



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> )	
Speech by Mr. Solano López (Paraguay) . . . . .	1
Speech by Mr. Péter (Hungary) . . . . .	4
Speech by Mr. Wickman (Sweden) . . . . .	8
Speech by Mr. El-Zayyat (Egypt) . . . . .	11

*President:* Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, may I convey to you my sincerest congratulations on your election to preside over the deliberations of the current session of the General Assembly. In expressing to you our best wishes for success in the difficult task that has been entrusted to you by the unanimous decision of the Members of the United Nations, I should point out that in the brief period that has elapsed since you assumed the presidency you have already given us ample evidence to confirm the wisdom of your election. Once again my delegation wishes to offer you its fullest co-operation.

2. As this is the first general debate that has been held since Mr. Kurt Waldheim was appointed Secretary-General of the United Nations and began to discharge his duties, my Government has expressly instructed me to confirm its full confidence and faith in the activities of the new Secretary-General, whose outstanding personal qualities of talent, wisdom, devotion to the cause of peace and justice, and deep-rooted knowledge of the problems of our era and of our Organization are a guarantee that through the years of his term of office he will guide the United Nations successfully to the achievement of the purposes and principles for which it was established.

3. Once again my delegation comes to the General Assembly to express its wishes, its concerns, its hopes and disappointments. However, as we are well aware that the allocation of work to the various main Committees will permit of a full and detailed discussion of the items on the General Assembly's agenda in those bodies, my delegation will confine itself here today to making only a few comments on some of those items, especially those in connexion with which we should like to make our position abundantly clear.

4. I should be derelict in the discharge of a fundamental duty, however, if I did not precede these comments with at

least a brief review of the characteristic features of the current international situation.

5. In the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General has given us his views on the international situation:

“Over the past year three main trends—two of them encouraging, one discouraging—have been apparent on the international scene. The first is the process of détente among the great Powers. The second—and discouraging one—is the persistence of conflict in several key areas of the world and the failure, both of the Governments concerned and of the international community, to find acceptable solutions to the underlying problems involved. The third trend is the series of efforts by the international community to co-operate in tackling, through the United Nations system, some of the great long-term problems of our planet, such as trade and development, the environment and population.” [A/8701/Add.1, p. 1.]

6. We are sincerely gratified to observe the relaxation of tensions between the great Powers and the consequent gradual improvement in their relations—all of which has led to an appreciable positive change in conditions. We know full well that for far too long a period of time the winds of the cold war raged all too forcefully, undermining or completely nullifying opportunities for constructive, fruitful common action. The impact of the new situation, which we witness with such satisfaction, is already obvious, even in regions of the earth geographically far removed one from the other, such as Eastern and Western Europe and the Korean peninsula. But the lessening of tensions does not mean that they have disappeared or that they have been completely eliminated, although we trust that a better day is about to dawn.

7. We must of necessity be cautious in our optimism. Indeed, we have good reason not to let our hopes fly too high. There have been agreements on the limitation of armaments, the importance of which we cannot and should not underestimate, but the possibilities for general and complete disarmament under effective international control—the ambitious goal of a decade—are still remote, and the sums spent by a few powerful States on increasingly complicated and costly armaments remain at such a high level compared with the volume of international financial aid provided by the developed countries to the developing nations that they immediately bring to mind the living conditions of most of the earth's population, which has thus far been frustrated in its desire to break down the artificially erected barriers which bar the way to a better life, to higher standards of living and a more equitable distribution of the fruits of its labour.

8. The efforts of the parties themselves and those of the international community have still proved unsuccessful in solving the conflicts in various key areas of the world, to which reference has been made by the Secretary-General. I am thinking of the Middle East and of Viet-Nam. In the Middle East, in view of the precarious present situation, a conflagration may erupt again the devastating flames of which not only would engulf the States located in the area but would also spread and intensify. I am thinking of Viet-Nam where a bloody, grim and destructive war is being waged such as we have seldom seen before. I am thinking of colonialism which, although dying out, has not completely disappeared and is still preventing many peoples from exercising their legitimate right to be the masters of their own destiny and to govern themselves. I must point out that the terrible scourge of racial discrimination still persists in some areas of the world.

9. My delegation has repeatedly stated its position on all these questions and I need not do so again. But I should like once again to express our hopes that in the not-too-distant future we shall witness the dawn of peace, of prosperity and justice for the States in areas now beset by armed conflicts and for the peoples of areas where the unrestricted implementation of the right of self-determination is not yet at hand.

10. At the beginning of my statement I said that my delegation, once again, wished to give voice to its hopes and its frustrations. The latter is an apt term by which to describe the tremendous and growing gap between the two parts in which the world of today is divided, viewed from the standpoint of their degree of development, levels of living and sharing of wealth. On more than one occasion we have said that under the prevailing conditions of international trade, with raw material prices at a standstill or declining and the costs of manufactured goods steadily rising, in the words of the Foreign Minister of Paraguay:

“The breach between over-developed and under-developed countries widens all the time and, although political colonialism may have ended, economic colonialism exercised over the agricultural countries will continue unless there is a substantial change in the present conditions of production and export of agricultural commodities.”

