emphasis that, on this the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of the survivors of the gas chambers and the concentration camps, the Jewish people will not tolerate a revival of the cancer of anti-Semitism. One cannot

here escape a tragic reflection—how many of the 6 million victims of the Nazis would be alive today if it had been given to the Zionist movement to create the State of Israel before that catastrophe?

67. It is painful to me to see a group of nations, many of which were recently liberated from colonial rule, deriding one of the most noble liberation movements in this century—a movement which not only gave an example of encouragement and determination to the peoples struggling for independence but also actively aided many of them during their period of preparation for independence and immediately thereafter.

68. What is the essence of Zionism? Zionism, in a nutshell, is the modern expression of the ancient Jewish heritage. Zionism is the national liberation movement of a people exiled from its historic homeland and dispersed among the nations of the world. Zionism is the redemption of an ancient nation from a tragic lot and the redemption of a land neglected for centuries. Zionism is the revival of an ancient language and culture, in which the vision of universal peace has been a central theme. Zionism is the embodiment of a unique pioneering spirit, of the dignity of labour and of enduring human values. Zionism means creating a society, however imperfect it may still be, which tries to implement the highest ideals of democracy—political, social and cultural—for all the inhabitants of Israel, irrespective of religious belief, race or sex. Zionism is, in sum, the constant and unrelenting effort to realize the national and universal vision of the prophets of Israel.

69. Mr. KEUTCHA (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, as I come to this rostrum with the signal honour of addressing once again our Assembly, a keen feeling of pride prompts me first and foremost to turn my thoughts to your predecessor. The twenty-ninth session and the seventh special session of the General Assembly owe their success to the dynamic action of Abdelaziz Bouteflika, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria. Thanks to his great experience in international affairs, his shrewdness as a diplomat, his complete and constant commitment to the just cause of the oppressed peoples of the world, he helped us move towards the attainment of some of the ideals in our Charter. He deserves the appreciation and the congratulations of the international community for his services to our Organization.

70. Mr. President, your election as President of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly is a tribute by the international community not only to your continent, with its old and noble civilization, but also to your country, Luxembourg, with which Cameroon maintains excellent relations of friendship and co-operation. We are confident that, thanks to your outstanding qualities and your great experience as a statesman, thanks to your devotion to the ideals of peace, freedom of peoples and equality among all men, and thanks also to the assistance of all those who are by your side, particularly the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly, to whom we would extend this tribute, our deliberations will be conducted successfully. I hope you will not find it embarrassing, Mr. President, if, on this occasion, I yield to the temptation to refer to the great warmth and consistent sympathy that you

have always shown with regard to Africa—which accounts for your now widely known nickname, "Gaston the African", given you in the European Common Market back in the days of Yaoundé I and Yaoundé II. It is therefore a pleasant duty for me to offer you the hearty congratulations of the people and Government of Cameroon, of its President, El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, and of my delegation, which here and now pledges to you its steadfast co-operation.

71. May I also tell you, Mr. President, how very much we have admired all that has been done during the past year by Mr. Kurt Waldheim, our Secretary-General, to ensure that the United Nations establishes a presence wherever its prestige may make for any substantial progress in efforts to further peace and co-operation throughout the world. May I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to his integrity, his courage and his devotion, and once again to express our complete trust in him.

72. The present session of the General Assembly is being held at a juncture in international political life that is encouraging to those peoples of the world that are sincerely devoted to peace and freedom. To be sure, antagonisms and frustrations that are capable of seriously disturbing the peace still exist here and there, and the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization, quite correctly points out that "the hard world of politics and human affairs is not so easily diverted into the calm and peaceful channels of idealism and common sense" [A/10001/Add.1, sect. XXI].

73. But we cannot fail to note with satisfaction that, after having marked time to some extent during the 1960s, when colonialism was dealt one of history's severest blows, the process of the liberation of peoples has been definitely speeded up during the past two years. Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Principe, Papua New Guinea, Cambodia, Viet Nam, Angola—all of these are names that call forth the hope of all men of goodwill committed to the struggle for human dignity, names that cause the backward-looking colonists and the imperialists thirsting for oppression to shudder.

Mr. Mutuale Tshikankie (Zaire), Vice-President, took the Chair.

74. Is it not a sign of the times that this process of liberation should be thriving at the time when our Organization is reaching its maturity? This Organization, after all, was born 30 years ago out of the determination of independent States to found a new international order based on respect for human dignity, on fraternal dialogue and on co-operation among all peoples, born equal and masters of their own fate.

75. And here we would offer our warmest welcome to the delegations of certain of those countries that are seated here for the first time in this gathering as representatives of sovereign States. Their presence among us is clear proof that ours is a rapidly changing world and that we are moving inevitably toward that universality that is the goal of the United Nations.

76. The march of peoples to freedom is irresistible. All States are aware of this, and in any case, those that pretend to forget this fact are in for a rude awakening.

77. Less than a year ago no one could foresee with any certainty that the peoples of Indo-China were so close to complete liberation. In that connexion, welcoming as we do the return of peace to that peninsula, my delegation firmly believes that it is high time the courageous people of Viet Nam recovered its rightful place in the concert of nations, so that, with the assistance of the international community, it may bind up its wounds, rebuild its country in peace and without interference, and contribute actively to the settlement of the burning problems confronting mankind today.

78. Respecting Korea, the Government and people of Cameroon know from their own experience the price of national unity. For that reason, Cameroon, which maintains relations of friendship and co-operation with both Korean States, must pursue its efforts to contribute to the best of its ability to the independent and peaceful reunification of the Korean homeland. In that connexion, we find it difficult to condone the maintenance, in one part of that country, of foreign troops, who in any case will never respect what for us is the sacred principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

79. That same principle of non-interference determines our position in the distressing matter of Cyprus. If the two communities, which, though of different origins, are nevertheless bound together by the same national destiny, had been able to enter into a brotherly dialogue, free from all intervention from outside, the island of Cyprus would have been spared much suffering. We are grateful to the Secretary-General for his unceasing efforts to encourage the return of peace to the island and to safeguard the independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment policy of that country, in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council of our Organization.

80. May I now turn to the problems of Africa, a continent which, more than any other, has had to suffer oppression, a continent which is a constant source of concern to my Government. The 12 months that have passed since the last regular session of the General Assembly have indeed resulted in great upheavals on our continent. Despite the desperate manoeuvring of certain backward-looking colonialists, Mozambique, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe have now all achieved full sovereignty. It is above all to the liberation movements of these brother countries that we owe our heartiest congratulations, for not only have they brought down a colonial system which for centuries was particularly oppressive, but they have shown also that freedom is indivisible, since by their sacrifices they have made it possible for the Portuguese people themselves to throw off the dictatorial yoke.

81. We know, however, that the struggle is not over. Great watchfulness must be the order of the day while the independence of the young States is put on a firm basis. The subversive schemes of the enemies of Africa, who kindle the flames of hatred and discord in Angola, must be exposed and combatted. Our Angolan brothers, we are convinced, will heed the urgent appeal that we are making to them to lay down their arms—arms provided by interventionist forces in all quarters—to stop killing each other, and to resolve

to put an end to the quarrels that discredit them and make Africa the laughing-stock of its enemies. We call upon all Members of this Assembly to refrain from encouraging in any way this fratricidal war, and to cease interfering in the internal affairs of Angola.

82. We take this opportunity to congratulate the new Portugal for having kept the commitments on decolonization which it made to the international community. We would remind it, however, that until powers are transferred to the representatives of the Angolan people, it retains its responsibilities for the security and territorial integrity of that country.

83. Finally, we welcome the understanding, the restraint, and the sense of responsibility shown by all brother countries directly involved in the question of the so-called Spanish Sahara in the search for a just and equitable solution.

84. Turning to the Comoros, without wanting to minimize the difficulties and unpredictable events which accompany any effort at decolonization, we earnestly hope that that archipelago in the Indian Ocean, which has been declared a zone of peace by our Organization, will soon attain its independence, unity and sovereignty.

85. Our sadness is great as we turn our eyes to the bastions of domination strengthened by racism and *apartheid* which continue to exist in Azania, Zimbabwe, and the international Territory of Namibia.

86. Need I remind you of the position of Cameroon on this subject? In accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations and with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice,³ the racist clique must put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. Powers must immediately be transferred to the genuine representatives of the Namibian people, who have been fighting for years under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization. The United Nations must continue to seek ways and means of safeguarding the territorial integrity of Namibia and of preventing the plundering of its wealth.

