

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records



**2137th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 2 October 1973,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	
Speech by Mr. Kuan-hua Chiao (China)	1
Speech by Mr. Tack (Panama)	7
Speech by Mr. Dennis (Liberia)	11
Speech by Mr. Simbananiye (Burundi)	14
Speech by Mr. Peete (Lesotho)	20
Reply by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	23
Reply by the representative of the Khmer Republic . . .	24

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before calling on the first speaker I would request representatives, and the public in general, to be good enough to remain silent at the end of each statement and thus show respect for the speakers who follow. I rely on those present to co-operate with us in this way.

2. Mr. CHIAO Kuan-hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Since the twenty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly, some notable events have successively taken place on the international arena. First, there was the cessation of the war in Viet-Nam and Laos. Secondly, there were the talks held and the agreements concluded between the two super-Powers—the United States and the Soviet Union. Thirdly, there was the convening of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. In the meantime, the third world has further awakened and grown in strength, and the African, Latin American and non-aligned countries held a series of important international conferences. What is the characteristic of the present world situation? Is the international situation really moving towards a general détente? This is a question in which people are interested. The delegation of the People's Republic of China would like to state its views on this question and a number of other questions with which the current session of the General Assembly is confronted.

3. First, what is the characteristic of the present world situation?

4. The Chinese Government has long held that our world is now going through a process of great turbulence, great division and great realignment. The basic contradictions in the world are all sharpening, in particular the contradictions between imperialism and colonialism on the one hand and

the oppressed nations and peoples on the other and the contradictions among the imperialist countries, especially those between the two super-Powers. Although no new world war has broken out since the Second World War, local wars resulting from imperialist aggressions have never ceased. The great victory of the heroic Viet-Nameese people's war of resistance against United States aggression and for national salvation has once again proved that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers. A small nation can defeat a big one and a weak nation can defeat a strong one, so long as they dare to struggle, are good at struggle and persevere in struggle. It is not the people who fear imperialism; it is imperialism which fears the people. Revolution is the main trend in the world today. Now that the war in Viet-Nam has ended, can it be assumed that the world will henceforth be tranquil? Obviously not. When the Korean war was ended in 1953, some people thought that no more gunshots would be heard in the world. Not long afterwards, however, the Suez war broke out and then the Viet-Nam war started. And even today, the war in Indo-China has not stopped completely, for there is still fighting in Cambodia. Tension in the Middle East has not relaxed in the least. The colonialists and racists are carrying out armed suppression against the African people and the African people are developing armed resistance against them. The aggression against, subversion and control of and interference in countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America by the super-Powers are continuing without end. A recent case in point is the military coup d'état in Chile. President Salvador Allende died a martyr at his post. We express profound condolences on his heroic death. At the same time, we hold one should not forget how harmful the absurd theory of so-called "peaceful transition" is to the anti-imperialism revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American people, a theory which has been advocated by another super-Power. The dismemberment of a sovereign country by armed force and the legalization and perpetuation of that division have also become a tendency on the part of the big Powers in their attempt to dominate the world. In the economic field, the gap is widening between the rich and developed countries and the poor and developing countries, and even among the developed countries there exist many contradictions, and hence détente among them is far from being the case. The recent Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries, held at Algiers, strongly condemned racism, zionism, colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism and strongly demanded a change in the present state of affairs in the world, demonstrating a further awakening of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples. In a word, we consider that the characteristic of the present situation is one of great disorder throughout the world and not tranquillity. And the main trend amidst this great disorder is that countries want independence, nations want liberation, and the people want revolution.

5. Second, why is there no tranquillity in the world today?

6. We have always held that all countries in the world, big or small, should be equal; that all countries, irrespective of their social systems, should establish normal State relations on the five principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence; and that international disputes should be settled peacefully on the basis of these principles without resorting to the use or threat of force. This should apply to relations between big Powers, to relations between a big Power and a small country, and all the more so to relations between a strong and a weak, or between a rich and a poor country. It was on these principles that China started to improve its relations with the United States and established diplomatic relations with Japan. In their joint communiqué issued in Shanghai on 27 February 1972, China and the United States further declared that they should not seek hegemony in the Asia-Pacific region and were opposed to efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony. The same principle was reaffirmed in the Sino-Japanese statement of 30 September 1972 on the establishment of mutual diplomatic relations. In our view, the above-mentioned principles are the minimum criteria for the equality of all countries in international relations and indicate the correct way to achieve a relaxation of international tension.

7. As sovereign States, the United States and the Soviet Union are fully entitled to take the measures they deem appropriate to improve and develop their bilateral relations. However, we cannot but point out that the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War signed by them on 22 June 1973 goes far beyond the scope of bilateral relations. One may ask, Who has given them the right to enter into what they call "urgent consultations" in case of a dispute between either of the parties and other countries and even between any other two countries? The phrase about disputes which "appear to involve the risk of nuclear conflict" is open to any interpretation, and their so-called "urgent consultations" are bound to be followed by actions dictated by their own interests. Does not this mean that they may interfere at will in the relations among all countries on the strength of the huge numbers of nuclear weapons in their possession? China absolutely will not go begging for nuclear protection from any country, nor is she afraid of nuclear threat from any country. But we feel in duty bound to state our views on this matter since it concerns all the people of the world.

8. The signing of such an agreement by the Soviet Union and the United States is by no means accidental, but is derived from the so-called principle which they agreed upon in 1972 that the Soviet Union and the United States have "security interests . . . based on the principle of equality".¹ What is meant by "security interests . . . based on the principle of equality"? To put it bluntly, it means rivalry

for world hegemony—wherever one goes, the other will do the same. What they are doing now is simply to wrap up this content in the form of an agreement.

9. In fact, this Agreement is a mere scrap of paper. It contains no explicit undertaking on the non-use of nuclear weapons; still less does it envisage the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. The United States Government was more frank when it stated that the Agreement is only a general statement of policy which does not involve any particular positive actions that either side has to take, and pointed out that agreements are not always maintained and there is nothing self-enforcing about this document.

10. However, the Soviet leaders have made a great fanfare, lauding that Agreement to the skies, alleging that it ushered in "a new era" in international relations and opened up "historical vistas for strengthening universal security as a whole," and that it was "indeed of historic importance for all mankind". They have their motives for so eulogizing the Agreement. One may recall Khrushchev's famous remarks: "Even a tiny spark can cause a world conflagration" and "We"—that is, the Soviet Union and the United States—"are the strongest countries in the world, and if we unite for peace there can be no war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake our fingers to warn him off." In this way, if the Soviet Union could be bound together with the United States, would not the whole world have to cringe to them? However, in our view, things may not necessarily turn out that way.

11. It is not so easy for the Soviet Union to bind itself to the United States. Shortly after the signing of the Agreement, the Soviet Union pressed forward with its underground nuclear tests and hastened the development of missiles with multiple warheads. The United States will not take this lying down. Why? Because the desperate struggle for nuclear superiority and world hegemony still goes on. The contention between the Soviet Union and the United States now extends all over the world. A vivid proof can be found in the recent subversion of a government in Asia and another in South America. Their scramble is becoming increasingly fierce. That is the reason why there is no tranquillity in the world today. So, what peaceful coexistence is there to speak of? There is only a travesty of peaceful coexistence; the substance is coexistence in rivalry. But whether such coexistence can last is, of course, another question.

12. The Soviet leaders noisily proclaim that as a "socialist" State the Soviet Union is the "natural and surest ally" of the developing countries. In the past, some people in China also believed this, because they saw the Soviet Union as the homeland of the great Lenin and the Chinese revolution, a continuation of the October Revolution. Therefore, how could the Soviet Union, as a socialist State, fail to give the developing countries whole-hearted internationalist assistance? But since Khrushchev rose to power, we came to realize, thanks to the long and direct experience we had gained as a result of the Soviet Union's demand for the establishment of a joint fleet in the China Sea, its withdrawal of experts, its tearing up of contracts, border intrusions, subversions, and so on, that this was not the case, and that what the Soviet Union practised was not

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1972*, document S/10674, "Basic principles of mutual relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America".

internationalism but great-Power chauvinism, national egoism and territorial expansionism. Therefore we will not blame those friends who have so far failed to see this for lack of experience. How can a socialist turn into an imperialist? There is in fact nothing strange about it if one goes a little into the history of the international Communist movement. Was not Karl Kautsky once a somewhat well-known Marxist? But he later betrayed Marxism and capitulated to imperialism. It was Lenin who passed the final historical verdict on Kautsky in his well-known pamphlet *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*.² People can change; so can a State. It has changed, and what can one do about it?

13. Lenin pointed out on one occasion: "We judge a person not by what he says or thinks of himself but by his actions." That applies to a State as well. What has the Soviet Government done to other countries in these years? This is clear to the broad masses of the people of Czechoslovakia, Egypt and Pakistan, to the peoples of Cambodia who are fighting dauntlessly, and to other peoples who have been subjected to its aggression, subversion, control, interference or bullying. The actions of the Soviet Government have amply shown that it is "socialist in words, imperialist in deeds", as Lenin said.

14. The Soviet-United States Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War cannot hoodwink many people or intimidate the peoples of the world, but can only arouse indignation, misgivings and disillusionment. The tide is mounting against the hegemonism and power politics practised by the super-Powers.

15. Third, who is really against détente?

16. Shortly after the war in Viet-Nam came to an end, the United States Government pronounced 1973 to be "the year of Europe". That was followed by the first stage of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—a conference advocated by the Soviet Government for many years. All this indicates that Europe is the focus of contention between the two super-Powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—and that the so-called European Security Conference is nothing but one of the forms of contention. Its proceedings showed, however, that it went far beyond the scope to which the two super-Powers wished to confine it. At that Conference many countries stated pointedly that deeds and not empty promises are called for in the matter of security; that European security must be based on the safeguarding of national independence and sovereignty; that one must not become mentally disarmed and off guard simply because the European Security Conference has taken place; and that in order to guarantee European security, military blocs must be disbanded, foreign military bases dismantled, and foreign troops withdrawn, so that the relations between European countries may be established on the principles of mutual respect for independence and sovereignty, complete equality and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

17. Moreover, some countries pointed out that the security of the Mediterranean and the security of Europe

were inseparable and that there could be no security for Europe when the Mediterranean is under the armed threat of, and contention by, the two super-Powers. All this is tantamount to a direct blow at those who seek by means of this Conference to consolidate the occupation of many European countries which resulted from the Second World War or the events thereafter, and to proceed further to disintegrate Western Europe and dominate the whole of Europe. The European Security Conference is still going on; but, judging from the proceedings of its first stage, it will further expose the ambitions of that super-Power which seeks to divide and disintegrate Western Europe.

18. While stepping up its arms expansion and war preparations and its world-wide contention with the United States for spheres of influence, the Soviet Union is clamouring for "spreading the zone of relaxation to the whole world". Accordingly, it has lately picked up once again the long-ignored trash known as the Asian Collective Security System. This is most amusing. It reminds us of the American by the name of John Foster Dulles, who, after the war in Indo-China was brought to an end by the first Geneva Conference in 1954,³ hastily rigged up the so-called South-East Asia Treaty Organization, which was directed against China and whose members were mostly non-South-East Asian countries. The Soviet Union is a European country and the chief of the alliance deriving from the Warsaw Treaty. Why should it be so eagerly concerned about the "collective security" of Asian countries? Has the ghost of John Foster Dulles gone to the Kremlin? Actually, would it not be less devious and more direct simply to extend the Warsaw Treaty to Asia?

19. Lately, the Soviet leaders have tried to pin an additional label on China, namely "opponent of détente". As the Chinese saying goes, this is putting Mr. Chang's hat on Mr. Li's head. Since you say you are so anxious to relax world tension, why do you not show your good faith by doing a thing or two—for instance, by withdrawing your armed forces from Czechoslovakia or the Mongolian People's Republic and by returning the four northern islands to Japan?

20. We hold that imperialism means war. There is a danger of war so long as imperialism exists. Today, when the various types of basic contradictions in the world are sharpening, the danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must be prepared, and must not let themselves be misled by a temporary and superficial facade of détente. Only thus can we better strive for a bright future for the world. In the final analysis, the destiny of mankind is decided by the people in their hundreds of millions who persevere in struggle and unity, and not by the one or two super-Powers.

21. Fourth, there is the Cambodian question.

22. The Chinese Government resolutely denounces the United States Government for continuing to support in various ways the puppet régime in Phnom Penh and wantonly to interfere in the affairs of Cambodia. The régime of the traitorous Lon Nol clique, which is now installed in Phnom Penh, was imposed on the Khmer people

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works* (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1965), vol. 28 (July 1918-March 1919), pp. 112-113.

³ Conference on the Problem of Restoring Peace in Indo-China, held from 16 June to 21 July 1954.

by the United States imperialists and their allies and has been illegal from its very inception. The Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia under the leadership of the head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, is the sole legal government of Cambodia. The People's Armed Forces of National Liberation of Cambodia under its leadership have liberated over 90 per cent of Cambodia's territory, with over 80 per cent of the population. The Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia has been recognized by nearly 50 countries. The participants at the recent Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which met in September at Algiers, have declared that the Royal Government of National Union under the leadership of Prince Norodom Sihanouk is the only legal government of Cambodia and earnestly requested all countries which love peace and justice to give it formal recognition [see A/9330, p. 12]. This is a voice of justice. The Chinese Government holds that the continued usurpation by the traitorous Lon Nol clique of the seat in the United Nations is a contempt for all countries that uphold justice, for the Fourth Conference and for the United Nations itself. The Chinese Government firmly maintains that the present session of the General Assembly should take a decision immediately to expel the representatives of the traitorous Lon Nol clique from the United Nations and restore to the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia under the leadership of the head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, its rightful seat in the United Nations.