11. I should also remind the Assembly, as I have already done on previous occasions, of a known fact which none the less should be repeated because it influences many of the positions we take. My country is not only a member of the large group called the developing countries, but at the same time it is one of those which realizes that in addition to the problems of development without adequate national capacity for financing and without sufficient international financial aid, which are serious enough in themselves, we are also faced with problems which derive from the fact that we are a land-locked, inland country far removed from the sea and from all the benefits which possession of a coastline brings with it. This fact explains our firm determination and our constant fight in all forums and in all organs to obtain endorsement of the principles of an increasingly enlightened international law which, through international justice, compensates for the obvious disadvan-

tages deriving from a land-locked position. To quote only one example among the many that I could mention, we should bear in mind that, in order to export goods which are the source of our income, and to enable them to compete successfully in foreign markets, land-locked States are compelled to reduce further the already low sales prices or somehow to absorb the higher transport and freight costs for goods shipped to the sea ports. Only thus can these goods compete on an equal footing with those from more fortunate countries that have the benefit of a coastline.

12. These remarks apply not only to questions concerning world trade but they also have an impact on matters included in the scheduled Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind.

13. I note the fact, which can easily be verified, that since the outset of the consideration of these questions in 1967 on the use of the aforesaid resources, one point has been very much in the forefront of our debates. This is the question of the extent or breadth of the territorial sea and the extent or breadth of the contiguous zone; and this area is increasingly being described as the patrimonial sea. The importance of this issue has been much more obvious in the current general debate, in the course of which very well qualified representatives of the riparian States have referred to the question in depth. I cannot forget that in these statements and with reference to the exploitation of the resources of the contiguous zone of the territorial sea, the speakers have emphasized that these resources should be used exclusively—I repeat, “exclusively”—for the benefit of the coastal States.

14. At the meeting held on 17 April 1971 at San José, Costa Rica, during the first regular session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country Professor Raúl Sapena Pastor, referred to the question of the breadth of the territorial sea in order to make the following points on behalf of Paraguay:

“The Republic of Paraguay is an inland land-locked country, and geographical and historical circumstances have deprived it of the extraordinary benefit of having a coastline. Nonetheless, Paraguay has the right to enjoy freedom of the high seas and unlimited navigation and to have access to fisheries, the underlying resources and the airspace over the sea. To the extent that the States with coastlines arbitrarily increase their sovereignty by widening their territorial sea, they are also arbitrarily limiting the rights of the Republic of Paraguay and of all inland or land-locked States.”

He went on to say:

“The breadth of the territorial sea can be fixed not by national precepts, whether they are derived from law or the Constitution, but through the consent of all States, including those that are land-locked and those that have coastlines, a consent expressed in the form of international agreements.”

15. The foregoing ideas apply equally to the contiguous zone. The sovereignty of nations over what is described as the territorial sea is an unquestioned concept of international law; but there is no generally accepted agreement on its breadth which, depending upon the coastal State concerned, extends from 3 to 200 miles. While there may have been a time when the individual will of each riparian State could be exercised in establishing the breadth of its territorial sea, we cannot today condone a system which produces a variety of views derived from unilateral decisions or proclamations. With respect to the breadth of the so-called patrimonial sea, the existence of different criteria is even less warranted.

16. None the less, we have been asked more than once to support the aspirations of States which wish to extend considerably their territorial as well as their so-called patrimonial sea, or the zone contiguous to the territorial sea. But we have already said that any extension of this kind automatically reduces the rights of the land-locked States. Therefore, there is an obvious contradiction in such requests, when they are made with no mention of any form of compensation. Certainly today's world is growing ever more interdependent; and certainly States—particularly those that belong to the developing world—need each other and are in duty bound to express mutual solidarity to each other in order to strengthen the defence of their common interests. But solidarity implies a certain amount of give and take. It cannot take the form of support by some States for the aspirations of others without corresponding concessions. Yet this is precisely the kind of one-sided situation which exists between the riparian States and the land-locked or inland States. Has the time not yet come, we wonder, to focus on these problems with a more decisive and enlightened sense of solidarity? This is the question that we are not called upon to answer alone.

17. Turning to another group of matters, I would touch on the fact that the General Assembly is preparing to consider actions that might be taken as a result of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Among the decisions which sooner or later will have to be taken are the recommendations for the establishment of an administering board, a secretariat, a fund and co-ordination procedures for programmes dealing with the environment, within the framework of the United Nations. In addition, the Conference adopted the text of a declaration,<sup>1</sup> on its Principle 20, which was to refer this to the General Assembly for consideration, together with the proposed amendments submitted in the course of the Stockholm Conference.

18. Owing to the fact that for various reasons my country was not represented at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, I feel it necessary to explain our position on Principle 20, which was the subject of many amendments. We are particularly interested in this Principle inasmuch as it affects international rivers.

19. Our position is defined in the text of the Declaration of Asunción on the exploitation of international rivers,

registered as resolution No. 25 of the Fourth Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the countries of the Plata basin, adopted on 3 June 1971 in the capital of Paraguay. As this Declaration has already been quoted in this general debate, I think it my duty to quote verbatim the substantive section of that document:

“The Foreign Ministers consider it to be of real interest to record the fundamental points on which agreement has already been reached and which represent the basis on which study of this item should continue:

“1. In contiguous international rivers, since sovereignty is shared, any exploitation of these waters should be preceded by a bilateral agreement between the riparian States.