87. We condemn the triple vetoes cast in October 1974 and June 1975, which only serve to encourage the racist South African forces to continue to defy the international community and to take a scornful attitude towards the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and by the Security Council.

88. In Zimbabwe, the responsibilities of the administering Power remain. It is up to the administering Power to use all means, including force, to make the racist white minority, which has usurped power in Salisbury, come to its senses.

89. We pledge our complete support to the liberation movements of Zimbabwe, which have established a united front to lead their people in a fight which must inevitably lead to an early victory.

90. Already, the racists are panicking. For some time now we have seen them engage in feverish activities whose obvious purpose is to divide Africa and to delay the advent of their defeat.

91. Need I repeat that if they wish to enter into a dialogue, they know who are the right people to talk to, namely, the liberation movements recognized by

the Organization of African Unity, which are the only authentic representatives of their people.

92. Cameroon will not spare any effort in its commitment to the total liberation of Africa. With all other peoples devoted to peace, justice and liberty, we will pursue the fight on all fronts.

93. Freedom is man's most prized possession, next to life itself. But it is not granted as life is; it is a delicious fruit which the peoples of the world may taste only after a long and bitter combat.

94. That, then, is the meaning of the ordeal in the Middle East, where a State Member of this Organization has seized the territories of others by force, reducing millions of persons to the status of wandering and stateless refugees.

95. The non-use of force in the settlement of international disputes is recognized by the Charter and international law, and is a principle which the Government of Cameroon holds dear.

96. That, and not some tendentious interpretation by those who care little for our dignity, explains our attitude towards Israel and our actions in the United Nations and other international organizations aimed at forcing that country to withdraw from occupied Arab territories and to respect the undeniable rights of the Palestinian people.

97. It is our hope that present efforts in the Middle East will accelerate the process of establishing a just and lasting peace, safeguarding the interests of all the parties concerned in the area in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

98. Today's world, for a number of years now, has been going through a social and economic crisis which it will be able to overcome only if all nations dispassionately act together in an appropriate framework such as this Organization.

99. Beyond question, the present crisis is the result of the selfishness of the strong, who would exploit the weak instead of agreeing to promote mutual development, with complete respect for the interests of every nation and for the special identity and dignity of each nation.

100. It is the plight of today's world that the progress of science and technology has made it possible for a privileged minority to monopolize most of the common resources of mankind, while three quarters of the human race continue to endure the harsh yoke of poverty and to feed on the most illusory hopes.

101. That excessive egoism has often been seen in the various gatherings convened by the United Nations and its specialized agencies over the years.

102. We are thinking above all of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, to which Cameroon attaches considerable importance. Although our geographical position in relation to the ocean spaces is not particularly advantageous, we share with other developing countries a deep concern arising from our fears of seeing the common heritage of mankind exploited in the interests of the same privileged minority.

103. The resources of the world have brought about the prosperity of the human race, but not without confrontation and war. We must not allow a new form

of domination to emerge in the ocean spaces which would destroy everything that our generation has done to bring about global development and international peace.

104. Nations must take this opportunity to purify their own special interests by bringing them within the general framework of interdependence and understanding among peoples, in order to exclude new causes of hostility from a world already beset by so many economic, social and political tensions.

105. We believe that the unified texts submitted by the President of the Conference and by the chairmen of the three committees of the Conference represent a useful basis for negotiations. The Conference should give them serious consideration at the next session as it might thus be able to emerge from the impasse imposed on it by those who are well content with the *status quo*.

106. My country will tenaciously pursue its efforts at bringing about a joint action both at the regional level and with other nations of the world, with a view to preparing a new form of the law of the sea based on justice and on the developmental requirements of all States.

107. It is not my intention here to dwell on the many other gatherings held over the past 12 months which have made it possible for the countries of the third world to determine the appropriate objectives and methods of action for resolving the problems pertaining to their development. At the seventh special session we have just considered in detail the impact of the international economic situation on the countries of the third world.

108. Cameroon, of course, has not waited until now to denounce the vices of a selfish economic and commercial system. We have always denounced, among other things, the constant deterioration in terms of trade, which is a major cause of the growing gap between the rich and poor nations.

109. That is why Cameroon will do what it can to support and foster any action which would translate into action the measures adopted at the sixth and seventh special sessions relating to the establishment of a new international economic order, in the hope that the objectives of the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States [resolution 3281 (XXIX)] will be achieved.

110. We hope that the Paris Conference on International Economic Co-operation, proposed by the French Head of State, will produce effective solutions not only to the problems of energy but to the whole range of problems relating to raw materials, bearing in mind the interests of the developing countries.

111. It is high time that the developed countries understood that their delay in satisfying the just grievances of the developing countries is inconsistent with the need for détente, much more obvious today than ever before in a world exhausted by decades of confrontations of all kinds.

112. At the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe we perceived a few rays of hope inasmuch as the strengthening of détente in that part of the world—which had seen the origin of two world wars—

might well serve the cause of development of the countries of the third world.

113. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to note that sources of tension continue, particularly in certain countries of the third world, and none can predict that they will not lead to a widespread conflict. Our concern is the more justified, because notwithstanding the partial agreements concluded among the major military Powers, the arms race is continuing unabated.

114. Reductions in the stockpile of weapons, announced from time to time, are nothing but propaganda, for in the East as in the West armament policies are today essentially qualitative in nature. We all know that there is no area where research is more dedicated to greater accuracy, power and invulnerability than in this area. In the East and in the West technology is flourishing and enjoys high political priority. That applies to all areas of destruction—strategic nuclear weapons, tactical nuclear weapons, conventional weapons, chemical weapons, psychological warfare—and applies also to outer space, to the Earth and to the oceans.

115. Once again I must state the belief of the Government of Cameroon that the old adage—he who wants peace, prepares for war—should be considered out of date today.

116. We favour general and complete disarmament under the auspices of the international community as a whole. We firmly support the proposal immediately to put an end to nuclear and thermonuclear tests, to conclude a treaty banning those tests and to convert to peaceful purposes of economic, social and cultural development the factories in which those weapons are manufactured. We support equally firmly the plan to have a world-wide disarmament conference which would make it possible for all States to reach appropriate decisions on problems which are crucial for their survival.

117. It is a fallacy to claim that the means for massive destruction with which some States are equipping themselves will never be used except for purposes of mutual intimidation. The well-being of mankind has hardly ever required that it live constantly under the sword of Damocles.

118. The liberation of the oppressed peoples of the world is nigh. Many nations, which only yesterday were fighting on the battlefield, are today working together to build a new world, to build the foundations of tomorrow's civilization, where the principle that "might makes right" will yield to the rule of law. We must move towards détente; co-operation must be strengthened and made a reality—a concrete reality for the well-being of the entire world. That presupposes that our resolutions and recommendations, our agreements and treaties, will emerge from the comfortable surroundings of idle diplomacy and filter through to the roots of a rising generation. That also presupposes a new ethic in international relations where national selfishness will give way to a more universal sense of human solidarity.

119. It is to be hoped that the need for such a civilization will be felt increasingly by those institutions whose task it is to train the principal protagonists in international life, and that we will see the emergence of training centres and research centres for diplomatic

and international questions which will go beyond the narrow framework of States—and that applies both to recruitment and to the orientation of the training courses.

120. I have just stated the position of my Government on the fundamental problems which confront us today. The international situation, as we are well aware, is depressing in a number of areas, but there are signs that the clouds are breaking up. We have noted with pleasure that here and there in the world there is a growing awareness of the need to establish a new international order.

121. May that political will, which emerged in the course of the seventh special session of the General Assembly, also guide the deliberations of our present session, so that our determination to build a world of peace and justice may lead to effective and humane action, bringing about solidarity and interdependence and uniting the peoples of the world.

122. The United Nations is an ideal place for this growing awareness to be expressed. We welcome this now as we are celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of our Organization. Cameroon remains convinced that at the present time the role of our Organization is irreplaceable as an instrument for maintaining peace and international security and as an ideal centre where new international relations, just and in accordance with the aspirations of the entire world, may be established.

123. Of course, its structures are hardly perfect. We believe that the jurisdiction of its various bodies and the way in which political authority has been distributed, should be altered, taking into account on the one hand changes which have taken place in the United Nations and the specialized agencies since its Charter was drafted, and on the other hand the admission of a large number of new Members which for the most part are countries of the third world.