23. Fifth, I turn now to the Korean question.

24. There are now before the General Assembly two draft resolutions on the Korean question—one sponsored by the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan and other countries [A/C.1/L.645], the other sponsored by Algeria, China and other countries [A/C.1/L.644 and Corr.1]. Regarding the former draft resolution, the Chinese Government considers that the position for retaining the United Nations Command and the United States forces in South Korea and for the entry of both North and South Korea into the United Nations is unreasonable and contrary to the joint communiqué of North and South Korea issued on 4 July 1972,⁴ although it contains the positive element of dissolving the so-called "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea".

25. The withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea and the peaceful settlement of the Korean question are long overdue. According to the provisions of the Korean Armistice Agreement of 27 July 1953,⁵ a high-level political conference for the settlement of the Korean question ought to have met within three months after the Armistice Agreement became effective. The conference was not held only because of the obstructions put up by the United States side at the time. Subsequently, the question was again discussed at the 1954 Korean Political Conference in Geneva. The then United States Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, peremptorily rejected all

reasonable proposals, thereby blocking once again a solution to the question of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea and the peaceful settlement of the Korean question. The United States was then absolutely unwilling to withdraw its forces from South Korea.

26. What could be done about it? Well, if you would not withdraw, we would.

27. In 1958 the Chinese People's Volunteers unilaterally and unconditionally withdrew from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Consequently, there are no foreign forces on one side in Korea, while large numbers of foreign forces, mainly United States forces, are stationed on the other side. This most unreasonable state of affairs cannot but constitute an obstacle to the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea.

28. Is South Korea so lacking in national self-respect that it must rely on the support of foreign forces? Obviously, such a state of affairs cannot be tolerated by the people in South Korea. Subsequently, thanks to the initiative of President Kim Il Sung of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a joint communiqué of North and South Korea on the independent and peaceful reunification of the country was issued on 4 July 1972, leading to the start of a dialogue between the North and the South. This was a big step towards the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea and the peaceful settlement of the problem of the reunification of Korea by the Koreans themselves. With the issuance of this communiqué, the Korean Armistice Agreement, signed 19 years ago, to a great extent ceased to play the role it once had. The Koreans in the North and the South have themselves agreed upon refraining from committing armed provocations, big or small, and upon taking active measures for preventing incidents of unexpected military conflicts. Is this not the best guarantee for the maintenance of the armistice?

29. It is captious to say that the dissolution of the United Nations Command and the withdrawal of foreign forces would nullify the 1953 Armistice Agreement. It should be recalled that the Korean Armistice Agreement was signed between the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers on the one hand and the United Nations Command on the other. According to that kind of reasoning, would not the withdrawal of the Chinese People's Volunteers mean that the Korean Armistice Agreement had long been nullified? Since the Chinese People's Volunteers could withdraw from Korea, why cannot the foreign forces in South Korea under the signboard of the United Nations Command do the same?

30. The continued presence of the so-called United Nations Command and of foreign forces in South Korea is at variance with the principles agreed on by the two sides in Korea on 4 July 1972 that "unification shall be achieved through independent Korean efforts without being subject to external imposition or interference". In point of fact, it is the very presence of this outside force that has emboldened the South Korean authorities to reject a number of reasonable proposals put forward by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, thus causing the dialogue between the North and the South to bog down. The Kim Dae Jung incident which occurred not long ago

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 27, annex I.*

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1953, document S/3079, appendix A.*

has shown how abjectly the South Korean authorities depend upon foreign forces. In order that conditions may be created to accelerate the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea, the United Nations Command should agree to disband, and all foreign forces stationed in South Korea should agree to withdraw.

31. As for the entry of both North and South Korea into the United Nations, this is plainly an attempt to legalize and perpetuate the division of Korea, which runs counter to the principle agreed upon between the North and the South that "as a homogenous people, a great national unity shall be sought above all as one nation, transcending differences in ideas, ideologies and systems". In his five propositions put forward on 23 June of this year [see A/9027, para. 19], President Kim Il Sung of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has pointed out that the North and the South should not enter the United Nations separately and that if they want to enter the United Nations before the reunification of the country is achieved, they should enter it as one State, at least, under the name of the Confederal Republic of Koryo after the Confederation is enforced. This proposition is entirely reasonable and merits the sympathy and support of all countries that uphold justice.

32. Sixth, there is the question of Bangladesh.

33. At the time of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly in 1971, the Soviet Union supported India in dismembering Pakistan by armed force. The General Assembly and then the Security Council adopted resolutions by overwhelming majorities calling for cease-fire, troop withdrawal and the repatriation of the prisoners of war by India and Pakistan [General Assembly resolution 2793 (XXVI) and Security Council resolution 307 (1971)]. At its twenty-seventh session, in 1972, the General Assembly further adopted two interdependent resolutions calling for the repatriation of Pakistan prisoners of war and expressing the desire for the admission of Bangladesh into the United Nations [resolutions 2938 and 2937 (XXVII)].

34. It was not until 28 August of this year that an agreement on the repatriation of prisoners of war and civilians was reached between India and Pakistan at New Delhi. This agreement has come much too late, but its ultimate conclusion is to be welcomed. The agreement reached is on paper, and there will have to be a process before it can be turned into reality. Complications may yet arise. The Chinese Government holds that the question of admitting Bangladesh to the United Nations can be considered once the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council are implemented without qualification. But this can be done only after the thorough implementation of the United Nations resolutions, and definitely not before.

35. Seventh, there is the Middle East question.

36. Although the two super-Powers are both trumpeting about a general world trend towards détente, a tense stalemate of "no war, no peace" still prevails in the Middle East. When the Soviet Union dismembered Pakistan in 1971, no one said there was the risk of a nuclear war. Neither has anyone made a similar warning in connexion

with the current United States intervention in Cambodia. It is only in the Middle East that, at the mention of an attempt by Arab countries to repulse Israeli aggression and recover their lost territories, the air is filled with cries about a risk of nuclear war between the two super-Powers. Why is this so? Because the situation of "no war, no peace" created and maintained by the two super-Powers serves them best in their scramble for spheres of influence, oil resources and strategic positions in the Middle East. In appearance the two super-Powers are each supporting one of the antagonistic sides, but in essence they are like two clay figurines which have been kneaded together and then remoulded, so that there is something of each in the other. Take the case of the aggressor Israel. Could Israel be so unbridled in its truculence if it received only supplies of American weapons but none of Soviet manpower? In our opinion, the so-called risk of a nuclear war has been deliberately fabricated to scare people. It is futile to count on the super-Powers to bring about a settlement of the Middle East question. Nor will the situation be changed by any resolution adopted by the United Nations. The only way out is to act independently and rely on one's own efforts. China has never had anything to do with the Israeli Zionists. China firmly supports the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their just struggle against Israeli Zionism. We believe that so long as they uphold unity and persevere in struggle, the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, with the support of the people of the whole world, will certainly surmount all the difficulties on their road of advance, recover their sacred territories and regain their national rights.

37. Eighth, there is the question of opposing colonialism.

38. An excellent situation prevails in Africa. In the past year, the African people have achieved a series of new victories in their struggle to win and safeguard their national independence and to oppose racism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism. Through their struggle they have come to realize more and more the necessity of armed struggle and mutual support. The Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], at its tenth ordinary session held last May in Addis Ababa, issued the resounding call to "eliminate all forms of colonialism on the African continent". The conference documents fully manifested the unity and co-operation of the African countries and their militancy against the common enemies, as well as the determination of the African people in the territories which have not yet become independent to expand their armed struggle for national liberation. With imperialist and super-Power support and connivance, the racist régimes and colonialist authorities in Africa are resorting to more insidious and brutal means in their desperate struggle to buttress their tottering rule. They have long refused to implement the United Nations resolutions which reflect the just demands of the African people. What deserves special attention is that while the old-line colonialists are on the decline, neo-colonialists of different shades are trying to take their place by means of cunning and deceptive manoeuvres. The super-Powers are sowing dissension among the African countries so as to fish in troubled waters. The African people are still faced with the task of a protracted, complicated and tortuous struggle. Africa belongs to the great African people. The Chinese people stand firmly by

the African people. We resolutely support the peoples of Mozambique, Angola, Azania, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Guinea-Bissau, Spanish Sahara and other regions in their just struggle for national liberation. We warmly hail and give recognition to the new-born Republic of Guinea-Bissau. We resolutely support the just struggles of all African countries against aggression, subversion and the sowing of discord by colonialism and neo-colonialism and in defence of State sovereignty and African unity. We are confident that the awakening African people will continue to win new victories in the course of their coming struggle.

39. Ninth, there is the question of opposing maritime hegemony.

40. The determined struggle for the recognition of maritime rights in a zone of 200 nautical miles initiated by Latin American countries has won increasing support among the numerous small and medium-sized countries. Both the Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of the OAU and the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held earlier this year, expressly declared that a coastal State is entitled to establish an exclusive economic zone or a zone of national jurisdiction with the maximum limit of 200 nautical miles. And land-locked States are also entitled to share sea-bed and fishery resources. On this problem of maritime rights, the numerous small and medium-sized countries are waging a gigantic and vigorous struggle against the maritime hegemony of the super-Powers. With a view to seeking hegemony on the seas and oceans, the super-Powers are trying in vain to preserve the outdated law of the sea and are doing their utmost to restrict the territorial sea and scope of jurisdiction of all countries. They insist that the three-nautical-mile or 12-nautical-mile rule for the territorial sea is sacred and inviolable, arguing that the expansion of the territorial sea and the zone of jurisdiction will narrow down the open sea. This is a bluff. What sacredness and inviolability! The three-nautical-mile rule was a man-made stipulation, and so was the 12-nautical mile rule. Both rules reflect the reality of the time when the seas and oceans were controlled by colonialism and imperialism. What is there that is so sacred and inviolable? As to the assertion that the larger the territorial seas and the zones of jurisdiction, the smaller the open sea, the question must be asked, What is the open sea? The so-called "open sea" has, in fact, always been the "private sea" of a few strong naval Powers. The numerous small and medium-sized countries have now stood up; they constitute the majority and demand a change in the so-called law of the sea, which is advantageous only to the imperialists. What fault can one find with this? In a proposal submitted by the Soviet Union and its allies to the United Nations Industrial Development Board on 2 June 1972, they said that "the sovereignty over the natural resources is depending to a great extent upon the capability of utilizing these resources by the industry of the developing countries . . .".⁶

41. At the 101st meeting of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction held in Geneva on 22 August 1973, a Soviet representative said that the develop-

ing countries could not increase their catch even if they had a 200-nautical-mile zone, because they lacked the technical know-how, fishing capacity, and so forth. These statements simply mean that the greater the might, the greater the right. This is the logic of imperialism, pure and simple. Why are the super-Powers so violently opposed to the position of the small and medium-sized countries for enlarging the territorial sea and the zone of jurisdiction? It is not difficult to see the underlying motive if only one takes a look at the contention between the United States and the Soviet Union for maritime hegemony in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the Caribbean, the Pacific and the Atlantic Ocean and their rivalry in setting up bases and plundering the fishing and sea-bed resources there. When the territorial sea and the zone of jurisdiction are enlarged, their "private sea" over which they act the overlords will contract. How can the super-Powers not desperately oppose this? However, their opposition will eventually prove futile. So long as the numerous small and medium-sized countries are united by seeking common ground on major points, while reserving differences on minor ones, and persevere in tenacious and protracted efforts, their struggle against maritime hegemony is bound to triumph.

42. The struggle against maritime hegemony is an important aspect of the struggle waged by the numerous developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to protect national resources and develop the national economy. It is also a new focus in the current struggle against hegemonism. In other economic spheres, the developing countries are also more closely co-ordinating their actions and strengthening their unity in the struggle against exploitation, plunder, dumping and monopoly by imperialism and big-Power hegemonism. The bilateral and regional economic co-operation of the developing countries is growing, and the various organizations of raw-material-exporting countries are expanding. More and more developing countries have come to realize that, in order to consolidate political independence, it is imperative to attain economic independence, and that in order to develop the national economy, it is imperative to rely on their own efforts and strengthen their mutual support and co-operation. It was by plundering and exploiting the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America that colonialism and imperialism accumulated their fortunes. Therefore, the people of these continents are fully entitled to demand repayment of this debt. However, in the light of China's own experience, colonialism and imperialism will never repay the debt and, what is more, they will create more difficulties for those countries which are defending their national independence and developing their national economy. It is futile to harbour any unrealistic notions about them. We must persist in opposing imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. We must rely on ourselves, rely on the people, wage an arduous struggle and exert sustained efforts. We believe that, by so doing, the developing countries will certainly become prosperous.