“2. In international rivers which flow into each other, since sovereignty is not shared, each State can exploit the waters in terms of its needs, always provided that it does not cause any considerable damage to any other State of the Plata basin.

“3. With respect to the exchange of hydrological and meteorological data:

“(a) Those already provided will be the subject of dissemination and systematic publication through documents and pamphlets;

“(b) Data to be processed, either simple observations and readings or graphic registers of instruments, will be conveyed or submitted in accordance with the judgement of the parties concerned.

“4. States shall in so far as possible attempt to exchange gradually the cartographic or hydrographic results of their studies in the Plata basin in order to facilitate the defining of the dynamic system of the basin.

“5. States will try as far as possible to maintain in the best possible navigation conditions the courses of the rivers under their sovereignty, adopting to this end the necessary means in order that the works will be carried out so as not to be prejudicial to any other current users of the river system.

“6. States, in carrying out public works designed for any purpose in the rivers of the basin, shall adopt the necessary measures to ensure that they do not damage or change in any prejudicial way the conditions for navigation.

“7. States, in the carrying out of public works in the river system involving navigation, will adopt any measures necessary to preserve the living resources of the basin.”<sup>2</sup>

20. My country considers that this Declaration implies very clearly *inter alia* the lack of entitlement of any State in the basin to divert the waters from one geographic region to another basin or sub-basin.

<sup>1</sup> See *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-16 June 1972* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.II.A.14), chap. I.

<sup>2</sup> See *Ríos y Lagos internacionales* (Washington, D.C., Secretariat of the Organization of American States, August 1971), pp. 187-188.

21. I should like now to refer to agenda item 89 entitled "Need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General". Two years ago I had an opportunity to state from this rostrum [1855th meeting] that my delegation did not believe that the time was then ripe to take up such a task, but I added that at the same time we considered that the item included in the agenda was an adequate instrument for proceeding to a real and effective evaluation of the predominant thinking among the Members of the United Nations concerning any possible review of the Charter. In the time that has elapsed since then a considerable number of States have been able to make known their views on the possible revision of the fundamental document of the United Nations. Some have done so through notes in answer to the questionnaire submitted by the Secretary-General. Others have done so in the course of statements made by their representatives at this session. We believe that the ideas suggested deserve most careful consideration. I am thinking in particular of the suggestions and proposals which refer to the composition and structure of the Security Council, and among these I should like to mention as an interesting example that which was put forward by the Foreign Minister of Mexico in the statement he made at the 2050th meeting of the General Assembly on 3 October last, to the effect that at least one permanent member of the Security Council should be a representative of the third world and should be on the same footing as the present permanent members. Certainly such an idea, as well as many other important ideas, has aroused understandable interest on the part of my delegation, and we shall examine these ideas, attributing to them all due importance.

22. I have reserved the last part of my statement for my comments on that scourge which has considerably worsened in recent times, and I refer to international terrorism. This terrorism, which with painful frequency makes victims of the innocent and is characterized by cruelty and absolute contempt for legal rules established to maintain harmony and for the common good, creates a general climate of insecurity and collective fear, breaking down faith in the effectiveness of law and order, and may even lead to a crisis in the rule of law.

23. Without ignoring the fact that in certain cases terrorism may be a reflection of underlying situations whose correction is essential and urgent, my country does not hesitate to condemn acts of international terrorism and considers that the time has come to proceed to joint action to eliminate this evil. First of all, we believe that every State should adopt measures, in the full exercise of its sovereignty, to prevent and punish this type of crime. Secondly, States, acting jointly, should seek ways and means to make certain co-ordinated and effective action to remove international terrorism from the face of the earth. For this action, for this search, there is no forum more suitable than the United Nations. On the basis of this conviction, we have been gratified to note the initiative taken by the Secretary-General in requesting the inclusion of this item in our agenda, and therefore we have supported this idea both in the General Committee and in the plenary General Assembly.

24. Mr. PÉTER (Hungary): One of the major characteristics of the present world situation is that we have very good news and very bad news at the same time.

25. The most recent very good news was that representatives of the thermonuclear Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, declared in a joint ceremonial act, with the participation of Foreign Minister Gromyko and President Nixon in Washington, the coming into force of their Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, signed at Moscow on 26 May 1972. In a matter of crucial importance to the future of all mankind, the effort to stop the danger of a thermonuclear war from increasing, this is indeed a historic event.