124. We also reaffirm our loyalty to the movement of the non-aligned countries. I would even say that that loyalty is the corner-stone of our foreign policy because, as was recently stated by the Head of State of Cameroon, El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, non-alignment, which used to consist in a dexterous form of co-operation aimed at establishing an uncertain equilibrium between two different approaches to the world, appears today as a way of asserting our personality in the international arena, a way of asserting our determination to be independent—in other words, a way of asserting our own free will in international relations.

125. No aspect of our policy of non-alignment, however, should be seen as negative or as an expression of a desire to remain in isolation. To us, non-alignment means, first and foremost, non-interference in the internal affairs of others. Non-alignment, to us, also means the renunciation of the use or the threat of the use of force in the settlement of international conflicts. Non-alignment, to us, means also a state of constant vigilance in the face of all organized powers, present or future, without any prejudice against any of them. It also means that we are constantly prepared to extend a friendly hand of loyal co-operation, while never sacrificing any of our vital interests.

126. Lastly, non-alignment, to us, also means tolerance and peaceful—even dynamic—coexistence among States with different political, social or economic régimes, working together to promote a world of peoples that are equal, that are freed from domination and fear, and that respect each other.

127. In other words, non-alignment, for us, is not the opposite of international co-operation, but its complement. We believe in the solidarity and interdependence of mankind; we believe that mankind may be compared to a chain, whose strength depends on the strength of its weakest link. International co-operation, consequently, is absolutely essential for the survival of mankind and must be extended both vertically and horizontally.

128. In the wake of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lima, the results of which were a useful contribution to the settlement of the vital problems of the world's peoples, and at a time when Cameroon is assuming important responsibilities as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, and now that the seventh special session of the Assembly devoted to development and international co-operation has just established the basis for constructive and promising dialogue between developed and developing countries in order resolutely to attack the problem of orderly development for one and all, I am pleased to reaffirm the determination of my Government to do its utmost to promote, not a bipolar world based on the constant confrontation of ideologies and interests, but a multi-polar world more open to a universal civilization that alone can provide an effective and humane response to the burning problems confronting today's world.

129. Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me great pleasure to express to the President, on behalf of the Government and people of the State of Kuwait, heartfelt congratulations on his election as President of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. His election is a tribute to the high status he enjoys in international circles as a statesman with wide experience. I wish him great success in guiding the proceedings of the present session. I want, too, to pay a tribute to his predecessor, Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika, the President of the twenty-ninth session and the seventh special session, for the wise and effective manner in which he presided over their deliberations.

130. I should also like to commend the efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, to strengthen the role of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security, as well as his concern for the problems of the developing countries, for which he deserves our appreciation and thanks.

131. The previous regular session yielded many tangible results in the field of disarmament and other fields, including the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. However, we cannot evaluate the role of the United Nations on the basis of the decisions adopted by its principal organs because a wide gap still exists between the adoption and the implementation of United Nations resolutions. It is a cause for great satisfaction that the Assembly at its seventh special session was able to examine the obstacles which hinder the establishment of the new international economic order, agree on a plan of action and approve

the measures necessary to put the provisions of the new order into effect. I should like to commend the constructive spirit which permeated the negotiations between the various geographical groups during that session. Though many of the measures agreed to are inadequate to fulfil the aims of the new order, we welcome them as a first step in the right direction leading to increased co-operation among States in trade, industry, science, technology and other fields of economic activity. The developed countries bear a heavy historic responsibility for achieving these goals and taking the necessary political action implicit in these decisions. No excuses will be accepted in the future for failing to discharge responsibilities and obligations that are prerequisites for the establishment of a new international economic order.

132. We attach particular importance to the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its fourth session, which will follow up the work of the seventh special session and continue the dialogue between the developing and the developed countries. We also welcome the efforts of our Organization to solve the worsening population problems of the world, provide multilateral food aid, extend emergency assistance to victims of drought and natural disasters, and organize programmes to protect the human environment. Such activities had humble origins and are being steadily expanded to meet the needs of our new international community, which is based on interdependence. Naturally this requires concerted efforts by all nations to find common solutions to international problems.

133. I should like to commend the efforts of the non-aligned countries and the developing countries to make basic changes in the present international systems. If one reviewed the major developments in the United Nations during the past three decades one would realize how much our Organization is indebted to those countries. The declarations adopted by the non-aligned countries and the developing countries during the past months in several conferences held in Algeria, Lima, Dakar and other capitals, clearly reflect the effective role they play in eliminating the remnants of colonialism, putting an end to unfair economic and social conditions, preserving spiritual and human values, solving problems posed by the danger of nuclear confrontation, achieving more democratic international relations and eliminating causes of tension which afflict mankind as a whole. The effectiveness of these countries was enhanced by the logic of universality in United Nations membership, which is inescapable for any organization that aims at maintaining world peace and security and at promoting world prosperity and the advancement of mankind.

134. I should like to take this opportunity to welcome the admission of the People's Republic of Mozambique, the Republic of Cape Verde and the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe to membership in the United Nations, which is a new victory for the principle of universality and a major contribution to the effectiveness of the United Nations. We hope that transition to independence in Angola will take place in the peaceful and orderly manner in which its sister States have achieved independence, in spite of the internal dissensions created by some foreign interests.

135. Kuwait supported the applications of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the Republic of South Viet Nam for membership in the United Nations because it believes that the two countries satisfy the requisite conditions for membership. We hope that the hurdles placed in the path of their admission will be removed, especially after the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 3366 (XXX) by 123 votes to none. Though we uphold the principle of universality in the United Nations, we should like to explain that this only applies to countries which adhere to the Charter, respect its principles and comply with its provisions. There are Member States within our Organization which have violated the Charter, disregarded its principles and flouted its provisions and yet remain Members. I should like to appeal to the international community to put an end to these violations by imposing prohibitive sanctions, including expulsion, so as to compel such countries to respect the will of the international community.

136. The endeavours of our Organization to improve its work in response to the demands of the non-aligned and developing countries were successful in all the principal organs with the exception of the Security Council. Because of lack of great Power unanimity, the Security Council was unable to apply the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter which empowers the Council to take the necessary measures to maintain or restore international peace and security even if that requires complete or partial interruption of economic relations and means of communications, the severance of diplomatic relations and the use of armed forces. In the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization [A/10001/Add.1] the Secretary-General admitted that the Council was not able to discharge its primary function and apply the system laid down in the Charter in an adequate manner. Instead, the Security Council evolved a procedure of decision by consultation and consensus which made the parties to a dispute the main factor in reaching a settlement. It is therefore our view that the Security Council has not been able to act in the manner prescribed in the Charter and is content, on the rare occasions in which it deals with questions of international security, to apply procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes without enforcing the measures provided for in the Charter to compel recalcitrant States to respect the wishes of the international community. It is our belief that so long as the Council maintains this attitude its prestige will be undermined and small countries will remain victims of force and aggression.

137. Conditions in the Middle East will continue to oscillate between war and truce and the region will remain in a state of constant turmoil until the problem is solved correctly and soundly at the root. The principal problem lies in the displacement of the people of Palestine from their land and the occupation of their homeland by world Zionism, which has colonized Palestine and deprived the rightful owners of the land of their right to self-determination and independence.

138. Peace will not be achieved in the Middle East as long as the people of Palestine remain deprived of the most elementary rights enshrined in the Charter and in numerous resolutions adopted since 1948, the latest of which was General Assembly resolution 3236

(XXIX), which reaffirmed the inalienable human and national rights of the people of Palestine.

139. Likewise, a just and lasting peace will not be achieved in the Middle East unless there is full respect for the principle enunciated in several resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, which is in fact a corner-stone of the Charter and which emphasizes the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and calls for the withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Arab territories. I wish to emphasize a truth that cannot be concealed: that unless the original sin which was perpetrated against the Palestinian people is corrected by the restoration of its inalienable human and national rights there will be no just or lasting peace in the Middle East.

140. Any step which is taken with respect to the conflict in the Middle East must be measured by its ability to deal with the roots of the problem, namely, the tragedy of the Palestinian people. Kuwait bases itself on the Charter, which stipulates that the territories of others shall not be acquired by force and calls for complete and unconditional withdrawal by any aggressor—a principle which has been reaffirmed in repeated resolutions adopted by the General Assembly since 1967 with respect to the conflict in the Middle East. Accordingly, any Israeli withdrawal from Arab lands must not be subject to any conditions.