43. Tenth, there is the question of disarmament.

44. The Chinese Government has always stood for disarmament. But what we stand for is genuine disarmament, not phoney disarmament; still less empty talk about disarmament coupled with actual arms expansion every day. At

⁶ See document ID/B/L.123 of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

present, we face the harsh fact that the super-Powers are hawking disarmament, and the Soviet Union in particular is most energetic about it. Nearly every year it comes up with some sort of proposal on disarmament at the General Assembly. Last year, it boasted of the great significance of its agreement with the United States on the so-called limitation of strategic nuclear weapons. And this year, it is even more vehement in lauding the so-called epoch-making significance of the Soviet-United States Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War. Meanwhile, it has sanctimoniously proposed a 10 per cent reduction of the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council and the utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries [2124th meeting]. This is Krushchev's old war: each has been peddled for more than a dozen years and has not deceived many people. How are military budgets to be assessed? To study this problem alone, a committee will have to be set up and work for many years. Can military budgets really be reduced? Anyway, nobody has ever seen this happen. We think it is better to stop this kind of empty talk, and stop it quickly. If you are really the "natural and surest ally" of the developing countries you should come up to this rostrum and declare openly that your military aid to all developing countries which is used to resist foreign aggression is gratis and free of charge, that you will not be a merchant of death, and that, although you have charged previously, you will not press for the payment of debt and interest, especially in the case of the struggling Arab countries. Be forthright and simple. Declare publicly that you will cancel all the military loans, that there is no need for repayment and that you will let them be gone with the wind. Would not that be more practical?

45. What general disarmament? Actually, in the world today, it is the two super-Powers that are engaged in an uncontrollable arms race. Their aim is nuclear superiority and the nuclear hegemony with which to dominate the world. To put it bluntly, any disarmament must first of all be the disarming of these two super-Powers. But can this be realized? On this point, the United States Government is somewhat more candid than is the Soviet Government. It admits that military expenditures cannot be reduced in the context of rivalry between the two hegemonic Powers. As to the numerous small and medium-sized countries, the real problem they face is definitely not disarmament, but the strengthening of their necessary and independent defence capabilities. Even Western Europe is inadequate in defence capabilities. How much more so are the large number of small and medium-sized countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America? What have these countries got to disarm? To talk about general disarmament in these circumstances is gibberish. If such proposals were really accepted, it would mean to ask the whole world completely to disarm itself in front of the two super-Powers and allow itself to be ordered about.

46. The Chinese Government is in favour of convening a world conference on genuine disarmament. But there must be the necessary pre-conditions and clear aims for the conference. That is, all nuclear countries, and particularly the two nuclear super-Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, must first of all undertake the unequivocal obligation that at no time and in no circumstances will they be the first to use nuclear weapons, particularly against

non-nuclear countries and in nuclear-weapon-free zones. For example, the Soviet Union should undertake obligations in respect of the nuclear-weapon-free zones in Latin America, and they must withdraw from abroad all their armed forces, including nuclear missile forces, and dismantle all their military bases, including nuclear bases, on the territories of other countries. Only thus will it be possible for all countries big and small to discuss on an equal footing and with equanimity and to solve the questions of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and other questions free from any threat of force.

47. Some people charge that China's position on the disarmament question is "either all or nothing". This is a distortion. One may ask, What difficulties are there for nuclear countries first of all to undertake the obligation, as the first step towards nuclear disarmament, that at no time and in no circumstances will they be the first to use nuclear weapons, particularly against non-nuclear countries or in nuclear-weapon-free zones? Is this not a truly effective first step towards the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons? But these disarmament-advocating "saints" would not even agree to undertake this minimum obligation. Does this not suffice to show that they are actually imperialists who persist in arms expansion and aggression, menacing the people of the world and aspiring to world hegemony?

48. The People's Republic of China is taking part in the activities of the United Nations for the third year. We wish to say frankly that what we have experienced in the United Nations has caused us to become worried. Speeches are multiplying and resolutions are piling up in the United Nations, yet the Organization has not been able to look into matters which it ought to—for instance, the question of the prevention of nuclear war—and it is impotent in the solution of many major world issues—for instance, the Middle East question. If things continue this way, what future is there for the United Nations? However, we are not disheartened. We believe that the present conditions in the United Nations should be changed and that the Charter should be revised. How can the United Nations go on working in the same old way it did more than 20 years ago, when the world has already changed? The third world has risen up. The United Nations must be able to give expression to the desires of the numerous small and medium-sized countries, truly to give effect to the principle of the equality of all countries big or small and to cease to be controlled by the super-Powers and their small number of followers if it is to be worthy of its name. China is ready to work together with all countries which love peace and uphold justice for the achievement of this noble aim.

49. Mr. TACK (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, first of all, on behalf of the Government and people of Panama, and personally, may I offer you our fraternal congratulations on your election to preside over this session of the world Organization. Your election to such a high post is a matter of satisfaction to Latin Americans. This is a doubly well-earned distinction because of your ability as a humanist and because you represent the supreme values of American culture as a spokesman of a country whose history has been written in pages of glory in the struggle for independence of Latin America.

50. We are also gratified to extend our cordial welcome to the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas on their admission as new Members of the United Nations. We are convinced that these States, one of which in fact belongs to our continent, will make a significant contribution to the work of carrying out to the fullest extent the purposes and principles of the Charter.

51. I should also like to greet the Secretary-General of the United Nations, whose efforts to make the ideals and principles of the Organization effective have earned him the appreciation and acknowledgement of the Members of the Organization, as well as of world public opinion. I also wish to greet the staff of the Secretariat who so devotedly and efficiently work in the different spheres of the world Organization's activities.

52. My country, together with other small and medium-sized nations, has studied with great care the statements made by the eminent spokesmen of the world super-Powers, who attach renewed importance to the work of our Organization and offer new prospects to mankind that the values and ideals of the United Nations will be sincerely and effectively put into practice.

53. The new attitude that can be read into the statements made by the Powers of the East and the West obviously reflect the transformations that are taking place in the disposition of world forces. One of the main aspects of this change is the increasingly important and legitimate participation in international decisions of the medium-sized and smaller nations, particularly those that in the last 25 years have gradually emerged from colonialism and dependency and have become independent and sovereign States.

54. It is an undeniable historic fact that admission to the Organization of new nations has increased the vigour of the United Nations potential to achieve fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter, and particularly that of ensuring the true sovereign equality of States. Gradually, a new international order has gained ground and force, based on the true and effective development of the purposes and principles of the Charter, which safeguard the right of the countries that lack war power and economic strength, and respect their sovereignty and their right to exploit their natural resources to benefit their economic and social development. The position of these countries in the international concert of nations is well-defined and the recently adopted Declaration of the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries, held in Algiers from 5 to 9 September 1973 [see *A/9330 and Corr.1*], stresses the point that I am trying to make. In that Declaration, they reaffirmed the decision to base their international relations on the principles of sovereign equality and respect for territorial integrity, to avoid the threat or use of force in international disputes; and to work out peaceful settlements in accordance with the principles of the Charter. The Declaration also appeals to all States to act in accordance with such principles.

55. The Republic of Panama has based its international policy on firm adherence to the principles adopted by the non-aligned nations and is therefore committed to the task of achieving world-wide respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and to the task of bringing about

decolonization, which is one of the categorical imperatives of our day.

56. However, the small nations still have some misgivings with regard to the apparently encouraging statements made by the great Powers. The good faith underlying these statements has to be proved with concrete facts. Events take place daily which vitiate the professions of openness on the part of certain Powers. The gigantic economic and military power of some of these nations constitutes a danger to the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the smaller nations, and this is particularly so for those Governments that are endeavouring to change their old economic and social structures in order to benefit the great masses of the population. There are still retrograde sectors and multinational economic cartels that refuse to agree that every country has the right to decide its own future for itself.

57. As far as we, the small countries, are concerned, the strengthening of the United Nations is one of our major hopes. In point of fact, it is the sole hope that we have of strengthening our independence and wiping out colonialism and all forms of oppression that still subsist in large areas of the world and this fact is brought home to us in our international relations.

58. Our national sentiments are offended by the brutal fact that on Panamanian soil jurisdictional limitations still exist that weigh heavily on our national existence. Since part of our objective is to free ourselves from this unjust situation, we undertake to make known our cause to all the sister Republics of America and to put it before the peoples of the world, because the persistence of a colonial situation in Panama is of concern to the community of nations.

59. Pursuant to these plans, the Panamanian Government, at the beginning of this year, called for the holding of Security Council sessions away from Headquarters so that that body might consider "measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter", to use the words of Security Council resolution 325 (1973).

60. My country had the honour of acting as host to the Security Council in Panama City from 15 to 21 March 1973. At that historic series of meetings, the question of the Panama Canal was thoroughly debated and we made it clear that we no longer wished to be a divided country bisected by a colonial enclave set in the very heart of the Panamanian isthmus.

61. These legitimate Panamanian aspirations, which have been recognized in official documents of the two countries concerned, without any real action being taken, can be summed up briefly as follows: first, to abrogate the Isthmian Canal Convention of 1903⁷ that was agreed to in perpetuity and all the amendments thereto; second, to convene on a completely new, equitable and just treaty

⁷ For the text, see *Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States of America, 1776-1949*, vol. 10, Department of State publication 8642 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972) p. 663.

regarding the present Panama Canal; third, to respect the effective sovereignty of Panama over the totality of its territory; fourth, to ensure the reintegration of the so-called Panama Canal Zone in the Republic of Panama, so that it is no longer subject to the United States jurisdiction; and fifth, to lay the groundwork for the assumption by the Republic of Panama of full responsibility for the efficient functioning of the interoceanic Canal.

62. My presence in this Assembly hall is due *inter alia* to my desire to repeat to the members of the Security Council, to the brother Republics of Latin America, and to the nations from other latitudes that supported our efforts and continue to encourage us, our undying gratitude and thanks. These deeply rooted feelings of gratitude are extended also to the illustrious representatives of Austria, China, France and the Soviet Union, who all voted in favour of a joint draft resolution that was submitted to the Security Council.

63. In the statement that the President of the Security Council read on behalf of his colleagues when he adjourned the meeting in Panama,⁸ the justice of our cause was set forth. According to that statement, the majority of the speakers at the Panama session stressed the fact that all States have the inalienable right to full jurisdiction over the totality of their territory. They also stressed that it is essential for all States to abstain from any act that might undermine the national unity and the territorial integrity of any other State. And on this point they stressed that the denial to Panama of its intrinsic right to full sovereignty and jurisdiction over the entirety of its territory, including the Panama Canal Zone, is a constant source of tension and, as such, constitutes a threat to peace and security in Latin America. They said that, in order to eliminate that threat, Panama must be given full sovereignty over the so-called Panama Canal Zone and the foreign military bases must be dismantled.

64. Practically all speakers expressed the opinion that without any doubt Panama has the right to make the maximum use of its main natural resource, namely, its geographical position, so as to benefit its own economic development; they pointed out also that the situation in the Panama Canal Zone constitutes a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We are particularly grateful for the decision taken by Peru, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Sudan and Yugoslavia to sponsor with Panama a draft resolution on the question of the Panama Canal.⁹ In accordance with that draft resolution, the Security Council—after having taken note of the willingness shown by the Governments of Panama and the United States of America to reach a just and fair agreement with a view to the prompt elimination of the causes of the conflict between them and to establish in a formal instrument agreements on the abrogation of the 1903 Convention on the Isthmian Canal and its amendments, and to conclude a new treaty that would fulfil Panama's legitimate aspirations and guarantee full respect for Panama's effective sovereignty over all of its territory—

would have urged the two Governments to continue negotiations in a high spirit of friendship, mutual respect and co-operation and to conclude without delay a new treaty aimed at the prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between them.

65. However, that draft resolution was not approved because of the negative vote cast by one of the permanent members of the Security Council. Yet the result of the vote was that, of the 15 members of the Council, 13 voted in favour; one—the United Kingdom—abstained; and the United States cast a negative vote.

66. I shall not prolong this statement by commenting on the political, diplomatic and psychological consequences of that outcome, but I cannot avoid repeating that it is obvious that the case of Panama requires a just and equitable solution without delay.

67. The Secretary-General, with his usual competence and dignity, described the correct approach to the solution of the problem. He informed the members of the Security Council at a meeting of that body that: "This problem awaits a solution which can only be based on the respect for law and the search for justice." And he added:

"A solution will have to take into account the basic principles which are enshrined in the Charter such as the principle of territorial integrity, sovereign equality, the obligation to settle all international disputes by peaceful means and the principle which by now has become an accepted common standard, namely, that any State is entitled to put to full use and for its own account all its natural potentialities."¹⁰

68. There can be no doubt that the support given to Panama by the Security Council and the views expressed by the Secretary-General evoked a positive response in important international circles. Proof of this can perhaps be found in the fact that President Richard Nixon in his annual report to the United States Congress on 3 May 1973, after referring generally to Latin America, specifically referred to the problem existing between his country and the Republic of Panama. In that message he pointed out that

"Another important unresolved problem concerns the Panama Canal and the surrounding Zone. U.S. operation of the Canal and our presence in Panama are governed by the terms of a treaty drafted in 1903."

He later noted:

"The world has changed radically during the 70 years this treaty has been in effect. Latin America has changed, Panama has changed. And the terms of our relationship should reflect those changes in a reasonable way."

And he came to this conclusion:

"It is time for both parties to take a fresh look at this problem and to develop a new relationship between us—one that will guarantee continued effective operation

⁸ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year*, 1704th meeting.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Supplement for January, February and March 1973*, document S/10931/Rev.1.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, *Twenty-eighth Session*, 1701st meeting, para. 16.

of the Canal while meeting Panama's legitimate aspirations."

69. Authorized representatives of the United States have repeated their readiness to abrogate the unjust Isthmian Canal Convention of 1903, a vestige of the "big-stick" policy and of the peak period of colonialism, an anachronism that has no justification in these days when we affirm the self-determination of peoples and the sovereign equality of the nations that proclaim the Charter of the United Nations as their international constitution.