26. On the other hand, it is very bad news that almost simultaneously B-52 bombers directed one of their most massive attacks against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

27. In this state of international relations two sorts of opinions can be heard in the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly. The vast majority of Member States have been pleased to note the generally favourable change in the world situation. Some speakers, on the other hand, have talked as if there had been no improvement in international relations—and, what is even worse—as if the phenomena regarded by others as signs of improvement actually portended new dangers. This concern expressed in statements by a good number of speakers has been given voice for very respectable reasons. But there have been speakers on this rostrum who think that the sublimated right and good of mankind would be served by the outbreak of a thermonuclear war. Those who have expressed such views have not even attempted to make any constructive proposal reflecting what their Governments believe to be a way to solve the problems. There being two kinds of tones heard in this debate, we cannot turn a deaf ear to the negative voices. I am sure, though, that the negative voices will gradually be isolated and dwindle away. Even at this session of the General Assembly they have diminished in number, extent and intensity alike. We must nevertheless take seriously those facts upon which they feel they have a right to build their absurd concept of the world situation. And we ought to do so even in the absence of such deplorable and negative utterances.

28. I would have very many reasons to begin my statement by explaining my Government's views on the most favourable aspects of the present international situation, first of all because Hungary is a European country and the most promising signs can be seen in Europe. It is also an exceptional case in the history of the United Nations that both the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General of the United Nations are representatives of European countries. It has been in these days that for the first time in the history of Europe a joint conference was held by the mayors of all European capitals, and that conference took place precisely in Budapest, the capital city of Hungary.

29. Still, I shall not start with this. I am going to expound my Government's position, not on the favourable, but on the unfavourable phenomena, in the hope that there will be

an improvement in relations where they need improving; that is to say, that the improvement of international relations will be extended to areas in which the obsolete rules of life of a bygone world are still kept alive.

30. It is clear that we live in revolutionary times. We are witnessing great changes of which we are at the same time passive and creative factors. There is a variety of adjectives to describe the forces in the world today. It can be said that there are peaceful forces and aggressive forces. It can be said that there are progressive forces and reactionary forces. Blended with all these, it can be said, there are forces, governments and aspirations which put into effect measures workable at a given time and place, for they understand the call of the times; and there are those which, by putting unworkable measures into effect, make themselves out of step, for they cannot understand the call of the times. There are people, individuals, governments and statutory measures that have outlived their time.

31. In the thermonuclear age the peoples have to re-examine the practices, laws and international relations they have maintained thus far, their conception of international law, the ideas they have of the questions of war and peace. They have to restudy—and I say this with good reason—even their principles regarding just and unjust wars. What might earlier have seemed, to a great extent, to be just wars should today be eliminated.

32. This acclimatization to new conditions is not an easy matter, nor can it be done very rapidly. But history goes on, and those who belong in the junk heap will be carried there by the tide of history. I now quote from a poet of Hungary's revolutionary past who expressed death and the coming of the new generation in an image of the decay and the revival of nature in the spring: "... we are pushed, as the tree's young leaves push off the leaves of yesteryear."

33. Yes, after tremendous historical catastrophes—and at the price of the wonderful sacrifices they entailed for man—a new epoch of mankind is being shaped today under comparatively easy circumstances. In a period of historic changes and changes in social systems, one can observe today a considerable relaxation and, because of an awareness of joint responsibilities, considerable co-operation in the relationship between the principal opposing forces, primarily between those on which the question of whether or not there will be a thermonuclear war depends. This relaxation, however, is not perceived and felt by all.

34. I wish now to examine, in their international context, those areas where the effect of relaxation cannot as yet be perceived.

35. The two Viet-Nameese parties to the Paris talks on the question of Viet-Nam—the representatives of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and, together with Madame Binh, the representatives of the national liberation movement—do not feel, because they cannot feel, the improvement in international relations. Still less is this improvement felt by the families of the victims lying in blood and dirt in North and South Viet-Nam in the wake of the wanton ravages of bombing raids. In characterizing the situation by means of a literary quotation, I do not at all intend to mitigate the gravity of this tragedy which is

practically unprecedented in the history of South-East Asia. On the contrary, I should like to point out the historical depth of the tragedy.

36. In the middle of the last century, in the very, very dark years of Hungarian history—there were many such years back in the past and also recently—the author Imre Madách, who might be said to have been the offspring of both the Slovak and the Hungarian peoples, in his drama entitled "The Tragedy of Man" outlined the past and future of mankind, which he brought to the surface out of the severe sufferings of his private life. This dramatic series of world historical scenes describes, besides the paradise of the first human couple, Athens, Rome and many other things, as well as the construction of the pyramids in ancient Egypt, where a slave dies. In this scene someone tries to console the slave's wife for her loss, saying that it means just one suffering man less. Thereupon the wife replies in these words:

"A mere number to you, to me the whole world.

"Alas, beloved, who will love me now?"

With this literary quotation I have wished to bring here, into the hall of the United Nations General Assembly, those untold human sufferings which are virtually increasing in some parts of the globe in spite of the fact that we have very serious reasons to talk of improvement in international relations.

37. The general improvement of the international situation does not yet make itself felt in the Viet-Nam question, although the Viet-Nameese side has sketched, with the largest possible measure of political realism, the outlines of an end to the war, a suitable international agreement, and the future of both North and South Viet-Nam. No one can doubt that this is the way of the future. There is no other way. It was a miscalculation in 1964 to devise the Tonkin Bay incident. It was a miscalculation in 1965 to start bombing North Viet-Nam. It was the proper thing in December 1965 to suspend the bombing attacks. It was a miscalculation again to resume bombing in 1966. It was a miscalculation to dispatch a United States armed force of more than 700,000 men to Viet-Nam. It was a miscalculation, while reducing the numerical strength of military personnel, to step up the attacks of mechanized warfare. Eventually there will be practically no one in the whole world who will know what business the United States of America has at all to be in Viet-Nam. One has an impression that even those who send American boys to Viet-Nam do not know that either.