141. We have been following with concern Israel's efforts to extort from the United States, as a condition of its limited withdrawal in the Sinai, extensive financial, petroleum, diplomatic, political and military commitments. The totality of American commitments to Israel constitutes an ominous precedent; it strengthens Israel's determination to resist withdrawal from the other occupied Arab territories, hardens its intransigence regarding its territorial expansion and fosters in Israel a conviction of being immune to any measure aimed at compelling it to make further withdrawals.

142. Israel's acquisition of modern sophisticated weapons will lead to the escalation of the arms race in the region and raise the level of destructiveness of future warfare in the region. These arms which will be given to Israel will only aggravate tensions in the region, increase the elements of instability and prompt the Arab States to seek new weapons to avert the anticipated dangers.

143. In resolution VIII adopted at Lima the non-aligned countries stated that they were convinced that the time had come to apply sanctions against Israel because it persisted in its refusal to implement United Nations resolutions and in its violation of the Charter [see A/10217 and Corr.1, annex]. Kuwait maintains that the time has come for adopting punitive measures against Israel, such as the imposition of economic sanctions and expulsion from the United Nations, in view of Israel's record of violation of the Charter, its failure to implement United Nations resolutions and its exacting a price for its aggression and for the dispersion of the people of Palestine.

144. The recent Israeli aggression against the Al-Ibrahimi Mosque in the City of Al-Khalil constitutes a danger to Islamic sanctuaries and religious rituals respected and practised by all Moslems in the world. This flagrant violation, in addition to the desecration of Holy Places in Jerusalem and the annexation of

Arab places by Israel, is not only a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions but also a challenge to the feelings of the Moslems and the very bases of this Organization. Therefore we request the imposition of stringent measures against the perpetrators of these acts, who have defied United Nations resolutions without punishment by the international community.

145. The international political climate and disarmament are closely interrelated. I have previously welcomed détente and the improvement in the relations between the big Powers, the latest manifestation of which was the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which we hoped would have a positive influence on solving problems created by the cold war and various other international problems. It seems that détente was not sufficient to end the arms race and lead to speedy measures for more general and complete disarmament. In the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General said the following:

"In a world increasingly preoccupied with the problems of social justice, hunger, poverty, development and an equitable sharing of resources, global expenditures on armaments are approaching \$300,000 million a year. Never before in peacetime has the world witnessed such a flow of weapons of war. Some \$20,000 million worth of arms are now sold annually in the international arms trade."
[A/1000/Add.1, sect. VIII.]

That paragraph is of special significance as it shows the close relationship between disarmament and social and economic development. We believe that lavish expenditures on arms have a marked effect on the deteriorating social and economic conditions in the world today, including world inflation, and may partially account for the reluctance of some developed countries to provide financial, economic and technical assistance to developing countries. Natural and human resources in the world are very scarce and in any case are insufficient to develop and improve weapons of mass destruction while at the same time providing food, clothing and other necessities to peoples. Hence disarmament has become a complex matter which transcends political relations among the big Powers; it includes economic problems in developed countries and their impact on economic and social development plans in the developing countries.

146. While speaking of disarmament, may I reaffirm the support of my Government for the proposal to hold a world disarmament conference. Kuwait has sponsored this idea because it firmly believes that disarmament is a matter that equally concerns all countries, big or small. Disarmament negotiations were not successful in the past because they were conducted in the form of a dialogue between the two super-Powers. We believe that the conference should be mindful of the incontrovertible fact that foreign occupation, colonialism and *apartheid* sow the seeds of conflict and compel small nations to purchase arms for use in the struggle to eliminate those evils. The conference cannot succeed unless all countries take part in it, including the nuclear Powers themselves. The agenda of the conference should be comprehensive enough to include questions not broached by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

147. From the outset Kuwait supported the call for declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The countries of the Indian Ocean have been affected in the past by the conflict between the big Powers and the division of the world into spheres of influence through the establishment of military bases and the conclusion of military pacts to promote the designs of the big Powers. I should like to proclaim today my Government's support for the proposal to hold a conference in the near future to study the prospects of concluding an international agreement to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. I should, therefore, strongly object to all attempts being made to establish military bases in certain islands of the Indian Ocean and any facilities that may be extended to the big Powers which may be of value to them in their political and military conflict. We believe that the conference cannot succeed without the support of the big Powers and the major maritime users of this ocean. A long time has elapsed during which it has been possible to study this matter in all its aspects and prepare the necessary studies; the time has now come to make progress towards concluding an agreement binding on all countries concerned.

148. We have closely observed the work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction since it was first established and we felt sure that its preparatory work had sufficiently advanced to ensure the success of the United Nations Third Conference on the Law of the Sea. Though the Conference has held more than one session, it has not yet been able to conclude the desired comprehensive agreement the chapters of which will encompass all aspects of the law of the sea and reflect new developments in international society and express the will of States which were not allowed to take part in the process of international legislation in the past. The agreement should also include the new régime which would be applied in the area beyond the limits of national jurisdiction that has been declared the common heritage of mankind as a whole. The process of negotiation is very slow and the major maritime Powers still adhere to obsolete texts and seek to take advantage of their advances in the field of science and technology to deprive the developing countries of their legitimate rights to the resources of the area beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. This abnormal situation cannot continue because disputes arise frequently between States over such questions as fisheries, pollution and the resources of the continental shelf. These matters cannot be resolved by unilateral declarations; multi-lateral agreements are still the main instrument of international legislation. We hope that the next session of the Conference will reflect a true political will on the part of the major maritime Powers to meet the wishes of the developing countries and implement the provisions of the Declaration of Principles Governing the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor, and the Subsoil Thereof, beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction [*resolution 2749 (XXV)*].

149. Portuguese colonialism in Africa ended as a result of the struggle of the peoples who were living under Portuguese rule and thanks to the role played by the developing countries and the United Nations. The victory achieved by African countries which formerly lived under Portuguese occupation should be

an incentive to the international community to support, morally and materially, the struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence. It should also strengthen the determination of the international community to take effective measures against South Africa, which has disregarded the wishes of the people of Namibia and our international Organization and has ignored the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice through its continued occupation of Namibia.

150. The policy of *apartheid* pursued by the minority régime in South Africa, which was condemned by the United Nations, is still a challenge to peace and security in Africa and the world at large and a violation of fundamental human rights and the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The racist minority régime in Rhodesia also constitutes a violation of fundamental human rights and the principles of the Charter. It is therefore our duty to do our utmost to put an end to this abnormal situation both in South Africa and in Rhodesia. The cause of freedom is an integral whole; so long as there is one oppressed people in any part of the world, peace and security will remain a far-fetched ideal.

151. Kuwait sincerely believes in regional co-operation among States; such co-operation helps to reduce tension in any part of the world in which it takes place. The countries of the Gulf believe in this principle and have taken definite steps to express it in a concrete form so as to promote stability in the Gulf and put an end to foreign interference in the affairs of the Gulf, which are the sole concerns of the States in that region. Kuwait believes that responsibility for the security and defence of the Gulf is a matter that should be shouldered by the countries of the Gulf themselves.

152. Kuwait believes in co-operation based on understanding and dialogue. It thus attaches great importance to the Arab-European dialogue, which started recently through the medium of the League of Arab States. The main aim of this dialogue is to make use of the potentialities of the industrial countries of Europe for the benefit of the developing countries of the third world. We stress the need to organize the transfer of the resources of technology, capital, management and trade to the developing countries within the framework of the Arab-European dialogue which we envisage as a manifestation of the new international economic order adopted during the sixth special session of the General Assembly. Hence the spirit of co-operation which has marked the dialogue between the two parties is an integral part of the atmosphere which characterized the negotiations during the recent seventh special session. I should like to voice the hope that the Arab-European dialogue will succeed because it offers great benefits for the developing countries and the European countries.

153. The ultimate aim of our Organization is to establish the rule of law in all activities of the international community. The essence of the ideal of the rule of law lies not in technical law as such, although that is of major importance, but rather in the supremacy of certain ethical convictions, certain rules of decency prevalent in the community, and in the psychological fact that those who are at the apex of power share those convictions and feel bound to conform to them.

154. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We have done a fair job in the past few weeks. The resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Seventh Special Session [resolution 3362 (S-VII)] can make history. To help it to do so we shall have to do an equally fair job at this thirtieth session. It was a rocky road to the resolution, yet we traversed it. The political framework needed for implementing it is the challenge before us now. To meet it, we have to keep the spirit of the seventh special session that helped rich and poor see the oneness of the world. An era of international détente is the answer to the challenge. This does not necessarily mean replacing the détente between the United States and the USSR but perhaps helping it to serve better the purposes of the much more necessary approaching universal détente. What we have achieved during the seventh special session removes a great many difficulties in international economic relations. It does not do the whole job, nor can it do anything without a strong political will to prop it up. There will have to be skilful pipers to turn to living reality the thoughts contained in the resolution. Without the political will, the old order will linger on, although its somewhat elusive end is in sight.

155. It is good that Mr. Thorn will be guiding the deliberations of this session. His skills are beyond doubt. He comes from a country that is the centre of the endeavours to unite the Western world and we attach high hopes to his experience in that field, which should guide us towards universal détente for which I am hoping.

156. The agenda before us at this session covers almost all the subjects of political crises with which we have been grappling for over 30 years: disarmament, the banning of nuclear tests, ideological stances, armed alliances, local conflicts and great Powers, Palestine, the Middle East, South African *apartheid*, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Angola, nuclear weapons. We are familiar with the entire list. To hope that these problems will be cleared out of the way at this single session is too much. These are urgent problems, crucial problems. All one can hope for is that we may temper our individual positions with concessions to others, although not on matters of principle relating to war, peace and freedom. My logic in this is that these are not new crises; they have been with us for a long time; it is only recently that they have been submerged by the social and economic disorders of this age. Now that the surface of those socio-economic problems has been scratched as a result of the deliberations during the seventh special session, the political issues are laid bare before us. They constitute a danger to the results of a document, produced during sleepless nights, which promises much. Politics are all-pervading. There is no way of subduing them. There is more than one way of living with their vagaries. Without a consensus problems are likely to block the road to universal détente and our resolution will remain a dead letter.

157. Members will appreciate that for me, coming from where I do, questions of freedom in Africa and in the Arab world are uppermost in my mind. With Mozambique here in the world community after a valiant struggle of a dozen years, Angola should not be long in coming. It will have to be left alone, though.

The fight that is going on there would not have taken so long had it not been for Powers outside Africa. The bullets fired are not African bullets, nor are they provided by Africans. They are sold or given away by those who make them, not for the sake of goodness, but for ulterior motives. Angola has become a latter-day Congo because it is as wealthy. Outside Powers are unable to let it be. It is coveted by many. The streets of Luanda are cluttered with many a corpse like that of Lumumba. I hope I am not being too much of a visionary if I say that the whites in the area, led by South Africa and abetted by like-minded whites outside the continent, are trying to prevent an inevitable eventuality: independence.

158. But why? This is why. In a decade or less there will be a closely knit number of nations, or even a "United States", composed of Mozambique, Malawi, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Angola and, certainly, Zimbabwe—a formidable menace to South African whites, who, if they fear Namibia's independence so much, may well look on such a combination of black States to the north with trepidation. It is not visionary what I see; it is possible, given the historical background of the area and the quality of the leaders there, most of whom are embattled patriots who have come to realize the extent of their interdependence during the fight for freedom.

159. South Africa will perhaps take longer to emerge from bondage, but this does not apply to Zimbabwe. In a few weeks the whites will have lived through 10 years of fearful independence—tense living. It is not for nothing that Mr. Smith and his party are mobilizing massively nowadays. All non-African males between 25 and 40 are being called up for two months a year. The non-belligerent noises they have been making do not tally with this preparedness for fight. They do not mean to give anything away. Africans whom they call "moderates" would do well not to heed linguistic conciliation. President Kaunda of Zambia is not one given to hollow talk. When he tells the world that a Zambian officer and 11 Zimbabwe nationalists were killed on 7 September by the intrigues of the agents of Mr. Smith, the world must believe him. What the United Nations can do is not much, but it has not managed to do even that fully. I refer to our failure in restraining Member States which do not abide by the resolutions adopted regarding sanctions. President Kaunda said that, and we must believe him.

160. However, help seems to be coming from a familiar corner: white settlers who never tire of telling the world that they are the custodians of Christian civilization are up against the church. This is the writing on the wall. The part played by young churchmen in Mozambique is still vivid in the memories of all. What sounded like a minor voice in the beginning has built up to a crescendo in Zimbabwe. The whole Roman Catholic Church is not mincing its words against the settler régime. Let us celebrate some of the names of those brave men by way of recognizing the good in an area wallowing in evil: Monsignor Donald Lamont of Umtali; Mr. Aloysius Haene of Gwelo; Mr. Patrick Chakaipa, Bishop of Salisbury; Monsignor Adolph Schmitt of Bulawayo; the Most Reverend Francis Markall, Archbishop of Salisbury.

161. It is these men who are the true custodians of Christian faith, not the pretenders who say it is they

who are. These men signed a message the other day against settlement and read it in their respective churches. They also got it published as an advertisement in the newspapers. The Anglican Bishop of Mashonoland declared his revulsion at the insensitive disregard for job opportunities for blacks. These gentle souls are brothers of those who disgraced the Lisbon dictators by revealing everything about Wiriyaamu. Is it too much to think that the Church's coming in as vigorously as it is doing at the moment is likely to shorten the days of the agony of the fighters?

162. At this session we shall discuss ideas for bringing the United Nations to meet needs that have been growing for over 30 years. Those who would rather keep it ticking on the way it did and does are no fools. They are big enough to know. They know as well as we do that the United Nations is not an island insulated from changes in world politics, social attitudes, economic relationships and the rest. They are not newcomers to the world stage. As a matter of fact, they have had a hand in creating the free climate of opinion and action that now prevails. We know it well. Without their work to rid us of serfdom we would not have been here.

163. The moral and practical help of the socialist countries can be denied only by those of us who do not know our contemporary history, or those who stand to gain from discarding that factor in the matrix of facts of our progress to freedom. When I say that these friends must reconsider their position vis-à-vis the restructuring of the United Nations, I say it advisedly, and mean it. My message to them is this: having done what you did for liberating Asian and African countries, carry on; give liberation a content. Without giving a hand to a new United Nations you will not be as helpful to the developing countries as you were in the 1950s and 1960s. I will go further. The reforms proposed are within the context of the Charter. To be better able to reformulate social and economic international relationships in the 1970s.

164. The United Nations came into being to give the powerful all the advantages of power. The proposals do not minimize that power. The changes take stock of the countries that wield power. None of their suggestions aim at the roots of the Charter. The proposals aim at meeting the challenges of the day within the framework of the Charter. They are not meant to reduce us all to dwarfs. We in the third world recognize that some of us are not giants. This is a fact of life. My appeal to the traditionalists, who would rather preserve the 30-year-old ideals, is that 30 years ago there was one kind of world, but today there is another. It is said that the poorer nations need the United Nations more than do the richer ones. This is a fallacy. Both groups need it and need it to be an effective Organization.

165. Sudan believes that the United Nations has done a great job in its time. But time does not stop. The United Nations has to change and reflect the new times. Sudan would prefer radical changes—for instance, doing away with the veto in the Security Council. It was a disgrace that some Powers got together and gave South Africa the support it needed to go on with its follies. And it was also a disgrace that the Security Council did nothing against Israel.

166. Our feeling is that those who stand against change will never serve the cause of justice and freedom.

167. An able and effective United Nations will help us to move steadily towards giving a little more now to the men and women to whom we said, during our days of struggle for independence, that we would give dignity. You cannot eat or drink dignity. The whirlwind of change in our countries must be complemented by a social and economic upsurge equal to what we promised our compatriots.

168. Giving teeth to the United Nations without tampering with the position of the able and mighty is certainly bound to usher in international détente. Along with my colleagues from the Arab world and the African world, I crave for a more effective United Nations, which will aim at allaying the fears of men and women still risking their very lives in the search to realize their potentialities, in the search for freedom.