70. In the time that has elapsed since the Council met in my country, the United States and Panama have come to an agreement on the methodology of the negotiations and, I repeat, have reaffirmed the commitment to abrogate the existing Treaty and to draft a completely new one that will be just and fair and designed to eliminate the causes of frictions that have thus far seriously upset our friendly relations. So that negotiations can continue, the United States recently nominated the well-known diplomat, Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, to head the United States negotiating team. We trust that Mr. Bunker will go to Panama very soon and that the negotiations will progress along the right lines—that is, that they will fully satisfy the legitimate aspirations of my country which, I am sure, are shared and understood by an overwhelming number of the States Members of this world Organization.

71. A few days ago, Secretary of State Kissinger, from this very rostrum [2124th meeting], repeated that justice cannot be confined to the frontiers of a single nation. We want that justice to shine on Panama too. We want it to illuminate the oppressed peoples of the world as well. The readiness of the United States to abrogate the 1903 Convention is a step that we consider to be a positive one, but the gesture must go beyond the mere spoken word; it must be embodied in tangible facts that will encourage the prevalence of justice that we, a peace-loving people, desire.

72. My Government considers it an unchallengeable truth that the geographical position of the Isthmus of Panama constitutes the main natural resource of the national Panamanian State, and that the inter-oceanic Canal is one way of exploiting such a resource. Logically, the Republic of Panama has sovereign rights over the territory and full jurisdiction over the inter-oceanic waterway and its coastal region. At the same time we are primarily interested in its continued secure and effective functioning.

73. It seems obvious to us that, within a natural and legitimate relationship between our countries, the jurisdictional exercise claimed by the Republic of Panama as an expression of its own territorial sovereignty also contains within it the maximum guarantees that the international waterway will continue to serve the needs of trade and international transit and the maintenance of international peace and security.

74. As Panama has found sympathy, warmth and support in this hall for our just cause, so too my country is at one with all those who nobly and justly are struggling, in Latin America, in Africa and in Asia. In other words, Panama is true to the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and racial discrimination. Panama welcomes the

decision of the liberation movement of Guinea-Bissau to declare that territory an independent State.

75. It is for that reason, too, that Panama maintains its adherence to the principle of a 200-mile width of the territorial sea and has made it part of its legislation. We have therefore joined all the countries in general, and particularly those of Latin America, that proclaim and defend that self-same principle. We consider it both necessary and urgent that an international agreement, widely accepted, should be drawn up in which would be set forth the legitimate aspirations of those coastal States for which the sea, the sea-bed and the subsoil thereof, including the continental shelf, straits and marine channels of communication, as well as the air space over those areas, are in fact important natural resources and, as in our case, their main natural resource. The location of the Panama Canal as a means of inter-oceanic navigation in our own territory and the fact that up to this moment, because of a profoundly unequal relationship, another nation has derived the benefit of the main natural marine resource of Panama, force us to attach capital importance to the question of international waterways and straits. We must press for respect for the legitimate interests of the coastal State without jeopardizing the need for world navigation and trade.

76. We note that there are many different situations and positions with respect to this problem and we hope that a positive result will be achieved by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, to be held next year.

77. The speedy progress of marine technology, the profound change in the concepts and the means of territorial defence, the accepted denuclearization of Latin America and the increasing need of the coastal peoples to exploit the sea for their own benefit and to utilize the vast resources of the oceans, as well as the inter-oceanic marine means of communication, all create new legal, political, economic and environmental problems. But, at the same time, the increasingly acute awareness of these problems by nations of the third world, whose coasts make up almost the total, or at least the majority, of the active coasts of the planet, make it inevitable that flexible agreements will be achieved with due regard for the diversity of existing situations, so that most of the aspirations of each coastal State will be met regarding its own coasts and straits, without curtailing the rights of other, land-locked countries.

78. As each developing country tackles the essential task of exploiting the resources of its geography for the benefit of its inhabitants, it is faced with a pattern of foreign economic domination which, sometimes subtly and sometimes with crude violence, stifles all efforts of true human liberation and creates and keeps alive certain sources of tension.

79. We whole-heartedly support the idea expressed in paragraph 19 of the Political Declaration adopted by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries that "international security cannot be achieved if it does not include an economic dimension which guarantees to all countries the right to implement their development programmes, free from economic aggression and any other form of pressure" [see A/9330 and Corr. 1].

80. In this statement I have referred to matters that are of vital importance to the Republic of Panama. But this in no way signifies that my country lacks interest in and devotion to the other work of the United Nations regarding the many items on the agenda of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

81. Our mission to serve the cause of international peace and security has been proved by Panama both in the Security Council during our term of office and in the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism that we had the honour of presiding over in July and August of this year. Furthermore, our historic background stands us in good stead in the International Court of Justice, in the Economic and Social Council, in the International Law Commission and in the Commission on Human Rights, as it did in the many steps we took in the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Nations¹¹ and in dealing with the question of the definition of aggression, the prohibition of genocide as a crime against humanity, decolonization and the eradication of discrimination and racial discrimination in the world.

82. The contributions we have made in this field are based on our unshakeable faith in the ideals which underlie the very existence of the United Nations and which are expressed in the many resolutions of the General Assembly on the principles of international law governing friendly relations and co-operation among States.

83. I believe that the statements that are made in good faith in the general debate of the General Assembly, in order to enhance the universalist mission of the United Nations in bringing together the great and small nations, must be brought to bear when we consider the report that the Secretary-General has submitted on the matter.

84. I think that the best tribute to and the most significant statement of support for the United Nations would be the full implementation of resolution 2925 (XXVII) in order to strengthen the role of the United Nations and to ensure that it will contribute more widely to the solution of international problems and increase the efficiency of the decisions and effectiveness of resolutions adopted by its constitutional organs.

85. Mr. DENNIS (Liberia): Having already had the privilege of expressing to you, Sir, the profound congratulations of the Government of Liberia on your election to the presidency of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and our very best wishes and assurances of our co-operation as you assume your grave responsibilities in the interest of securing world peace, you will permit me now to extend our sincere appreciation to your illustrious predecessor, Mr. Stanisław Trepczyński, the Deputy Foreign Minister of Poland, for the able and astute manner in which he conducted the affairs of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

86. My Government also wishes to convey to the Secretary-General its deepest appreciation for the dedicated and

wise manner in which he is discharging his arduous and highly important task on behalf of justice, peace and security for all peoples throughout the world.

87. Liberia reasserts its firm belief in the principle of universality, because it is only by the harmonization of action by the peace-loving peoples of the world that mankind can achieve that security and lasting peace to which this Organization is dedicated. I therefore again express, on behalf of my Government, a warm welcome to the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic on their admission to this Organization.

88. That the era of cold war and confrontation among the major Powers is being replaced by a new era of negotiation and détente is a heartening development, which my Government unreservedly welcomes and will actively support. We do not, however, believe that the achievement of this long-awaited détente in itself guarantees the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Such a peace can best be assured if all the nations strive to promote an atmosphere of trust and tolerance in international affairs and assiduously grapple with the perennial economic, social and political problems with which we are all still confronted. The seeds of peace and concord have been sown, but they cannot be nurtured into a satisfying harvest so long as situations which constitute threats to international peace and security are not promptly and fairly dealt with.

Mr. Ibgingira (Uganda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

89. The Government of South Africa, supported by a minority racist clique from within and by its powerful trading partners from without, carries on with impunity what this Organization has rightly called “crimes against humanity”. *Apartheid*, the worst form of racism in existence today, continues to plague the African peoples of South Africa. The United Nations has condemned this outrageous policy, which denies to the African majority their fundamental freedoms and constitutes a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. Our brothers in South Africa have demonstrated extraordinary patience and endurance, but their patience is not unlimited. Unless this Organization can find means effectively and speedily to implement its resolutions on South Africa, I foresee a deterioration of the existing situation and a consequent failure of all efforts aimed at a peaceful solution.

90. Regrettably, the South African police, in a repetition of the Sharpeville tragedy, recently murdered several black workers whose only crime was their boldness in pointing out the inequities of existing employment practices and economic benefits. But were those murderers punished? No—they were rewarded with words of congratulation.

91. These practices, clear manifestations of a bold and unrepentant racism, and the system of government which fosters them, are so deeply wrong, so offensive to morality, so unbearable, so unjust, so clearly at variance with the noble sentiments contained in the Charter of this Organization that it is still astounding and a source of despair that men can support and uphold such practices and such a system, seemingly blind to the terrifying evil and inhumanity of it all.

¹¹ Adopted by the American Institute of International Law at its first session in the City of Washington, 6 January 1916.

92. We express the hope that the principal trading partners of South Africa will weigh their desire for profits and immediate financial returns against their responsibility to assist, on moral grounds and in keeping with their obligations as Members of the United Nations, the oppressed peoples of South Africa to obtain their most basic, fundamental and God-given rights as human beings.

93. Willy Brandt, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, in his profound statement delivered before this Assembly on 26 September, said unreservedly for his country that "... we condemn racism as inhuman and as the cause of the most terrible crimes" and reaffirmed its support for "the principle of the universality of human rights." [2128th meeting, paras. 59 and 60.]

94. The Secretary of State of the United States, Henry Kissinger, in his brilliant address before this twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly on 24 September, said, among other things:

"We shall honour our pledge to promote self-determination, economic development and human dignity across the continent of Africa." [2124th meeting, para. 51.]

95. My Government finds those commitments most encouraging and expresses the hope that all nations will desist from those activities which perpetuate injustice and inhumanity in southern Africa and, rather, render substantial moral and material assistance to the peoples of South Africa and southern Africa as they seek to acquire their fundamental freedoms.

96. In all forums of this Organization, Liberia and other nations have appealed for justice, self-determination and freedom for all the peoples of Zimbabwe; yet the illegal régime of Ian Smith continues its oppressive domination of the majority African population while denying to them the basic rights of political representation and equal economic and social opportunities. Most African political leaders in Zimbabwe are either in prison or have severe restrictions placed on their movements. This increasingly intolerable situation cannot and will not last. A small group of men, solely for racial reasons and because they possess the power to do so, continue to deprive the African majority in Africa of all their political rights, as well as of their equitable share of the wealth of their own land. Such practices must shock the conscience of the world—and if the people and leaders who perpetuate and benefit from them cannot be convinced by measures now being employed, then it is the responsibility of the entire international community to undertake whatever new measures are required to eliminate those injustices.

97. We reaffirm our commitment to and total solidarity with our oppressed brothers in Mozambique and Angola. Portugal should now know that there is no price which the people of Africa will not pay to end oppression and colonial domination.

98. The Assembly is aware of the recent reports of massacres in Mozambique. Portugal, in its brutal attempts to intimidate the courageous people of Mozambique, has resorted to mass indiscriminate slaughter of innocent men, women and children.

99. This is not the first time that Portuguese atrocities have attracted world-wide attention. The representative of Liberia on 20 February 1961 sounded an early warning in a letter to the President of the Security Council in which he asked that immediate action be taken by the Council to prevent further deterioration and abuse of human rights in Angola. He then gave the following reasons why it was necessary for the Council to meet:

"This is necessary because men are dying in Angola, because men are being cast into prison without trial, because men are living under conditions which are an affront to human dignity and a defiance of human rights. ... Must the machinery of the United Nations wait until the dead are counted not by the scores, but by the thousands before action is taken?"¹²

100. Today, in Mozambique as well as in Angola, Portugal continues its ever more repressive and desperate activities, the last faint flickers of a dying and vicious colonialism. The dead are now indeed counted by thousands, but the will of the people to freedom cannot be denied. How long will we tolerate this?

101. I must make special mention of the gallant people of Guinea-Bissau who, having liberated three fourths of their country, happily proclaimed their independence on 24 September. My Government on 26 September joyously accorded recognition to this new sister State. Moreover, as a mark of its profound solidarity with the new Government and people of Guinea-Bissau and as an expression of its deepest satisfaction and joy at their declaration of independence, my Government will, as soon as a constitution of the new Republic is announced and the new Government is organized, proclaim a national holiday in commemoration of their attainment of independence. We cherish the hope that Guinea-Bissau will soon assume its rightful place among the ranks of nations in our world Organization which are contributing to international peace, security and co-operation.

102. The Government of Liberia continues to view the question of Namibia as a serious special case for the United Nations. The General Assembly, through resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V), by which it terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia and provided for the establishment of a Council to administer the affairs of Namibia, and the Security Council, by agreeing in resolution 301 (1971) with the opinion of the International Court of Justice that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal, have together established a firm base upon which the United Nations would be enabled to use the best channels available to it to bring about a peaceful transfer of power from South Africa to the people of Namibia.

103. However, the United Nations Council for Namibia remains totally ineffective because South Africa neither recognizes it nor permits it to exercise its lawful role in ensuring the independence of Namibia. Instead, the Government of South Africa seeks to entrench in Namibia its grim policies of *apartheid* and exploitation.

¹² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, 943rd meeting, para. 11.*

104. As the mission of the Secretary-General to Namibia may not continue after this year, the question that confronts us now is, What next? If a tragic and violent confrontation is to be avoided and the rights of the people of Namibia ensured, then the United Nations, and in particular the five permanent members of the Security Council, must urgently undertake new initiatives designed to bring about the speedy implementation of the decisions both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

105. The Liberian Government remains convinced that the highly explosive situation existing in the Middle East constitutes a grave threat to world peace. We believe that the territorial integrity and the right to national existence of all the States in that region must be ensured. Therefore we emphatically oppose all forms of aggression and the acquisition of territory by force of arms. For this reason, the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) appeals to us as the most practical measure for ensuring a just and lasting solution to an admittedly difficult situation. The Secretary-General should be complimented for his untiring efforts in seeking ways to bring a speedy and lasting solution to the problems of this troubled region of the world. We note with appreciation his recent visit to the Middle East and look forward to further positive action to this end.