38. In Viet-Nam it is thus impossible to perceive that the international situation is improving. Time, however, is on the side of those who want the effects of the prevailing conditions of international life to be felt also in the Viet-Nameese question.

39. The Hungarian people and their Government support those constructive proposals, which give a sketch of a new, peaceful future of the Far East as a whole, and which have been set forth by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet-Nam, together with the libera-

tion movement. We can be sure that these proposals provide the realistic core of a solution to the problems. They have been drawn up by men who live there among the people and who do not seek to let the people suffer from the war and its consequences as long as possible, but who want the people to enjoy the blessings of peace as soon as possible. The main requirement raised in those proposals is in fact the removal of a single man with a small group. What the sons of the American nation are dying for in Viet-Nam is actually the monomania of a single man, Thieu.

40. The improvement of international relations is imperceptible not only in Viet-Nam, but in the Middle East as well. It is difficult to convince the peoples of the Arab countries that international relations are improving. For five years now those peoples have been waiting for something to be done on the strength of the resolution adopted by the United Nations Security Council in November 1967, resolution 242 (1967). Some interested Powers argue that there is an essential difference between the English and French texts of that resolution. This difference really exists, but it is not this that enhances the world-wide historical importance of the problem but rather the need to secure the conditions of peaceful coexistence of the peoples of the Middle East.

41. The Government of Israel would make a real contribution to the continued improvement of the international situation if it could take into consideration two facts: one of them concerns the historic aspects of the issue; the other bears a relation to international law.

42. After the end of the Second World War the progressive forces of the world—here in the United Nations also—came out in favour of the restoration to their homeland of the dispersed people of Israel because they hoped to do something good for the future of the peoples. In the years of the preparatory and initial stages of the Second World War, fascism, anti-Semitism, racial hatred, the German *Übermensch* notion, and *Ausradierung* (the radical extermination of the Jewish people) became, as it were, the most sternly dominant factors in Europe. Never in the history of mankind have people been killed in such a concentrated manner, in such large numbers and in relatively so short a time as during the era of fascism in Europe. The Soviet Union—which many charge with anti-Semitism today—was the decisive factor that made it possible to crush the Fascist Powers, which had sought the complete destruction of Jewry. Had it not been for the Soviet Union, it would not have been possible to defeat Hitlerite Germany.

43. This year the Soviet Union celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of its existence. This is one of the most significant anniversaries in modern history. We are glad that this event occurs at a time when the biggest Power of the other hemisphere has joined in working out the conditions of peaceful coexistence between the two thermonuclear Powers.

44. I have digressed from the Middle East question, but only apparently. It is not without reason that many see precisely in the problems of the Middle East region the danger of a new world war, a thermonuclear war. The

further trend of the situation in the Middle East will largely depend on relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

45. The Government of Israel would therefore do a great service to the favourable development of international life if it could take into account the fact that progressive mankind brought into existence or restored the State of Israel in the hope that a progressive, peaceful and happy enclave of humanity would emerge in the restored homeland of the persecuted Jews. Instead of this, a policy of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racial hatred manifests itself in all that Israeli Governments have done since the establishment of the State of Israel. We, the Hungarian Government, are very much interested in the fate of Israel. Many Hungarian Jewish families, persecuted at the time, have since sought new homes in the "Promised Land". They have a large number of relatives living in Hungary today. These people are also adversely affected by the pursuit by the ruling quarters of Israel of their anti-Arab policy of aggression.

46. In the light of these historic facts, the Israeli Government could do much to promote the favourable development of international relations if it took seriously into consideration Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations Charter is the principal source of international law today. In pursuance of Article 51 of the Charter, if a Member State victim of armed attack does not receive sufficient effective assistance from the United Nations Security Council, that State has an unrestricted right to resort to any means, including the use of armed force, to repulse the aggression. Since Israel is unwilling to comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the Arab countries victims of aggression have full authority under international law to reoccupy by armed force the territories occupied by the aggressor.

47. These two factors—the historical one and the one based on international law—can for a short time be ignored by the Government of Israel, which feigns to be deaf and blind to them, but by so doing it undermines the very existence of the State of Israel.

48. With profound responsibility towards the future of the people of Israel one can state the following. The Government of Israel has before it proposals from Arab countries that can place the national security of Israel beyond question; if, however, the Government of Israel cannot take these proposals in all seriousness—proposals which are founded on the Security Council resolution—then it will dig the grave of Israel. At home in Hungary we often speak about the role of short-sighted men in politics. With regard to Israel it can be said that in the short-term time might favour the Israeli leaders stricken with short-sightedness, but in the historical perspective those persons will bury the country of Israel for good. The hard facts of history provide examples of how some nations disappeared from the historical scene in consequence of vicious acts by irresponsible leaders. If Israel's leaders of today imagine that, owing to their specific geographical position, the international influence of Zionism that is spread all over the world can make their present attitude realistic, they are tragically mistaken.