169. How can the Palestinian people restore their faith in man if they do not advance from the previous session, which gave them a window on the world, to something more tangible? Every man, woman and child appreciates the place given to the Palestinians in the world community last year. Unless the Palestinian people go forward from there, their cynicism will continue. And how can one blame them for that? Those of them who do not see much in the second Sinai military disengagement agreement have been poring over the calendar of war and peace in the area. They have come up with staggering facts that they are spreading far and wide in the Middle East. This is a sample of what they are saying despondently: it has taken the Israelis eight years to withdraw 10 miles from Sinai; now they want five more years to withdraw 20 miles. The calculation they have been making leads to a despairing conclusion: if this rate is going to set the standard, it will take the Israelis 50 years to hand over Sinai. And they go on: it is now four years since the Rogers Plan, which Egypt accepted in the face of great odds, and two years since the October war. One tends to share their gloom.

170. The Israeli authorities are still talking of an "interim agreement" with Egypt, and a close look at the term "interim" reveals that this means eight years. Nothing seems to make headway. The most recent political move seems to be stuck. Egypt has gone as far as a country can go, braving the wrath of many leaders and peoples, though it is not entirely alone. A few leaders thought that President El-Sadat of Egypt was affording the area yet another chance by showing dangerous resilience. At the moment, those few leaders who went along with him are wondering.

171. On the one hand there are the Palestinians and the Arab peoples who never thought that President El-Sadat would gain much by being wise and peaceful. On the other hand there is the United States of America, which is considering arms sales to Israel to the tune of \$2,000 million a year for a period of 10 years. To make this cynicism palatable the United States is talking of lifting the embargo on arms to Egypt which has been imposed for two decades. And it declares that there is no commitment in this connexion.

172. And, of course, there is Israel, which will not sign the agreement until the United States does what

it says. What is an impasse if this is not one? The United States is fumbling and faltering because it has moved a long way from the principles that have guided it throughout its history. It is busy importing ideas from the European political scene of a century ago, sometimes even more than a century ago. Those ideas or modes of behaviour fitted those times, those peoples and that world. The United States has to rediscover its own conscience. In the case of Palestine, President Woodrow Wilson must have been heartbroken at the turn events took when the Ottoman Empire was broken up after the First World War. It all went against his convictions. He said: "Peoples are not to be bandied about from one sovereignty to another by an international conference or an understanding between rivals and antagonists." Outraged by the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 and the Balfour Declaration of 1917, Wilson tried to put justice and high principles into a political life of treachery and double dealing.

173. That is a part of the American tradition which has been abandoned completely. The opposite is now the case. Today the United States is trading territory that does not belong to it for money and arms. But even that is not working. Look where it stands with the Sinai disengagement of troops. In the face of the United States' unqualified support for Israel our Organization is paralysed. But it will not be so much longer. The vote which brought the Palestinian people into the community of nations last year is but the beginning of further steps towards affirming the Palestinian entity. Ultimately Palestine will be recognized by both the United States and Israel.

174. I have taken so much of your time in speaking about Palestine and the Middle East because they are the focal-points of danger which should be the subject of our attention during this session.

175. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to exercise their right of reply. Members of the Assembly will recall that the General Assembly, at its 2353rd plenary meeting, decided that statements made in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

176. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): The Foreign Minister of Spain made some remarks about Gibraltar at the previous meeting in the course of his statement in which, I was glad to note, he eloquently defended the rights of colonial peoples to self-determination. My Government knows no better way of applying the principle of self-determination than that of consulting the wishes of the people concerned. The wishes of the people of Gibraltar, as the Foreign Minister of Spain knows, are reflected in the preamble to the Act of Parliament which brought into force Gibraltar's current constitution.

177. At this late stage in our debate I do not wish to rehearse at length the views of my Government on the rights and obligations which arise from article X of the Treaty of Utrecht. We have made it clear in the past, and I repeat again this afternoon, that the wishes of the inhabitants of Gibraltar are the paramount consideration for us; and we believe that in saying this we are acting fully in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

178. We have made clear to the Spanish Government our belief that Spanish restrictions against Gibraltar, which regrettably still continue in force, can only harden the feeling of Gibraltarians towards Spain. We have suggested that the Spanish Government should concentrate on the human element of the problem, in particular on the attitude of the Gibraltarians themselves, rather than on a somewhat arid interpretation of the Treaty of Utrecht, on which, in any event, there are clearly differences of view.

179. None the less, as my delegation said in explanation of vote in the Fourth Committee on 5 December last year, we believe that it is important for our two Governments to continue by discussion to seek the elements of a negotiable agreement which might be acceptable to all concerned. In this spirit, we have remained in touch with the Spanish authorities this year, most recently in the meeting between my Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary and the Foreign Minister of Spain as recently as a few days ago. We do not consider, however, that the stage has yet been reached where a common basis has emerged on which substantive negotiations could begin. But our discussions have been useful, and we will go on trying. I must, however, make it very clear that in our view the time has come to recognize that patience and understanding will do more towards a solution to this problem than will public accusation or public recrimination.

180. Mr. EL-ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We should have liked to answer the deplorable statement made by the representative of Egypt immediately after he made it at the 2367th meeting. However, we chose to wait and to hear the representative of the other régime that participated in this ill-fated agreement, because we were confident that they would play the same tune, since they are actually playing under one conductor. We prefer to answer the two representatives together since, unfortunately for the Arabs, they are playing in one and the same orchestra.

181. The representative of Egypt attacked the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic personally, although the Foreign Minister of Syria said not one word directly affecting the President or the Foreign Minister of Egypt. The representative of Egypt said that Mr. Abdul Halim Khaddam represents the Baath Party of Syria, not the people of Syria. If Abdul Halim Khaddam represents the Baath Party of Syria, why did the representative of Egypt decide, together with him, his President Hafez al-Assad, and the Baath Party, to enter the October war? If the Baath Party does not represent the Syrian people and the Arab people, why did Egypt wage the battle of liberation together with it and why did Egypt participate in the creation of the United Arab Republic?

182. We have heard the same tune during the past two weeks from the same maestro, the United States, which wanted to put in its newspapers news about a disagreement between the Foreign Minister of Syria and the President of Syria, Hafez al-Assad, to the effect that Abdul Halim Khaddam does not represent the policy of Syria or the policy of Hafez al-Assad.

183. In his statement about the Sinai agreement [2367th meeting] Abdul Halim Khaddam was repeating the words of the angry masses demonstrating in the

Syrian towns and in the countries of the Arab nation from the Gulf to the ocean.

184. The representative of the Egyptian régime said that the Egyptian soldier and the Syrian soldier marched together in the battle of liberation in October 1973. This is true. But the Egyptian soldier withdrew from the battle and left the Syrian soldier, his companion and comrade-in-arms, alone. And this was very unfortunate.

185. The representative of Egypt said that, when the Foreign Minister of Syria attacked the Sinai agreement, he placed himself at odds with the will of the Syrian people and the Arab people. Who is putting himself at odds with the will of the Arab people? Is it the one who signs agreements of surrender and makes concessions with the enemy that is still occupying its lands and the lands of its brothers? Or is it the party that refuses to surrender?

186. The will of the Arab nation was represented by the Arab masses and the summit conferences. I wish to remind the representative of Egypt of the Sixth Conference of Arab Heads of State or Government, held at Rabat in October 1974, in which the President of Egypt, Anwar El-Sadat, took part. The Rabat Conference decided upon the following, and I quote from the decisions of this Conference the basis upon which Arab action is to be established:

"first, to co-ordinate political, economic and military action between the Arab countries in order to achieve Arab integration in the different fields;

"secondly, the non-acceptance of any attempt to realize partial political settlements, in view of the oneness and indivisibility of the problem . . .".

These are the decisions of the Rabat Conference which represent the will and desire of the Arab people.

187. The representative of Egypt tried to assure this Assembly and public opinion that he represents and knows more about the policies of Syria than the Foreign Minister and the President of Syria. He informed this Assembly that Syria is now engaged in negotiations for a new disengagement agreement on the Golan Heights similar to the new disengagement agreement in Sinai. In the absence of my Foreign Minister and the head of my delegation, I represent my country and I reiterate that President Hafez al-Assad, the Foreign Minister, Mr. Abdul Halim Khaddam, Syrian officials at all levels, and the Syrian Baath Party, which represents the will of the Syrian people and the Arab countries, have decided that they will never agree to sign any such shameful agreement as the Sinai agreement or to agree to the conditions accepted by Egypt in this agreement. We cannot accept any agreement that would freeze the *status quo* in the area, which would put peace out of the reach of the Arab nation and which would nullify the rights of the Palestinian people and the rights of the Arab States whose territories have been occupied.