106. Ten years after the whole world sighed with relief when the nuclear test ban treaty of 1963¹³ was signed, promising a lessening of the threat of nuclear war and raising hopes that the danger of radioactive contamination had ended, it is regrettable that some countries continue to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Such actions threaten the hopes of mankind not only for a safe and clean environment but also for world peace.

107. At this, the focal point of the conscience of mankind, we appeal to all Governments concerned to heed the anguished pleas of a concerned people and to desist from all further nuclear tests in the interest of humanity.

108. We note with deep appreciation the action taken by the General Assembly to ban the use of bacteriological weapons [*resolution 2826 (XXVI)*] and we express the hope that measures will soon be undertaken by the Assembly to prohibit the employment of chemical weapons as well.

109. With the convening of the proposed Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, an opportunity will be presented to all of us to assist in furthering the realization of universal peace by justly contributing to the economic development of all nations. Thirteen years have passed since the Second Conference took place in Geneva. In that brief span of years, the increase of world population, the birth of new nations and revolutionary advances in science and technology have combined to make the question of the uses of ocean space a foremost question of our day.

110. If, in our one world, inequalities still abound and the gulf between rich and poor nations continues to widen, the

causes lie in the way in which the wealth generated from the quarter of the earth's surface comprising land space has been unevenly distributed. The forthcoming Conference on the Law of the Sea affords us an historic opportunity to advance the cause of peace and prosperity for all nations by the legal order we shall frame to govern the three-quarters of our earth comprising ocean space. For this reason, my Government has attached the greatest importance to the work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, of which we have been a member since its beginning in 1967.

111. The Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations refers to our determination both "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". In accomplishing these ends, we are pledged, among other things, to employ international machinery for the economic and social advancement of all peoples. Moreover, Chapter IX of the Charter specifically deals with economic and social co-operation for the purpose of ensuring "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations . . .".

112. Although United Nations efforts in pursuance of these goals have fallen short of the purposes and principles of the Charter, the assistance rendered by the specialized agencies of the United Nations has been helpful in meeting both chronic and emergency needs around the world, thereby fostering the kind of co-operation among the peoples of our one world which exemplifies the highest ideals of this Organization put to practical effect.

113. Recently, the United Nations commendably assisted the countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region in dealing with the human problems resulting from the severe droughts which have affected that region and drastically reduced the availability of both crops and livestock. The United Nations also rendered prompt and valuable assistance to the peoples of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh during the recent natural disasters affecting those countries.

114. However, effective as those measures have been, much more must be done.

115. The framers of the Charter wisely understood that the problem of preserving international peace and stability was not solely a matter of providing means for ensuring the peaceful resolution of international conflicts and the prevention of aggression around the globe. The emphasis placed on the social and economic advancement of the world's peoples reflects the belief that all the peoples of the world should share in the bounties of this earth and that freedom from hunger and want, from poverty, ignorance and disease is an essential prerequisite to the enjoyment of all fundamental rights. We affirm these beliefs primarily because it is right and just to do so. But more than that, we do so in the sure knowledge that world peace and security cannot be long ensured if the gap between the "have" and the "have-not" nations remains so vast and apparently unbridgeable. That this gap continues to widen is unacceptable and extremely dangerous to the achievement of international stability and harmony.

¹³ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963.

116. The First United Nations Development Decade has been a painful disappointment. We look now to achievement of the goals set forth for the Second. But what becomes increasingly apparent is that a firm commitment from the developed countries has not existed in the past. Without that commitment, these efforts cannot yield success. Moreover, the vicissitudes of the international economy, and the world monetary system, factors over which developing countries exercise no control, often adversely affect our economies.

117. What is at stake is to ensure that the prerequisites of development, including capital inputs and technological assistance, are available to all nations on a sufficiently large scale, with reasonable and unburdensome terms. It is only by those means that the chronic problems of underdevelopment and the resulting instances of human misery, the inability of all men fully to have the opportunity of realizing their individual capacities, may be effectively tackled.

118. The President of Liberia has called upon all Liberians to become totally involved in building a better Liberia, in working for the development of the country to the benefit of all. He has therefore emphasized that the primary effort of ensuring development must be ours. "Self-reliance for self-sufficiency"—this phrase sums up his challenge to the people of Liberia. But these policies are not limited to measures taken within the boundaries of Liberia, for we believe strongly in economic co-operation among all nations for the benefit of all the peoples of the world.

119. At a time in history when the genius of mankind has provided the means for vastly increasing agricultural production on less acreage, for producing heavy machinery and consumer goods on a massive scale, for arresting many of the conditions which breed disease and ill health, the challenge which faces us collectively is to use this capability for improving the condition of humanity. Let us refrain from large and wasteful expenditure of scarce resources on implements designed for the destruction of human life. Let us create in our one world that degree of mutual trust, tolerance and goodwill which will ensure that all men, regardless of race, creed, religion or ideological persuasion, shall live together in peace and prosperity.

120. I applaud, therefore, the recent proposal put forward by Mr. Andrei Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union [2126th meeting], that the military budgets of States permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and other States with major military and economic potential be reduced by 10 per cent, and that part of those savings be directed towards providing assistance for developing countries. This is a notable and commendable positive step, and my delegation calls upon the General Assembly to consider this proposal seriously.

121. It is true that a nearly identical proposal was put forward by the Soviet Union in 1958¹⁴ and 1959,¹⁵ but as an essential twin goal of the proposal is to effectuate some

progress in the area of disarmament, those years of cold war may not have allowed for its serious consideration. However, in the spirit of major-Power détente which now prevails, ushering in a spirit of increased trust, tolerance, understanding and co-operation, we sincerely believe that this proposal will receive the consideration it deserves.

122. It is perhaps fitting at this time to remind ourselves that a new order of change has come into being in international relations, and to ponder over the fate of this Organization and refuse to permit sterility of imagination to cause us to remain unresponsive to problems that have been defined by new realities.

123. In this regard, we call upon all Member States, big and small, to give serious consideration to measures which will make this Organization more effective in today's world by enhancing its democratic character and adding to the impact of its decisions. The interest of a nation in peace, justice and economic progress does not increase or decrease in degree with the size of its population or the military power contained in its arsenals. These are issues which are vital to all nations and on which all nations should speak with equally authoritative voices.

124. My President recently said:

"At its birth, the United Nations placed great emphasis upon the limitless possibilities of the human mind—and personality. It affirmed the equal creation of all human beings, and expressed the hope that the developing nations of the world would enjoy the right to share equitably in the wealth of the world. Unfortunately, after 27 years of its existence, man's hopes for a world order of peace, equality and justice have remained disappointingly unfulfilled."

125. Let us therefore focus on this task and rise to this grave challenge and, in so doing, fulfil the sacred purpose of this great repository of man's hopes: to attain peace in our time and for all time, and to promote the economic and social advancement of all peoples in freedom and justice.

126. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): From this international rostrum I have the honour of transmitting the message of fraternity and solidarity which His Excellency Colonel Michel Micombero, President of the Republic and Head of the Government of Burundi, addresses on behalf of his people—struggling to safeguard its independence and the results of its popular revolution of 28 November 1966—to the other peoples of the world involved in the same struggle for the triumph of the ideals of peace, security, social justice and for the elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and imperialism in all its forms.

127. It is also my pleasant duty to extend, on behalf of the Government of Burundi, the warmest and most sincere congratulations to President Leopoldo Benites and to the other officers of the Assembly who have just been elected to bring the work of the twenty-eighth session to a successful conclusion.

128. The choice of a distinguished diplomat like Mr. Benites, whose personality, confidence and objectivity

¹⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 64, 70 and 72, document A/3929.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, *Fourteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 70, document A/4219.

are so highly esteemed, both in his own country and in the rest of the world, constitutes a sure pledge and an earnest of the success of this session.

129. On behalf of the active solidarity of our peoples, we know that the struggle for political and economic liberation in Latin America, Asia and Africa is something which Ambassador Benites not only cherishes, but which also constitutes for him a sacred duty.

130. My delegation will firmly support the initiatives and decisions which he will be called upon to take as President with a view to the attainment of the objectives of our Organization and in order to bring about respect for the principles of our Charter.

131. Permit me to pay a well-deserved tribute to our President's predecessor, Mr. Stanisław Trepczyński, who conducted our deliberations with brilliant intelligence, unshakeable faith in the Organization and high diplomatic talents. The progressive countries of the world highly esteem the stand of the Polish People's Republic for peace, decolonization and economic and social development, objectives which our outgoing President himself championed during the session and in other circumstances.

132. I have, furthermore, the honour of conveying to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, my sincere congratulations for the record of his activities this year. Once again we should like to express to our distinguished Secretary-General our great admiration for the tact, patience and devotion which he has displayed in the difficult and delicate task of international affairs. We were particularly moved by Mr. Waldheim's efforts this year to bring about the triumph of the ideals of peace and security, and the development of friendly relations among peoples.

133. On 18 September 1973 [2117th meeting] the United Nations was strengthened by the entry of three new Member States: the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. My delegation is gratified at this decision, which is so appropriate for the international community. The principle of universality of our Organization does require, in fact, the representation of the greatest possible number of States so that all peoples can feel involved in the problems of universal peace and the economic and social development of nations, whatever their location or size. That is why we greet with enthusiasm the admission of the three new Members, which, for us, constitutes a new stage on the road towards the emancipation of colonized peoples. We expect from the two German States a major contribution to the solution of problems which are paralysing international society, such as decolonization, underdevelopment, the exploitation of man by man, and the scourge of racism.

134. Every year most of us travel thousands and thousands of miles to come to this rostrum in order to take stock of the activities and results of our Organization, from both the political and the economic point of view. Our presence will also enable us to gain some insight into the future prospects for the whole of mankind.

135. The people of Burundi, peace-loving and liberty-loving, warmly greeted the victories won and the successes recorded in recent years by the other peoples of the world that have inflicted resounding defeats on the imperialist and colonialist forces. In Africa independent States have had to face divisive manoeuvres and plots of all kinds hatched by imperialists with a view to the collapse of institutions and even the dislocation of nations. But the progressive forces, supported by the revolutionary forces of the world, have repulsed victoriously the criminal assaults of these enemies of the human race. Other sovereign States have been the victims of aggression on the part of the Portuguese colonial régimes and the racist régimes of South Africa and Rhodesia. Here again these acts of aggression and intimidation have met with the revolutionary determination of worthy and valiant peoples who are always ready to repulse triumphantly the enemy, whatever the aid granted these régimes by the imperialist and neo-colonialist Powers. Neo-colonialist Powers have done everything in their power to oppose sovereign and independent States with the purpose of weakening the anti-imperialist front, but the vigilance and wisdom of Africa have confounded them.

136. The hour of victory against economic domination and cultural alienation has arrived in other African States which have taken energetic and revolutionary measures to win their independence and safeguard their authentic cultural heritage in spite of threats and blackmail of all kinds.

137. The trends towards national emancipation have forced the colonialist régimes to decamp from vast territories seized by the national liberation movements at the cost of the blood of the worthy sons and daughters of Africa. The war waged by Israel against the Arab countries and its permanent usurpation of the land of the Palestinian people have aroused the anger and condemnation of all peace-loving and justice-loving peoples. The Arab Republic of Egypt and other Arab countries which have been the victims of imperialist and Zionist aggression have been supported by all revolutionary peoples in their just cause.

138. In Asia, the peoples of Indo-China are marching inexorably towards final victory. Imperialism at bay shrinks at nothing to shed the blood of innocent people. In spite of the dimensions of the means of destruction used in that part of the world, every day the laurel of victory is held aloft by millions of fighters for freedom and honour.

139. In Latin America, liberation movements are gaining ground in spite of the heinous and criminal acts of despair, like the event which has just occurred and afflicted the Chilean people. But the blood of President Allende constitutes the revolutionary ferment which is out of the reach of the bullets of the imperialists and their lackeys.

140. The peace-loving States and peoples of the world are determined today more than ever to wage a decisive struggle, a struggle against hegemony and political, economic and cultural expansionism. However, we consider that this evolution of the international situation should not permit us to cherish any illusions. Real dangers continue to constitute a serious threat to international peace and security, to the independence and sovereignty of States.

141. The primary objective of the United Nations is the maintenance of peace in the world and the harmonious development of all peoples, and we are forced to note that we are still far from having attained these noble principles and objectives.

142. Of course, for some years now there has existed a climate of *entente* among the great Powers because of the strengthening and development of their mutual relations. This situation has succeeded in reducing the tensions and dangers of a generalized war. However, in spite of the provisions of the Charter, which prohibit the use of force in international relations, the threat or use of force for aggressive purposes against third-world countries is now assuming alarming proportions. The antagonisms of the super-Powers encourage wars and localized crises in certain parts of the world, thus leading to intervention in the internal affairs of other States.

143. It seems to me essential for this twenty-eighth session to lay down new bases for international relations founded on justice, security and development.

144. Colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism gravely jeopardize peace and the economic development of the African continent. In Africa, colonialism, neo-colonialism and *apartheid* constitute a grave threat to peace and the development of the continent. For several years, resolutions have been adopted in favour of the liberation of the whole of Africa. Today, with the complicity of those very people who take those decisions, the situation has not developed in favour of liberty. On the contrary, it has deteriorated every day.