49. I apologize for having dwelled so long upon this matter, but the question is one of the most instructive issues not only for the present generation but also, I might say, for the history of all mankind. If the Government of Israel does not draw a lesson from the historic and legal factors, it will inevitably dig the grave of its own country and people. Over the short-term some representatives of the Israeli Government might feel that time is on their side, but they ought to know that the future of Israel hinges on whether or not it will be able to settle the problem of its relations with surrounding Arab countries. It would be an illusion for the Government of Israel to seek to build the future of its country upon international zionism. There is only one solid and sure foundation on which to build the future of Israel: friendship with the neighbouring countries, together with recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people.

50. I hope members will not mind my long discussion about the problems of the Middle East, but there is a very serious reason for it. Many people are convinced that the potential source of a new world war is to be found not in Viet-Nam but in the Middle East. A few European Governments, for example, the Government of Austria, back the proposal that the problems of the Middle East and the Mediterranean area should also be placed on the agenda of the prospective European conference on security and co-operation. In addition to all this, in dealing so thoroughly with the Middle East questions, I am prompted also by the fact the the effect of the general improvement of the international situation can be perceived least of all in that region. It is a common international duty of all States Members of the United Nations, an obligation under the Charter, to work out a concrete plan for the peaceful settlement of relations in the Middle East. The Hungarian Government views the efforts of Ambassador Jarring with deep respect and tries not only with good wishes but also with concrete steps to help him to fulfil his historic mission.

51. The large majority of the States Members of the United Nations are countries of what is called the third world. In Georgetown earlier this year their representatives addressed a strong appeal to other countries of the world, asking for their assistance in solving the economic problems of the developing nations.<sup>3</sup> While we talk here—and with good reason—about improvement in international relations, poverty is increasing in large parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The peoples of the world have to take concerted action to eliminate the last vestiges of colonialism, to liberate the peoples still living under colonial oppression and, at the same time, to help the countries liberated from colonial domination to overcome their economic difficulties.

52. An important event in the history of the United Nations was the settlement of the question of Chinese representation. The Government of Hungary was pleased to receive the news of events which indicated the lessening of

the international isolation of the People's Republic of China and its active participation in world affairs. The settlement of relations between Japan and China is also an event of great importance in international life. It is worth quoting the poem which the Japanese Prime Minister wrote on the historic occasion when, as representative of the Japan of modern history, he was recently on an official visit in the China of the world socialist system. That poem reads as follows:

“Japan and China broke their relations  
many years ago,  
“But now the time has come  
to resume these links.  
“Autumn is approaching.  
“Our neighbours welcome us with warmth  
in their eyes.  
“The Peking sky is clear, and  
the autumn air is deep.”

That verse is certainly more graceful in Japanese and Chinese than in English or Hungarian. But that is not the point. What is important is that representatives of two great nations have met. Of course it is clear to me that China's rejoining international life could have taken place under more auspicious circumstances. The main reason for the present less auspicious circumstances is that during 22 years the prevalent tendency in this Organization was to boycott the People's Republic of China. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is glad that this issue facing the United Nations has now been solved.

53. Besides the solution of this issue, much more visible signs of the improvement of the international situation can be discerned in Europe. I know that the name of Europe does not have a pleasant ring to the vast majority of Member States. That name is linked with the barbarous centuries of colonialism and the tragedies of two world wars. But now, at the dawn of a new epoch for mankind, when today's generation is preparing to live in the thermonuclear age, Europe is trying to enforce the policy of peaceful coexistence instead of the alternative of the dreadful cataclysm of thermonuclear war.

54. It is a good thing that at precisely this time both the President of the General Assembly and our Secretary-General are representatives of European countries. I wish to offer both of them my congratulations in this context. The Foreign Minister of Poland, in his statement here in the general debate [2042nd meeting], referred to the tragic past of his country, to the centuries during which Poland had been practically non-existent in terms of international law. Today the Polish people live in the finest period of their history and, thanks to their considerable achievements, have become one of the most active factors of European peace and security and of international co-operation.

55. A very lovely manifestation of the hopes entertained in Europe with regard to the Polish people is a nursery rhyme which two great promoters of the interdependence of the peoples of Central Europe, the two Hungarian composers Zoltán Kodály and Béla Bartók, discovered at a time, in the early years of the century, when from the legal

<sup>3</sup> See Declaration adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries at Georgetown, Guyana, on 12 August 1972.

point of view Poland did not even exist in reality. This nursery rhyme can be rendered into English as follows:

“Little duckling bathing in the big black pond  
“Is about to visit mother in Poland.”

Today not only Poland but the other European countries along with it can live in peace and security.

56. It is this peace and security that we wish to place on more solid foundations than heretofore. That is why we wish to convene a conference on European security and co-operation. This is not merely an affair of Europe. If we put it through properly, it will benefit also other peoples of the world, since the immeasurable resources to be released by the termination of the arms race can then be used to solve fundamental problems concerning the life of mankind.

57. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic looks to the future with good hope. We think the United Nations has been and will be an expedient engineer of this future. I compliment our new Secretary-General in expressing that belief. Recently the mayors of the European capitals held a meeting in Budapest. On that occasion the Burgomaster of Vienna presented the text of a joint statement. This is the mark of a new stage in the relations between Budapest and Vienna. Secretary-General Waldheim, both as former Ambassador of Austria and as a former Foreign Minister of his country, has had an important share in improving the relations between States in Central Europe. Also on behalf of the Hungarian people and Government we ask him to use the goodwill with which he has promoted friendship between our two peoples in order to contribute on a global scale to strengthening the mutual understanding and security of the peoples of the world.

58. When we think of the future of the United Nations, we cannot forget its past either. After the First World War the League of Nations came into being, but was dissolved amid the events following the outbreak of the Second World War. The United Nations was established after the end of the Second World War. Its founders drew a lesson from the experiences of the two World Wars. Nevertheless, this Organization has often found itself in a state of crisis during the past few years. Among the many factors that have saved the existence of this Organization there has been a special, personal factor: the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant. Not only this Organization but the whole of mankind have gone through extremely critical periods in the past years. The wisdom of our former Secretary-General, his responsiveness to human and social problems, his modesty and humility before the great facts of history revealed to us the impressive greatness of his calling in the world and helped many of us to discharge the accumulating tasks confronting the United Nations.

59. I express the wish that his sense of responsibility will prevail in this Organization.

60. Mr. WICKMAN (Sweden): Mr. President, geographically and historically, the relations between Poland and Sweden have been close throughout the centuries. I therefore take particular pleasure in conveying to you our

sincere congratulations upon your election to your high office.

61. Mr. Secretary-General, we have already had the opportunity to express our sincere felicitations to you during your recent visit to our country. Today I wish to state once again that you can rely upon the unfailing support of the Swedish Government in your devoted and tireless efforts in the cause of world peace.

62. “To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”—this very opening line of the Charter expresses our principal commitment as Members of the United Nations. To prevent, to restrain and to confine the use of military force remain the prime objectives of the United Nations.

63. War is unacceptable as a means of settling international disputes. This must apply also to the conflict in Viet-Nam. The United States has employed its immense economic and military resources to escalate the use of force to unprecedented levels. Immense sufferings are being inflicted upon the people of Viet-Nam. The physical environment of the country is being devastated. And this morning has brought a dramatic confirmation of the indiscriminate bombing of central Hanoi. The French diplomatic mission has been hit, and members of its staff have been killed or wounded.

64. This war must be brought to an end. A political solution of the Viet-Nam conflict must be found. The Viet-Nameese must at least be given the possibility to decide their own future without interference from outside. As for South Viet-Nam, a reasonable solution would seem to be the formation of a coalition government, coupled with the provision of guarantees against oppression of any party by another. All over the world people are impatiently expecting the parties to the current talks to agree on a peaceful solution.

65. The conflict in Viet-Nam is a drastic reminder of the human sufferings that are caused by war, particularly to civilians. Many of the international rules in this field date back to the Hague Conventions of 1907, which are now out of date in important respects. Modern science and technology have made available increasingly cruel weapons and means of warfare. We have now reached a state where technologically advanced Powers can from a safe distance wage large-scale war on man and his environment even without the use of nuclear weapons.

66. The United Nations and the International Committee of the Red Cross have during the last few years been engaged in supplementing existing rules against inhuman warfare by new ones covering modern weapons and means of warfare. My Government regards this work as vitally important.

67. In our opinion, the need for rules restricting air warfare is particularly pressing. The Second World War saw the introduction of the mass bombing of cities. Area bombing has been carried out during the war in Viet-Nam. These acts of war are legally questionable, of doubtful military value and have terrible effects on the civilian population.



68. All use of weapons and methods of warfare causing unnecessary suffering must be subjected to international prohibition. A beginning was made with the 1925 Geneva Protocol covering chemical and bacteriological warfare.<sup>4</sup> In 1969, the General Assembly affirmed the comprehensive nature of that Protocol [*resolution 2603 (XXIV)*]. Consequently, the Protocol also bans the use of tear gas and herbicides. We must urge unreserved respect for this prohibition by all States. We must go even further. Dumdum bullets were forbidden at the turn of the century because they caused unnecessary suffering. Now, by means of international conventions, we must impose a similar ban on a number of modern weapons which are particularly cruel. The report on napalm and other incendiary weapons,<sup>5</sup> soon to be presented to us by the Secretary-General, will no doubt provide us with a valuable basis for discussions on such a ban. Increased knowledge of the effects of modern weaponry should also serve to alert public opinion to the necessity of decisive international action in this field.

69. It is deplorable that the international community should today have to concern itself with modernizing the laws of war. We should all have preferred to concentrate on rules for the peaceful and harmonious coexistence of all peoples. Nevertheless, we must tackle the task of limiting, by way of mandatory and precise rules, the suffering and devastation brought about by war. World-wide popular support should be mobilized to that end.

70. Some of the problems I have mentioned fall within the purview of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. As for others, we shall have to consider further which bodies are the most appropriate to tackle them.