188. This agreement is not a peace agreement. Here, I would like to answer the representative of Israel who spoke at this meeting. The Sinai agreement is an Israeli-American manoeuvre seeking to prolong the Israeli occupation of Arab lands, to freeze the *status quo* in the area, and to sow the seeds of dissension between the forces confronting the Israeli aggression, in order to liquidate these forces one after the other.

It is also designed to deceive world public opinion, and convince it that there is a movement towards peace in the area. The pretext used is that the Israeli troops will withdraw a few kilometres that do not represent even 1 per cent of the occupied lands in return for political, economic and military concessions, the compelling result of which is to alleviate the pressure on Israel by freezing the Egyptian front for a number of years, thus enabling the forces of Zionist aggression to continue their occupation of the other areas in Sinai, the Golan Heights and the West Bank.

189. The Sinai agreement introduces a new and dangerous element because, for the first time, it brings a world Power into this conflict. And if other super-Powers should tomorrow take similar action, whether in the Middle East problem or in any other conflict, you can imagine the danger to peace posed by the friction between these super-Powers which will send their troops to separate the forces in these specific regions.

190. The United States is completely on the side of Israel. And the price of this agreement which was described as a step towards peace—and this is very strange—is tons and billions and billions of dollars' worth of sophisticated weapons like the Pershing missiles, the F-15 and F-16 planes, and the M-60 tanks. This is the price of an agreement which is considered to be a step towards peace. What will be the price of the agreement that will one day consolidate permanent peace in the area?

191. The representatives of Israel and Egypt also said that this agreement is in implementation of Security Council resolutions 338 (1973) and 242 (1967). Resolution 338 (1973) provided for three main items: first, a cease-fire; secondly, implementation of resolution 242 (1967); and, finally, negotiations to establish a permanent and just peace in the area. The second item, which comes immediately after the cease-fire is the implementation of resolution 242 (1967), which affirms only two principles: first, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab areas; and, secondly, the ending of the state of belligerency and recognition of the right of all States to live in peace. Therefore, resolution 338 (1973) affirmed that after the cease-fire during the war of October 1973 a withdrawal had to come, and following that there should be negotiations to establish permanent peace. However, the Sinai agreement unfortunately put the cart before the horse: it brought an end to the state of belligerency and to the boycott but also assured surrender to Zionist pressure at a time when 99 per cent of Arab lands are under Israeli occupation. How can peace be realized in the area under these conditions?

192. A few moments ago we listened to the Foreign Minister of the Sudan, who said that if Israel after all these years—after eight years of occupation and after 27 years of neglecting human rights in the area—is prepared to withdraw only 10 miles, when shall we see their withdrawal from all occupied Arab lands and when will we see permanent peace?

193. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I must apologize but I should like to invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to sum up what he has to say. He has gone beyond the 10-minute limit laid down by the General Assembly.

194. Mr. EL-ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): I do apologize, Mr. President, but you may have observed that I am replying to both the representative of Egypt and the representative of Israel. In any case, Mr. President, I am going to be extremely brief and I will conclude my statement in a few minutes.

[*The speaker continued in Arabic.*]

195. The representative of Israel said that the agreement concerns Egypt and Israel alone, and that other countries should not interfere or criticize it. I would say that we are not interfering with Israel and Egypt, but that we are dealing with an agreement that affects the rights of a whole people—of 3 million persons—an agreement that concerns the occupied lands of countries in the area. If we did not do so, we would be encouraging Israeli aggression because we would be permitting Israel to benefit from its aggression. This is rejected by the Charter of the United Nations and all international covenants. We all have an interest in criticizing any question that affects the interest of the Arab people and the rights of the Palestinian people.

196. Secondly, the Israeli representative said that we should not raise objections for the sake of Arab and Israeli children. What children does he mean? Does he mean the children in the Palestinian camps in Lebanon, who are being strafed by Israeli planes and by napalm every day? Are these the children whom the Israeli representative does not want to die on the battlefield? Does he want them to die from the Phantom-16, the Phantom-15 or the Pershing missiles?

197. He also said that the Palestinians are a bunch of terrorists and that he is ready to take into account the interests of the Palestinians although he does not recognize the PLO. Who decides that the PLO represents the Palestinian people? Is it the representative of Israel? The Rabat Conference decided that the PLO is the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Last year, the General Assembly, by resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3237 (XXIX), recognized the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people.

198. We do not object to the fact that there is a terrorist party in Israel led by Menachem Begin, and we did not object to the fact that Israel perpetrated many massacres and crimes against the Palestinian people. It is not up to Israel to appoint the representative of the Palestinian people. However, if Israel truly wants peace, it should implement the United Nations resolutions and recognize the right of the Palestinian Arab people to live in their homeland in accordance with the United Nations resolutions, then this will be the sole road to peace; and no force, whether Arab or non-Arab, and no super-Power can impose upon the Arab people acceptance of concessions or settlements so long as these lands are under occupation.

199. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I feel that I owe it to the Assembly and to the world at large to correct certain assertions and misconceptions which permeated the statement by Mr. Allon. I speak to the world at large because I know that the mass media, to a large extent, reflect the misconceptions and assertions of Israel. I know that my voice may not

carry further than this Assembly, but I am confident that the voice of justice will be heard sooner or later.

200. I have been dealing with this question since 1922 when I was 17 years old, when we found that the perfidious Mr. Balfour promised something that did not belong to the United Kingdom. I am not going into the ramifications of the question, but certain matters should be made clear about zionism, which Mr. Allon praised to the high heavens, forgetting that in the Bible Zion was a spiritual symbol. "I looked up to Zion." We know it from the Psalms and we know it from all the books of the Old Testament. There are two concepts of zionism. One is the spiritual concept, which we applaud, for we respect everyone who has a devout and religious feeling, whatever his religion may be. But what we have here is geographical zionism, which is used by the religion Judaism as a motivation for political and economic ends.

201. The three monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—sprang from the Middle East. Many people in the world—millions upon millions—embrace one of those three religions. There are only 16 or 17 million Jews. But Palestine is as sacred, if not more sacred, to the Christians and Moslems as the Jews claim it is to them.

202. But a distinction should be made between Semitic religions, on the one hand, and Semitic culture, way of life and ethnic origin, on the other. A religion is not identical with a people. You cannot turn back the pendulum of history: this was tried before, by both Christianity and Islam; but it did not work out, especially when the Christian Crusaders in the eleventh century marched on the land of Palestine. Then, too, a great monotheistic religion was used as a motivation for a political and economic end.

203. There are a thousand million Christians; they are not one people. There are 750 million Moslems; they are not one people. There are Christian peoples, Moslem peoples and, I submit, there are Jewish peoples.

204. Saint Augustine, in the sixth century, succeeded in converting the British to Christianity. Christianity is a Semitic religion; so is Islam; so is Judaism. Does Christianity make Semites of the British? Does it make Semites of the French? Does it make any country in which the majority belong to a certain monotheistic religion Semitic? I submit it does not: what makes the country Semitic is the people of the land, their culture, their language, their way of life, their food.

205. And who are those Jews who hoist the banner of territorial zionism? Who are the motivators of geographical zionism? They are the Ashkenazim of Central and Eastern Europe, whose ancestors hailed from the northern tier of Asia and whose forebears never laid eyes on the land of Palestine.

206. We have our Arab Jews, and they have lived in peace—and not only have they lived in peace but they were our people while their faith was their own. I do not want to recite to you the names of Arab Jews who distinguished themselves in Arab culture and history. This question was created for us by the converted Jews—Jews who converted in the eighth century when there was a confrontation between Byzantium and Islam and it was desirable to have a détente so that the balance of power might not interfere

with those two entities. There were a few rabbis around, and they were told that there were some pagan people who had come from the northern tier of Asia and had settled in what today is southern Russia, and that they could go and convert them to Judaism. Perhaps that would not have occurred had it been known what would happen centuries later. But it is the descendants of those people, whose forebears and ancestors had never seen the land of Palestine, as I said, who came with this philosophy, which has created so much trouble in our region and which may perhaps spark a global war.

207. Bear with me, Sir, because many of you here are newcomers, and you should know the antecedents of this question. The historical argument is plain. We deplore what Hitler did to those people because, after all, they were human beings; we are all *homo sapiens*. When Hitler persecuted the Jews, who fled from Germany? The affluent and the influential and those who could make their way out. Otherwise, there would not have been enough Jews for Hitler to kill or persecute. And Mr. Allon mentioned the round figure of 6 million Jews having been sacrificed—and we deplore that fact, too. And I must say that there were perhaps three times that number of Gentiles who were killed; but we will not go into that.