145. In South Africa, an oppressive régime is being inflicted upon the population with the full knowledge of the Members of this Organization, upon millions of human beings who are kept in the chains of slavery on the pretext that they are what are called men of colour. These barbarous crimes are encouraged by Powers which themselves only recently suffered from the scourge of mankind, namely, racism and *apartheid*. Have certain founding Members of our Organization already forgotten that it was to fight effectively against such scourges that the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco? Far from applying the resolutions adopted against the Pretoria régime, certain Powers encourage that régime by all available means in its horrible policy of escalation designed to achieve the moral and physical exhaustion of a helpless people. The régime of racial discrimination and *apartheid* has just increased its toll of victims by the massacre of African workers, which include a large number of African nationals from independent neighbouring countries. Provocations against what are called coloured men by the Pretoria régime are not even limited to the freedom fighters; the weapons of this reactionary police State cut down anyone and everyone at the whim of the South African leaders of the moment. This enslavement is supported by the NATO Powers and Israel.

146. In Namibia, while the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity [OAU] had authorized the establishment of contacts in order to ascertain South African intentions, Pretoria showed by its most categorical refusal that it had no intention of withdrawing from

Namibia. On the contrary, the racist Government has just undertaken a programme which it calls "Bantustanization", which constitutes a programme for the Balkanization of the Territory and for pitting Namibian against Namibian.

147. The policy of the fragmentation of Namibian territory pursued by Pretoria is tangible proof that South Africa is not ready to withdraw from international territory, but rather that Pretoria in fact wishes to extend *apartheid* there in its most criminal form.

148. The good faith of OAU and the United Nations did not win a favourable response from the Pretoria Government, and that is why the summit meeting of African countries held to celebrate the tenth anniversary of OAU considered that the mandate entrusted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations should be suspended because it was fruitless.

149. The delegation of the Republic of Burundi condemns once again the savage colonialism which South Africa inflicts on Namibia and the black people of South Africa. It is high time, indeed, for the Namibian people to be consulted about their own fate. The integrity and independence of the Namibian territory should be safeguarded.

150. In Zimbabwe, after almost eight years, the rebel régime of Salisbury is defying the United Nations. Indeed, in spite of the many resolutions condemning Rhodesia, in spite of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) imposing economic sanctions, the racist régime of Salisbury is still in power. This situation might have changed if the United Kingdom had had good faith and if certain countries had not violated the economic embargo decided upon by the United Nations. In these circumstances, my Government requests once again that the United Kingdom should use all the means available to it, including armed force, to grant independence to the Zimbabwe people and to put an end to the rebel régime of Salisbury.

151. My Government would venture also to remind the Member States in this Assembly that countries which deliberately violate resolutions of the Security Council and the recommendations of the General Assembly are in contravention of their commitments under the United Nations Charter.

152. What is worse, the encouraged arrogance of the Rhodesian rebels has prompted the régime to use economic warfare against Zambia, which has done nothing wrong except to be governed by Africans whose attachment to democracy and the fraternization of races is offensive to the Fascists in Salisbury.

153. All peace-loving countries, confident in the United Nations and in OAU, are behind the Government of Zambia in its valiant and noble struggle for the triumph of the objectives of peace based on the liberation of Zimbabwe.

154. In Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau the revolutionary liberation is irreversible. The blind obstinacy of Portugal has led it to perpetuate its outrageous exploitation of African territories. The arrogant and reactionary ideas of the Lisbon authorities are a disgrace to that country, which boasts of having stifled—unsuccessfully, fortunately—the

upsurge of emancipation of the colonized peoples. It is running against the current of history still to dream of a colonial empire when independence and sovereignty have now become the inalienable rights of peoples.

155. Portugal cherishes illusions by persisting in defying the recommendations of the United Nations and failing to heed the appeals of faith and goodwill which call upon it to put an end to its horrible colonial practices. The Lisbon Government is aware of the important defeats that have been meted out to it at the hand of the liberation movements. Thanks to the support of certain Powers, it believes it will stand fast for a long time to come. It should be disabused, because a people determined to win its liberty shrinks before no might or force.

156. Thus the fighting people of Guinea-Bissau have just proclaimed their independence. My delegation is happy to announce to this Assembly that the Government of Burundi recognized the Government of the democratic Republic of Guinea-Bissau from the very first days of its existence and will do everything in its power to support it. We would convey to the young State of Guinea-Bissau our most fraternal congratulations upon the memorable event of its liberation from the forces of colonial oppression. We now consider that the presence in Guinea-Bissau of a single Portuguese soldier constitutes an act of aggression against an independent and sovereign State. I take the opportunity offered by that well-deserved independence to pay a tribute to the promoter of the Guinean revolution, Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde, the eternal hero of the struggle for the freedom and dignity of man.

157. In the light of the recent crimes committed in the regions under Portuguese domination, the Republic of Burundi once again calls upon the General Assembly to expel Portugal from the United Nations, because the grave crimes committed by Portugal against the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau are a serious threat to peace and human dignity. Portuguese colonialism is a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter.

158. The situation in the Middle East remains tense and explosive because Israel continues to oppress and humiliate the Arabs under its control and is persisting in its blind and pointless policy of provocation and aggression towards the Arab countries of the region.

159. Until very recently my country still cherished the hope that it would see Israel come to reason by committing itself—as international opinion has ceaselessly called upon it to do, and as its own interests require—to a just, equitable and lasting solution of the problem that is almost as old as our Organization.

160. But we are forced to note that Israel remains a factor for instability in the region, which it is impossible to eliminate, and Israel is doing everything in its power to oppose any attempt, whatever the source, to re-establish peace and security in the region. It has opposed with blind obstinacy the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the unanimous adoption of which was welcomed by the overwhelming majority of the States Members of our Organization as a decisive step towards a

normalization of the situation in that troubled part of our planet. On the strength of unconditional support from a super-Power, it has ceaselessly derided and disregarded the wise and pressing appeals of the international community to reconsider its attitude towards the martyred people of Palestine and neighbouring Arab countries by guaranteeing the right of the Palestinians to a worthy and decent existence and by respecting the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of its Arab neighbours.

161. But, what is worse, the world is witnessing for the first time the implementation and systematic use at the State level of piracy and terrorism as a method of government and as a norm of behaviour in international relations.

162. The innocent victims of the shooting down of a Libyan civil aircraft over occupied Sinai are there to remind us that Israeli terrorism now no longer spares anyone, even innocent passengers ignorant of all the facts of the Middle East.

163. Everything is happening as if Israel were assuming that the patience of the international community is unlimited and that it has been given a blank cheque to persist in its policy of escalation of terror, violence, hate and murder.

164. The tragedy of the Middle East in general and the Palestinian people in particular deserves particular attention.

165. Do we really need to remind the Assembly that the restoration to the people of Palestine of international rights constitutes the fundamental condition for the establishment of a lasting peace in the region? The struggle of the people of Palestine for its usurped territory represents the effort of a people determined to recover its self-determination and sovereignty.

166. The Member States of our international Organization should offer material and political assistance to the Palestinian people in accordance with the spirit of solidarity which should characterize Member States whenever imperialism, colonialism or neo-colonialism seeks to wound the dignity of a State and to call its existence into question.

167. That is why my delegation considers the time has come for the members of this Assembly individually or collectively to take the measures necessary to make Israel respect the international commitments it undertook in freely adhering to our Charter. For its part, the Republic of Burundi will interpret its responsibilities in that sense until Israel ceases its acts of aggression and expansionism and until the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine are restored.

168. Thanks to its unshakeable courage, its high sense of dignity and its fierce determination to fight for the safeguarding and strengthening of liberty, progress and independence, the valiant people of Viet-Nam has driven its enemies to capitulation.

169. The signing of the Paris agreements on Viet-Nam without any doubt constitutes a brilliant victory for the

Viet-Nameese people over the forces of occupation and aggression which for 12 years have unleashed their forces in successive waves over that part of Indo-China. We are particularly gratified at that happy event because my country has ceaselessly condemned the unjust, cruel, absurd and cowardly war inflicted upon the Viet-Nameese people. The struggle of the Viet-Nameese people proves eloquently and poignantly that the threat of violence, recourse to brutal and massive force, blackmail and intimidation avail nothing against a people which is proud and determined.

170. We call upon the imperialist and reactionary forces of this world to reflect on that example of heroism and sacrifice.

171. My delegation calls upon all parties to the Paris agreements to abide scrupulously by the spirit and letter of those agreements, as does the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet-Nam. Viet-Nam, which for 28 years has known nothing but the horrors of war, will now be able to devote its time, its energies and its enthusiasm to the tasks of national reconstruction for the welfare and prosperity of its people.

172. The news of the opening of dialogue between the two Koreas has filled us with joy and hope.

173. The free determination of peoples is a sacred principle of our Charter. Therefore, the United Nations should refrain from any act or initiative which might constitute an obstacle to the reunification of the Korean people.

174. For that reason, to permit the Korean people to decide freely on its fate and future, free from interference and outside pressure, my delegation considers that the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should be dissolved without further delay and that all foreign occupation troops should evacuate Korean territory. The United Nations flag cannot cover acts of aggression in any part of the world.

175. At a time when the two Koreas are embarking on the road to reunification and renewal of ties, it seems to us that the idea of the admission of the two Koreas to the United Nations constitutes a plot against the legitimate aspirations of the Korean people.

176. The situation in the Kingdom of Cambodia is very familiar to us. There, a legitimate and popular Government was overthrown by an imperialist Power, which everyone knows acted through Cambodian puppets. In order to give a respite to the clique of corrupt and suborned elements who usurped power at Phnom Penh, foreign troops of occupation have been landed in Cambodia and have imposed an atrocious, cruel and ruthless war on the peaceful people of that country. Cambodian patriots, in response to the appeal of Prince Norodom Sihanouk of 23 March 1970, did not hesitate a moment before launching the decisive offensive against the Cambodian traitors and foreign forces of aggression. Today, the United National Front of Cambodia and the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia control more than nine-tenths of the population of the country and more than nine-tenths of Cambodian territory.

177. It is the duty of the international community to do everything in its power to see to it that Cambodia becomes once again the oasis of peace that it has always been, thanks to the wise, skilful and far-sighted policy of its illustrious Head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

178. In Cambodia the restoration of peace requires, as one of its pre-conditions, the immediate withdrawal of all aggressive and occupying troops, the end of foreign intervention and strict respect for the right of the Cambodian people to self-determination.

179. The United Nations, for its part, should draw the logical inferences from the situation in Cambodia and also from the resolutions adopted by the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Algiers from 5 to 9 September last [*see A/9330 and Corr.1*].

180. Since the Government of Prince Norodom Sihanouk controls nine-tenths of Cambodian territory and the vast majority of the people of that country, and since the non-aligned countries represent two-thirds of the Members of our Organization and recognize Prince Sihanouk's Government as the legal and legitimate Government of Cambodia, the present session of the General Assembly should restore to the Government headed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk its legitimate rights in the United Nations.

181. If the objectives and purposes of the Organization are still valid and relevant, the revision of the Charter becomes an urgent matter if we are to take account of new realities and developments in the international situation.

182. The right of veto, which has been accorded to five Members of the United Nations, has been used by some of them to block progress, peace and the emancipation of peoples. Without going too far back into the history of our Organization, I would simply remind the Assembly of the veto cast by the United Kingdom in February 1972 at the meetings of the Security Council in Addis Ababa in opposition to the solution of the Rhodesian problem by constitutional and peaceful means. I would also recall the different vetoes used by the other Powers in order to oppose any attempt to break the present deadlock in the Middle East crisis.

183. The veto, besides being a flagrant violation of the principle of the equality of States, constitutes a means of keeping whole peoples and regions in a state of humiliation, injustice, oppression and agony. It should therefore be abolished because its abuse is contrary to the spirit and objectives of the Charter.

184. But, apart from the veto, the actual membership of the Council, in my delegation's view, constitutes a shocking anachronism. It is absolutely unjustifiable to entrust the tasks of peace-keeping only to the great Powers most of which, modern history shows, have been and still are involved in the conflicts and crises which have shaken our planet. We must act in accordance with the evidence: you cannot be judge and party at the same time.

185. Until the General Assembly really becomes a world parliament and has effective and increased power in the

maintenance of international peace and security, we think the Security Council should be composed in such a way as to be a faithful reflection of the international community, taking strict account of geographical distribution and trends of opinion and political tendencies in the General Assembly.

186. It is only then and then alone that all the peoples of the world, duly and democratically associated in the conduct of world affairs, will be able to enjoy the benefits of peace and international security.

187. My country has no claim to possess nuclear weapons, but it has no less interest therefore in the problems of disarmament. To avoid the temptations of a large-scale war which would profit no one, the General Assembly should demand the elimination of all existing nuclear stockpiles in the world and the banning of all tests of nuclear and chemical weapons. A world conference should replace the present Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, so that the fundamental problems of disarmament should no longer be discussed outside the framework of the United Nations.

188. Within the same context, the military alliances born of the last war, which fall within the framework of the cold war, should be dissolved. Similarly, the dismantling of all military bases is a necessity, as is the withdrawal of foreign troops from all parts of the world, because we do not recognize the right of any State to appoint itself an international policeman.

189. The threat of nuclear war should be removed by the destruction of accumulated stockpiles and by a permanent ban on such stockpiles.

190. The arms race, the stockpiling and the accumulation of war material is liable to provoke such panic among those Powers which do not possess nuclear weapons that, in order to break the monopoly, additional nuclear Powers are going to emerge, a phenomenon which will lead to a permanent state of escalation and the multiplication of hotbeds of terror. The money which will be swallowed up in such rivalry will serve only to satisfy the vanity of the great Powers.

191. We firmly believe that the enormous sums of money spent on armaments could serve the highly humanitarian cause, namely, the improvement of the standard of living of all peoples and particularly the economic and social development of the third world. The Republic of Burundi is convinced that the contribution to development which could be made by nuclear technology used for peaceful purposes will be most useful, while the resources released by disarmament could be used to improve standards of living, to intensify the struggle against under-development, and to narrow the economic gap for the benefit of all peoples rich and poor. Without claiming to possess the monopoly of truth, we can declare, without risk of error, that there does exist a real cause-and-effect relationship between disarmament and development. The disarmament equation, the equation that disarmament equals development, has become a truth which requires no proof.

192. Despite certain hotbeds of tension which threaten world peace, there exists for the time being a new political

climate of détente among the great Powers. This new climate will perhaps make it possible for us to deal with greater lucidity with the problems posed by poverty, hunger and ignorance. We must, if we wish to safeguard universal peace, narrow the gap separating the rich and poor countries, a gap which for the time being is constantly on the increase. The developed countries should do more to avoid the crises which dangerously disturb international trade relations.

193. If, for two years, the United Nations has had to stress forcefully that the economic development of the world has to be planned by an appropriate strategy, it intended by this to remedy the errors of the First United Nations Development Decade and accelerate the upsurge of the poor countries over the years and in this way, to harmonize the equilibrium of our planet. This Strategy requires that the rich make certain sacrifices by using a part of their wealth to assist the developing countries to emerge from their uncomfortable economic position.

194. We are obliged to note that over the last two years the Second United Nations Development Decade has brought with it more disappointment than progress. Indeed, the poor countries for the most part continue to get poorer, while the rich countries become more and more prosperous. Furthermore, the rich countries continue to disregard the lot of the poor countries and their survival, since world trade is developing more and more to the advantage of the industries of the consumer society.

195. The present economic evolution of the world must change its course if we are in the future to ensure world economic equilibrium, the harmony of our relationships and, consequently, universal peace.

196. The failures of the first two years of the Decade have been accentuated by the world monetary crisis which has beset the Western currencies, has disorganized their exchange relations and is weakening the impact of our own reserves. Frequent periods of inflation and the unilateral measures taken by the rich countries to deal with them have affected and continue to disorganize the economies of the weak countries, although they bear no part of the responsibility for these crises. Hence, a feeling of frustration, mixed with indignation, has obliged us to ask the rich countries to control their economies and to institute machinery capable of preventing these monetary crises which have today become only too frequent. While urgent and concrete measures should be taken to reorganize the Western currency system, we think it essential that a new world monetary system should replace the existing one, because it is no longer in keeping with the interests of our planet.

197. The Burundi delegation is convinced that to have a monetary system which would safeguard the interests of the partners we can no longer confine ourselves to observing passively the changes worked out by the Club of Ten. All interested countries, small or great, rich or poor, should be not only consulted but associated intimately with the creation of a new world monetary order.

198. The international economic balance cannot be restored simply by a monetary diagnosis. It requires that

other parameters be used. We are prompted, therefore, to express the wish that a healthier commercial co-operation be established in our trade.

199. The developing countries have so far been constantly suffering from a deterioration in the terms of trade. Primary products are often subject to quotas and are seldom fairly priced. The present system must change in favour of the poor countries. We hope that the major negotiations which are soon to begin will remove all the obstacles to the intensification of trade between rich and poor countries. We must establish a new system, which will open up new markets to the products of the under-industrialized countries, provide just and fair remuneration for primary products and allow healthy trade co-operation. It is in the field of trade that the developed countries can underpin the efforts of developing countries in dignity and reciprocity by a system permitting all parties to participate equally in the harmonious development of the world economy, and, in particular, the economy of the third world, so that everyone will be able to enjoy fully the fruits of his fairly remunerated efforts.

200. My delegation considers that, in order to accelerate the economic development of the poor countries, the United Nations should direct the policy of international financing organs towards respect for the strategy which it has outlined. The World Bank and its group of institutions should adopt a more flexible approach to the plans presented by the poor countries, particularly the least advanced.

201. But unfortunately we have had to witness political criteria affecting the financing of third-world plans. My delegation, therefore, unreservedly condemns that conduct on the part of international financial organs. Such an attitude constitutes intervention in the internal affairs of a nation.

202. We feel, similarly, that the criterion of profitability should be interpreted with generosity and that account should be taken particularly of the level of economic development of the recipient countries. Otherwise, the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade could be seriously jeopardized.

203. Certain Governments have raised their voices in this Assembly to denounce the sinister activities of multinational companies and their bad effect on the development of their economies. We share the same concern with regard to these companies which, with the complicity of certain major Powers, have been preventing the developing countries from the exercise of their sovereignty over their own resources.

204. Solutions should be adopted to permit the third-world countries to dispose fully of their own resources and freely to decide the lines of their own economic and social development.

205. Among the developing countries there is a group of 25 which have been classified as the least advanced countries on our planet. Urgent appeals have been made at meetings of international organizations to accord them privileged treatment in the provision of capital and in trade relations. But those appeals have gone unheeded. Today

they are still the most underprivileged. That is a situation which, if solutions are not found, is liable to create even more serious cleavages in levels of development.

206. To help these countries emerge from their present situation, some measures should be contemplated and put into practice. The more advanced countries, in the name of universal solidarity, should help the least advanced by lifting non-tariff barriers, eliminating quota restrictions and reducing freight costs. Those measures should be taken for the land-locked countries also, particularly because most of them are also among the least advanced countries.

207. At a time when the General Assembly is meeting, a distressing situation still prevails in part of our globe. The Sahelian region has been afflicted by drought, as members are all aware. The peoples of that region continue to suffer from the effects of this natural disaster. In order to normalize the situation and to erase the painful traces of this drought, years of tireless effort will be required. Let us hope that universal solidarity will contribute even more by assisting the Governments of these regions to hasten their return to normality.

208. The search for peace, the elimination of injustice and shameless exploitation among States are without any doubt among the most important and most powerful factors in the promotion of the prosperity and progress of mankind. To succeed in this noble task which the United Nations has assumed, all the nations of the world will have to agree resolutely to march hand in hand to achieve great victories against these scourges of mankind.

209. It is in that spirit of solidarity that I express hopes for the success of this session and for the well-being and prosperity of mankind.

210. Mr. PEETE (Lesotho): It is a source of great pleasure for me to congratulate Ambassador Benites, on behalf of the Lesotho delegation, on his election to the high office of President of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. I have no doubt that he will—as he has already demonstrated—guide the work of this session to a successful and fruitful conclusion.

211. I should also like to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the Commonwealth of the Bahamas on its accession to independence and its subsequent admission to membership in this world Organization. On the basis of its history, my delegation is convinced that the Bahamas will be an active and effective Member of the United Nations, especially in the field of decolonization.

212. My delegation hails the admission of both Germanys to membership in the United Nations because it is a significant landmark in the history of this Organization. It is a great achievement in diplomacy and a giant step towards making the United Nations a truly universal Organization.

213. My Government will be happy to lend its support to the admission of the remaining divided nations to this Organization to ensure that all peoples are adequately represented in our deliberations.

Mr. Benites (Ecuador) resumed the Chair.

214. I speak before you on behalf of a people who, alongside others, lost their own in the two major wars of this century. We welcome the détente amongst the big Powers. We were happy at the signing of the Paris peace agreements on Indo-China and the lowering of tensions in Europe is for us a matter of satisfaction. Indeed I believe that mankind is now poised to seize the opportunities for a more durable peace that are offered by these developments.

215. But these opportunities for a more permanent peace will be lost if the basic human rights of all peoples are ignored. There can be no peace that is based on the sufferings of others. The hunger and poverty of the vast majority of humanity are no basis for a permanent international régime which provides for mutually satisfactory accommodation of the interests of all peoples.

216. As Chancellor Willy Brandt of the Federal Republic of Germany said last week so eloquently:

“... human distress is conflict. Where hunger prevails, there can be no peace in the long run. Where bitter poverty prevails, there can be no justice. Where a man's very existence is threatened for want of basic daily needs, it is not permissible to speak of security.” [2128th meeting, para. 38.]

217. The denial of human rights to others either on the basis of race or any other characteristic can contribute no more to humanity than deluding us into interpreting temporary armistices or the absence of bloody conflicts as peace.

218. The allocation of resources to military expenditures by the rich countries continues to increase, while in the rest of the world the basic daily needs of millions of people have no hope of being satisfied.

219. It is in the context of this reality that this Organization, whose principal function is the maintenance of international peace, should take concrete decisions to alleviate man's suffering as a pre-condition to a more permanent peace structure.

220. The urgency of meeting this reality is underlined by the current indications of a world-wide food shortage. No one can dispute the fact that such a shortage, unless redressed, will create conditions in the third world which will undermine social institutions and stability.

221. This Organization should galvanize man's creative abilities in science and technology to solve the perennial problems of drought, which afflict many countries of the developing world. My country is among those which have suffered drought year after year. We do not hope to rely solely on relief foodstuffs from the rich countries. We hope more permanent solutions can be found to alleviate problems arising from these conditions.

222. My delegation in this context welcomes the initiative of the United States Secretary of State for the convening of a world food conference [2124th meeting] and we sincerely hope that the energies that détente between the super-Powers and other big Powers has released will be devoted to the realization of that most fundamental of human rights, the right to live.

223. On behalf of the Lesotho Government I wish to register Lesotho's opposition to the recent spate of nuclear tests because, inasmuch as these tests are irrelevant to the essential needs of humanity, they militate against international co-operation and endanger the lives of human beings as well as the living resources on which they depend. They are regrettably carried out in a spirit of overt defiance of international public opinion and of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

224. When the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade was adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970 [resolution 2626 (XXV)], some of us were hopeful that the international community had at long last become aware, in the interests of durable peace and stability, of the pressing need to combat the scourges of mass poverty, unemployment, disease and malnutrition plaguing the developing countries. But the first over-all biennial review and appraisal of progress has already shown how dismally over-optimistic we were.

225. The gap between the planned objectives and targets of the Strategy and their achievement in the wide spectrum of the problem areas of socio-economic growth and development, as elaborated in the Strategy itself, remains as wide and frightening as ever. To quote but a few areas of critical importance to the development effort of such least-developed countries as mine, there has been a failure on the part of developed countries as a whole to achieve aid goals of 1 per cent of gross national product, a failure to achieve official assistance of 0.7 per cent of gross national product, insufficient action to help developing countries gain access to export markets in spite of the newly introduced generalized system of preferences, failure to evolve a concerted policy on debt relief, and a tendency to pay lip service to the interests of developing countries in multilateral trade and monetary negotiations. I cannot hope to exhaust the whole list of disappointments or shortfalls here, and of course some individual developed countries have performed better than others in various fields. But all in all, the economic and technological gap between the “have” and the “have not” countries, or between the north and the south, is ever widening. As one expert study on the subject concludes, the International Development Strategy remains “much more a wish than a policy”. The situation gives the impression that the Strategy was adopted with no intention of implementing it, and if this is the case my greatest fear is that the credibility of the consensus of this august body is being terribly undermined.

226. In my view the bleak and disappointing results of the first two or three years of the Second Development Decade make it urgent and imperative that both the developed and the developing countries should vigorously make a concerted effort, not only to implement the existing targets and policy measures of the Strategy, but also to seek new areas of agreement, to widen and deepen existing ones, to evolve new concepts and standards and to seek agreement on additional measures. As an extension of the new east-west policy of détente, both rich and poor countries should seriously strive to establish new structural relationships on the basis of equitable co-operation and partnership, as well as mutual benefit. The world community ought to realize that, while the basic responsibility for the

development of the developing countries rests with those countries themselves, development, like maintenance of world peace, is a global problem that transcends national frontiers and very often defies national solutions, and it is therefore a joint responsibility of all nations.

227. As members of the General Assembly are very well aware, Lesotho is one of the hard-core among the least developed of the developing countries. In addition to the problems that are common to all countries which are similarly classified, Lesotho is plagued by unique problems which other developing countries are fortunate enough not to experience. The source of those unique problems is Lesotho's own geographical situation, which is such that it is the only State Member of the United Nations whose territory is completely embedded within the territory of another State Member of the United Nations, whose political philosophy is, furthermore, directly opposite to its own.

228. At this stage I can only express the hope that special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, as well as special measures in favour of land-locked developing countries, envisaged in the International Development Strategy and elaborated upon and refined by other forums or agencies will be translated into reality as a matter of priority, taking into consideration the unique geo-economic position of my country. I should like to state that the Government of Lesotho stands ready to support any efforts aimed at evolving institutional arrangements for the implementation of such special measures. The idea of the creation of special funds is attractive to my delegation, but in the event that this is not sufficiently palatable to the majority of developed countries I would like to give support to the use of the United Nations Capital Development Fund in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, in the hope that the developed countries will now be more favourably disposed towards increasing their contributions to the Fund.

229. My Government fully supported the establishment of the United Nations Environment Programme, as well as the establishment of the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme. We hope that the establishment of the programme will lead to an internationally co-ordinated solution to the problem of the pollution of man's environment, which is one of the most recently recognized hazards to human survival. We also hope that in addressing themselves to these problems both the Governing Council and the secretariat of the United Nations Environment Programme will attach as much importance to the problems of the spread of deserts as to the loss of productive soil through soil erosion. In my country soil erosion is the greatest environmental problem which we have for many years been trying to solve. Our efforts have so far not met with any success. Our very limited arable land is annually being swept away to the oceans by soil erosion, thus undermining our annual increase of agricultural output. The hazard to human life posed by the spread of deserts such as the Sahara Desert is too recent an example to need emphasis.