208. I take you back to the year 70 A.D.: the Romans happened to be ruling that area, and what did they do? They tried to propitiate the Jews. The Romans were then on the decline. They even put someone—Herod—on the throne to rule the Jews as a king. The Jews happened at that time to be in Palestine. Our own Jews did not come from Palestine: they came from Ur of the Chaldees, which is the western part of Iraq, where Abraham was born. C. W. Wooley—whom I knew, Mr. Richard—was an archaeologist who did a lot of archaeological work on Ur of the Chaldees. Our Jews descended as tribes—Jacob and his 12 sons. I am not going to recite the Bible to you here, but they sold poor Joseph, as you know, and did not tell their father. Anyway, the Jews descended on the land of Canaan—read Genesis, chapters 32 and 33; you have all the facts there. And when finally Joshua came to Jerusalem it was called Uru Salim—Uru, the land of peace. It was Uru Salim before the Jews—our Jews—went there.

209. And who were the people of Jerusalem? They were Semites who had come some 1500 years before Joshua stormed Jericho and Jerusalem. Jerusalem was populated by Semites. We did not mind other Semites—our Jews—coming there. And they stayed for how long? Between Judea and Israel, about 600 or 700 years.

210. But this has nothing to do with the Ashkenazim, the Khazars, who came from the northern tier of Asia, as I said, and had no affinity with our Jews. They are Jews by religion, but they are not Semites.

211. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): May I remind the representative of Saudi Arabia that his 10 minutes have expired?

212. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Sir, do not do this to me: I have to reply. For heaven's sake, do not cut the thread of my argument. Had you said I would be limited to 10 minutes, I should have said "no", right then. There are certain exceptions to be made.

213. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): With all due respect to you, Mr. Baroody, I would very respectfully ask you to be so kind as to recall that it is the decision of the General Assembly that the exercise of the right of reply is limited to 10 minutes. Quite naturally, we have let Ambassador Baroody speak. He has been speaking for 20 minutes now. But I do request him to be good enough to sum up his statement so as to allow other representatives to exercise their right of reply.

214. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from French*): I shall do everything in my power to be brief, but I should also like to say, in accordance with the rules of our Assembly, that I wish to address a few words to my brothers from Syria and from Egypt. Instead of taking my seat and requesting to speak in exercise of the right of reply, I shall take two more minutes and speak now. Mr. President, I therefore think you are covered by this explanation. Nevertheless, I shall be very brief.

215. I am speaking for all the Arabs, because I was one of the first of the Pan-Arabs and there are 20 countries which constitute the League of Arab States. I can assure you that no other Arab is going to speak. Therefore, if you wish to speak of logic, multiply 10 by 20 and that will give you 200 minutes.

[The speaker continued in English.]

216. Palestine became holy to the Jews by association. So it is, by association, to the Christians and Moslems. There are 16 million Jews; there are 1,000 million Christians; there are 750 million Moslems. If we go by the democratic yardstick, how can 16 million have priority of domain over the land?

217. This Hemisphere has North America and South America, the homeland of the Red Indian. Would anyone here who hails from any country of North America or South America heed the Indians if they were to come to this rostrum and say that this was their homeland? Actually they were the indigenous people of the two continents. Nobody would heed them. They live in reservations. But the Arabs do not live in reservations, and the Palestinians are the people of the land.

218. After the Temple was destroyed, who left Jerusalem in 70 A.D.? It was the affluent and the influential. And then came Christianity. Many Jews embraced Christianity. And then, when the Byzantines lorded it over the Christians and Islam came on the scene, many Jews embraced Islam in the Fertile Crescent. I have been a researcher of this subject for 55 years. And whom did the Ashkenazi Jews who were converted to Judaism expel? They expelled our Jews, those original Palestinians, most of whom—or a good part of them—were Jews. Is that not ironical?

219. Mr. Allon, whom do you think you are fooling? You cannot do this to us. As long as there is a Palestinian people, whether originally they were Jews or Gentiles, they are the people of the land.

220. I remember when Mr. Arafat came to this rostrum and said, "Here is an olive branch, take it". All right, you are afraid of a Secretary of State. Think of cantonments. Think of anything. But you want to claim the 16 million Jews as Israelis. But you did not mention that there are 3 million Jews in the Soviet

Union, who you claim should come and live with your brethren. I do not know how many American Jews there are. Many of them are my friends and I can tell you that they would not give 10 cents for the whole of the Middle East. They are happy here as Americans. But you want to bring them there. I do not know about the British Jews. Their number is dwindling because inflation played havoc with the economy of the United Kingdom. They might also want to leave.

221. Mr. Ivor Richard, my good friend, you are lucky that you belong to the Labour Party of the United Kingdom. I am sure that if at the time there had been a Labour Government there would not have been such a promise—and the promise was conditional. And what business was it of Mr. Truman, the haberdasher from Missouri—may his soul rest in peace! It was not the American people, because the State Department told Mr. Truman time and again, "You will alienate the Arabs." I went to Mr. Warren Austin, entrusted with a mission by His Majesty King Faisal—may God rest his soul in peace!—who was our representative in the General Assembly at Lake Success. The Americans would not heed us. Mr. Warren Austin said: "We shall see; we may place this under the Trusteeship Council until we find a solution." But it was Mr. Truman who was fishing for votes and who was pestered by Mr. Weizmann, Mr. Frankfurter, Mr. Brandeis and others. I do not have to tell you. I have lived here for a long time and I know what went on. I am a contemporary of these events.

222. What business had the United Kingdom at a distance of 3,000 miles and the United States at a distance of 7,000 miles to come to us? What did we Arabs do to them? We traded with you; we liked you; we opened our doors to you. Why did you not give away part of your land? And then to add insult to injury you also brought the Communists into our midst, and now there is détente between you and the Communists. I sometimes wonder—where is my Chinese friend?—whether there is something in what he says about the collusion of both Powers. I hope not, because then they would sell us down, not the Thames—the Thames flows quietly now—but down any river that they choose. That is the crux of the problem.

223. Finally, my brothers from Syria and Egypt, do not allow anybody to drive a wedge between you so that the Zionists and perhaps some other Powers can have suzerainty over our whole Middle East because of the oil. Come if you want, anyone who likes mischief—we will set the oil ablaze, and if there is no hell, hell will be let loose on earth.

224. Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I do not wish the dialectics of my friend, the representative of the United Kingdom, who spoke earlier, to confuse this Assembly. At the 2367th meeting the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain did indeed refer to self-determination in dealing with the question of the Sahara.

225. Obviously there is an indigenous population in the Sahara. But in no way can one extend that right to a prefabricated population made up of people serving on a military base which, as you all know, has been established in Gibraltar.

226. I do not wish to go into minor details. I believe that the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country was clear, accurate and quite decisive. The position of the General Assembly was fixed some time ago. It merely requested that, for the purpose of negotiating the decolonization of Gibraltar, the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom should meet to discuss the decolonization of the Territory and to safeguard the legitimate interests of the population.

227. To seek refuge in the preamble of a constitution which was created by an order-in-council which may be abrogated by another order-in-council would be to go on indefinitely. We would never reach a formula for a solution.

228. I believe that the time has come to complete the decolonization of dependent territories. It is in this spirit that my Minister for Foreign Affairs spoke here this morning, when he expressed our fervent hope that next year we may come to this Assembly and say that Gibraltar has been decolonized.

229. In point of fact, the principle of territorial integrity is as respectable a principle as any other. The territory involved here is very small, an area of 1 7/8 miles with a population 17,000. But whatever the size of the population, it remains covered by the agreement reached.

230. The agreement, as stated by the representative of the United Kingdom, is the Treaty of Utrecht and it was said that, if His Majesty's Government decides to give up, hand over or in any way divest itself of this Territory, Spain has the first claim.

231. I believe it would not be superfluous to recall that, according to an old Anglo Saxon adage, "international law is part of the law of the land". I do not believe that there can be any valid reason why domestic or municipal law should alter the scope and content of what is agreed upon by two sovereign States.

232. I do not wish to add anything else, but I recommend that you read the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain. It clearly explains the whole matter.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2255th meeting.*

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1975, document S/11818/Add.1, annex.*

³ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I. C. J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*