230. With the passage of time the Middle East situation, as is evident from recent events, is becoming more and more

complicated. As the attitudes of parties to the conflict continue to harden, the United Nations peace-making machinery seems to be manifesting symptoms of fatigue and helplessness. This conflict is gradually becoming the pivot of the world's energy crisis. In addition, a colonial situation seems more than ever before to be developing in the occupied territories, which makes all the more tragic the fate of the Palestinian people. It is the view of my Government that any measures calculated to change the character of those territories would only complicate the solution of the problem. Even under these greatly changed circumstances, Security Council resolution 242 (1967), if not distorted, still provides a reasonable framework for its solution.

231. In southern Africa, 35 million African people continue to be politically dominated and economically as well as morally exploited by a handful of settlers of European descent, who use their overwhelming military and economic power to deny their subjects even the most basic of human rights and freedoms.

232. We in Lesotho continue to insist that a just solution of the Rhodesian crisis must of necessity be preceded by the release of all political prisoners; the revocation of the current state of emergency; a watertight guarantee of freedom of expression and of assembly; the repeal of current discriminatory legislation; and the convening of a genuinely representative constitutional conference, whose decisions would have legal effect only if approved by all Rhodesians on the basis of unqualified universal suffrage.

233. The solution of the Rhodesian problem is the responsibility of the United Kingdom Government. We believe also that it is the duty of the international community to assist the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe morally, materially and in any other way possible. The continued existence of the Ian Smith régime is incompatible with the establishment of durable peace in southern Africa, as has been demonstrated by its past military excursions and its senseless economic blockade of Zambia. In addition to the fact that its persistence is a threat to the security and sovereignty of the independent African States which neighbour it, it is a potential source of racial conflict which may one day engulf the whole of southern Africa, unless events in that part of the world follow a different course.

234. While the world continues to be shocked by the revelations of the atrocities of Portugal in its colonies, some of Portugal's powerful western allies continue to deny that their military and economic assistance is used in the perpetration of those atrocities. I submit that, if the military, economic and technical resources which are placed at the disposal of Portugal are not used in Portuguese wars against freedom movements, that kind of aid to Portugal at least frees resources of Portuguese origin to be deployed against the human rights of Portugal's colonial subjects, to stifle the liberation struggle and to perpetuate Portuguese political domination and the economic exploitation of Angola and Mozambique.

235. In conformity with my Government's policy, Lesotho was among those countries which blessed the Secretary-General's initiative in making contacts with Pre-

toria over the question of Namibia. Addressing itself to the stark realities of the situation, Lesotho is now beginning to entertain serious doubts on the wisdom of this dialogue, as South Africa's continuing Balkanization of the territory, even during the course of the negotiations, is clearly calculated to prejudice any possible satisfactory outcome.

236. On the situation prevailing in South Africa the views of my Government are well known. My Government has stated many times before that the people of South Africa would soon come to the conclusion that they had no alternative in the solution of the *apartheid* problem but resort to the use of force. My Government has also observed that *apartheid* was likely to lead to the tragedy of racial confrontation—confrontation that could not be confined to Africa but that would result in racial hatred and bitterness throughout the world. It is clear to us that, unless there is a change of heart on the part of the South African Government, racial violence is going to become a feature of life in southern Africa.

237. My Government has always espoused a policy of friendship with all States and good neighbourliness in particular with all the countries of southern Africa. We seek confrontation with no one. Our policy of good neighbourliness in no way diminishes our commitment to the United Nations principles on the universal rights of man; therefore we shall never cease to condemn the evils of *apartheid*, racism and colonialism.

238. In our own society we shall continue to reflect the common humanity of man. We shall continue to provide refuge to the victims of *apartheid*, racism and colonialism. In our schools we shall continue to provide places for people of all colours to enable them to develop their intellectual capabilities to the fullest extent possible in an atmosphere free from racial bigotry.

239. Our foreign policy is dictated by our national interests. In the formulation of those interests we shall continue to be guided by our obligations under the Charter and our commitment to peace and justice.

240. Allow me to express the profound appreciation of my Government at the expressions of sympathy and condolences extended to my Government and the families of the Lesotho nationals who lost their lives or suffered injuries in the recent shootings at the Carletonville Mines in South Africa. These expressions of sympathy give us reason to believe that the international community is still fully conscious of the value of human life and the dignity of the human person. I wish to assure you that the Lesotho Government has made arrangements for the interests of those affected and their dependants to be looked after by counsel in the proposed judicial inquiry into this incident.

241. Finally, I am pleased to inform this Assembly that the Kingdom of Lesotho has today accorded full recognition to the new sovereign State of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau. On behalf of my Government I wish to congratulate the Government and the people of Guinea-Bissau on the bold step they have taken.

242. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before calling on the representatives who have asked to be

allowed to exercise the right of reply, I should like to recall that at its 2123rd meeting, on 21 September 1973, the General Assembly adopted the General Committee's report [A/9200], paragraph 7 of which provides that statements made in exercise of the right of reply shall be limited to 10 minutes. I shall now call in turn on those representatives wishing to exercise the right of reply.

243. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): One of the speakers at today's meeting of the General Assembly, distorting the truth and turning facts which are known to everyone upside down, tried in every possible way to make it appear as though the easing of international tension and the improvement in relations between large States, in particular between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, were detrimental to the interests of medium-sized and small States.

244. A clear and convincing answer to this kind of unfounded assertion and totally absurd presentation of the facts as being precisely the opposite of what they are was given recently by the Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, in his well-known statement made at Tashkent, when he said, *inter alia*:

"The role of each State in the development of international relations is determined above all by the policy that State pursues. The authority and influence of any given country in world affairs depend to a considerable extent on this factor. In other words, the political watershed does not divide the large from the small countries, but follows the line separating the policy of peace and progress from the policy of aggression and reaction.

"Those countries which take a position of actively fighting to strengthen peace and achieve equitable international co-operation and which, in so doing, are guided not by short-term or narrow national calculations, but by their conscious and principled choice in favour of the general strengthening of international security, are becoming increasingly important."

245. Since the Soviet Union came into existence, we have repeatedly had to listen to all kinds of nonsensical and even monstrous fabrications directed against the policy of the first socialist State in the world. However, neither the earlier slanderers nor those who have now appeared can change the objective truth. The whole world knows, and each of the representatives in this hall knows—even the speaker I referred to knows—that the Soviet Union resolutely and unswervingly wages an active struggle for the strengthening of peace and international security, for the avoidance of the use of force in international relations, including the prohibition forever of the use of nuclear weapons, for the cessation of the arms race, the reduction of military budgets and general and complete disarmament, for the freedom and independence of peoples and for friendly relations among all States.

246. The Soviet Union persistently followed this peace-loving policy before the Second World War and after it, and it will continue to pursue this policy in future. The Soviet

people, like all peace-loving peoples, are deeply satisfied that the Soviet Union's relations with the United States, and also with France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan and many other States on all continents, have been noticeably normalized and improved, that the States of Europe are making joint efforts to reduce tension on the European continent and that agreements are being concluded to limit the arms race and prevent nuclear war. It is precisely this peace-loving policy of the USSR and all the other socialist countries, conducted, as the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973, again confirmed, with the active support of the non-aligned States, which has led to the marked easing of international tension. This improvement in the international atmosphere is welcomed by the vast majority of States, as can be seen in particular from the statements of almost all representatives who have spoken at this session of the General Assembly, with the exception, sad to say, of one speaker.

247. In any case, this one speaker's statement speaks for itself; it needs no commentary from us. The purpose of his statement is perfectly obvious—to distract the United Nations from business-like discussion of concrete problems, to prevent the United Nations and this twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly from doing effective work, to hamper the work of maintaining international peace and security and promoting disarmament and the struggle against the remnants of colonialism and racism in the world. Only a delegation which has no constructive programme of its own—as is clear, incidentally, from its statement—could speak in this way.

248. While emphatically rejecting the slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union, the Soviet delegation does not feel it necessary or reasonable to engage within the walls of the United Nations in polemics directed against such fabrications. We should only like to stress that such an approach is incompatible with the purposes and practice of the United Nations. Attempts of this kind have failed in the past, and they are again doomed to failure now.

249. Mr. DOUC RASY (Khmer Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, having the honour and the pleasure of speaking under your guidance leads me to make a confession to you. My delegation is constantly imbued with the desire to avoid polemics with any delegation meeting under your presidency. Our Foreign Minister has already explained the physiognomy of the Khmer Republic, which is not the physiognomy that some representatives have tried to depict here. However, it becomes necessary to speak out and to say certain truths.

250. We have come here as representatives of nations working together for a noble cause, and it is, I think, unnecessary to say that the language to which we resort must remain within certain limits—I would say, the limits of courtesy and decency. Regardless of our emotions, our inner thoughts, we must still respect certain rules and regulations.

251. I take the floor today to reply to a certain representative who has spoken of the “puppet régime of Phnom Penh”—a peculiar puppet régime, I must say, a régime that is supported by the people and has been based

on two popular elections, one of a legislative nature, and one of a presidential nature. A peculiar puppet régime, I must say, that is based on an executive power, one that has emerged from the co-operation between two candidates for the presidency, who were opposed but one of whom is now President of the Republic, and the other the Prime Minister. I think that in the world it would be rare to find a comparable puppet régime based on conciliation.

252. Again, a peculiar puppet régime, I must say, a republican régime whose government is situated in the capital of Cambodia—in Phnom Penh and not in Peking. Perhaps we might add that it would have been better for Cambodia to have a régime situated in Phnom Penh rather than a peripatetic Government that wanders homeless over the world. I do not need to go into details in this connexion.

253. This worthy representative, whom the representative of the Soviet Union did not dignify by naming, thus contrasts “the Lon Nol clique, illegal from the very beginning,” with “the only legal Government of Cambodia—the one presided over by Norodom Sihanouk”.

254. If you will allow me, Sir, I shall limit myself to saying that the Lon Nol Government, on 8 August 1969, was invested by the National Assembly elected on 11 September 1966. In January 1970 Norodom Sihanouk visited France, the Soviet Union and China. But none of the Ministers of that “legal” Government followed him.

255. And even had he not been deposed, he could not legally have nominated a single member of the Government because Cambodia at the time was a constitutional monarchy, and article 97, paragraph 2 of our Constitution is extremely clear. It says:

“Ministers are nominated and assume their functions only when they have obtained an absolute majority by secret ballot, and thus are shown to have the confidence of the National Assembly”.

Therefore, under no circumstances could Norodom Sihanouk nominate any Government that might be deemed legal.

256. It is, I must admit, regrettable that certain so-called advanced countries contend that the legality of Cambodia depends on the will of a single man and not on national representation.

257. And that representative complained that the seat in the United Nations had been usurped by the Lon Nol clique. May I define the word “usurpation” for you? To usurp a title is to have that title without being able to assume the functions. But at the end of this session the representatives of the Khmer Republic will return to Phnom Penh, in Cambodia. They will transmit all the Assembly resolutions to the Government of that country and the Government will undertake to implement these resolutions in the country that is called the Khmer Republic. Now, however, if the Khmer Republic seat is given to the representatives of Norodom Sihanouk, at the end of this session those representatives will go off to Peking, where they will not be able to apply the resolutions of the General

Assembly in the territory of Cambodia. Therefore, who is the usurper in these circumstances? The one who usurps the title of representative of Cambodia is the one who is unable to carry out his functions within the national territory of Cambodia.

258. Now, of course, the representative to whom I am referring flattered himself by saying that Norodom Sihanouk controlled 90 per cent of the territory and 80 per cent of the population. Need I say that this is a gross lie? If his forces did control 90 per cent of the territory and 80 per cent of the population of the Khmer Republic, why did they not then take the other 10 per cent of the territory, why did they fail to take the other 20 per cent of the population? Why is it that on 17 September 1973 Norodom Sihanouk said in an interview in Algiers, "Alas, we cannot take Phnom Penh this year or next year, nor for a number of years. For the time being we cannot take an important city. I must be frank". Why? I can tell the Assembly why. For after that he admitted the cause—the cause in fact lay in his powerlessness. He said, "The Red community of the Khmer in Peking is too Stalinist". Well, why has he not sufficient authority to stop that Red Khmer group in Peking from being Stalinist? He does not have the authority. He lives within this Red Khmer community in Peking and lacks enough authority to control his own people in exile. How, then, can he claim to have any authority whatever over more than 80 per cent of the population of Cambodia and 90 per cent of the territory? Furthermore, let it be admitted here, when you are not even master of your own military staff, you can hardly give orders to the army.

259. The representative also asked for the immediate expulsion from the United Nations of the "traitorous clique of Lon Nol"—and I thank him for the epithet. If that happens, what will you do, Mr. President? What will you do, Mr. Secretary-General? Can you expect to apply the resolutions of the United Nations in Cambodia, and, Mr. Secretary-General, can you establish the permanent presence of the United Nations in Cambodia? If the representatives of the Khmer Republic were expelled from the United Nations, the Secretary-General would be obliged to address himself to Peking for representation. Those will be the consequences of expelling the Khmer Republic from the United Nations. The United Nations will be paralysed whereas it should increase its universality; it should be able to retain the right to ensure application and implementation of its decisions in all territories and in all countries.

260. Before concluding, I should like to reserve the right of my delegation to reply to other delegations if we deem it fit at any moment to do so and if these explanations I have just given are insufficient.

261. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform members of the Assembly that in future, in connexion with the exercise of the right of reply, when the President indicates that 10 minutes have elapsed, the interpretation of the statement of a speaker who ignores that warning will be stopped.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.