71. Under all circumstances, disarmament efforts within the framework of the United Nations must be continued energetically and must concentrate on particularly urgent issues, where it seems realistic to hope for results in the foreseeable future. A total ban on nuclear weapons tests—and such tests are still being carried out undiminished in number and in strength—appears to offer such hopes. The objections raised concerning the verification of underground nuclear testing are no longer valid.

72. It is a matter of concern that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*] has not yet attracted sufficient support. The readiness of the non-nuclear States to accede to the Treaty is, of course, related to the willingness of the nuclear Powers, for their part, to contribute to armaments control and disarmament. From this point of view the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms is a step in the right direction, although this is not disarmament in the real sense of the word. We must now hope for further binding agreements in the disarmament field between the super-Powers.

<sup>4</sup> Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925.

<sup>5</sup> See *Napalm and Other Incendiary Weapons and All Aspects of their Possible Use* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.I.3).

73. However, all nuclear Powers must take an active part in future disarmament efforts. An opportunity for such participation would be offered by a world disarmament conference. Such a conference, in which all States should participate, could also give new impetus to continued efforts in the sphere of disarmament in general.

74. Last year's decision on China's representation in the United Nations [*resolution 2758 (XXVI)*] was an important step towards that universality which should be the goal of our Organization. The question of the representation of divided States presents us with specific problems which are not necessarily identical from case to case. Where reunification seems remote, the participation of such States in the work of the United Nations becomes particularly essential. The process of détente in Europe gives rise to hopes that the two German States will soon be able to join the United Nations. Both can make valuable contributions to our work.

75. The question of Korea's representation can be seen in a similar light. Korea has been a special concern of the United Nations ever since the early days of the world Organization. Divergent views on responsibility for the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 should no longer prevent us from considering dispassionately the Korean problem and the role that the United Nations can and should play in this matter. We welcome the efforts of the North and South Korean Governments to improve neighbourly relations. The international community has every reason to follow closely the development of relations between the two Korean States. If those two States were more widely recognized by other States this would probably contribute to détente and peace in that part of the world.

76. In the Middle East, pressure from the international community is essential if peace and détente are to be achieved. The fact that a cease-fire has, by and large, been effective for more than two years is of course gratifying. This circumstance must not, however, become a reason for our relaxing our efforts to reach a solution based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The Swedish Government reiterates its support for the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in their endeavours to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

77. The détente in Europe was greeted with great satisfaction by many speakers here last year. In this year's general debate we are able to register further progress in this respect. Strong forces are at work for a normalization of relations between the European States. But it is not enough to normalize and stabilize the situation. Determined efforts are needed to achieve a fruitful exchange and co-operation among all States in Europe. It is our hope that a conference on security and co-operation in Europe will contribute significantly to this development.

78. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is our common guideline in the efforts to secure, in the words of the Declaration, "the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world" [*resolution 217 (III)*]. For centuries the struggle for human rights has played a particularly important role in Europe. This struggle has known both victories and defeats, and such rights have rarely been

extended to peoples in other continents living under the supremacy of European Powers.

79. The struggle for human rights in Europe has registered serious set-backs in recent years. This applies in particular to developments in Greece and Czechoslovakia. In spite of repeated assurances, the Greek Government has failed to embark upon the road back to democracy. In Czechoslovakia the proponents of the ideas of 1968 have been subjected to increased pressure.

80. The difficulties involved in finding methods to safeguard respect for human rights are well known. The Swedish Government welcomes the fact that since 1970 the United Nations Commission on Human Rights has been authorized to receive and analyse individual complaints regarding violations of human rights. In this way a possibility has been created within the United Nations to focus attention on consistent patterns of gross and reliably attested violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms. We consider that the results of these studies should also be made public. Within international organizations we will continue to press for more effective measures to safeguard human rights, regardless of national frontiers. A vigilant international public opinion is an important contribution to the protection of those rights.

81. Where there is suppression of human rights, there is usually also a tendency to resort to violence in internal conflicts. To condone violence in such conflicts could undermine the inhibitions against the use of force also in relations between States. There may be cases where the inclination of a régime to suppress by violent means every form of opposition sparks desperate acts of violence from those oppressed. In order to find long-term solutions to these problems we have to identify and eliminate the underlying causes of violence. In many cases these causes may be intolerable injustices.

82. The urgency of solving these long-range problems does not absolve us from the responsibility of tackling the acute problems, which certain forms of international terrorism confront us with. Whatever the motive, the international community cannot possibly tolerate such actions as the hijacking of aircraft, the taking of hostages, or the murder of persons engaged in peaceful activities outside their own countries. My Government welcomed the Secretary-General's proposal for the inclusion of such problems on our agenda [*A/8791 and Add.1*], and the Swedish delegation will co-operate in efforts to take efficient international measures against these forms of violence. This does not, however, absolve individual Member States from taking adequate measures to the same end.

83. While tackling the problem of how to fight international terrorism, we must not fail to react when individual Governments gravely encroach upon the rights of human beings on account of their ethnic origin. When whole communities in a country are subjected to violence on such grounds, public opinion in other countries naturally reacts with particular vigour. When a Government forces an ethnic minority into exile, it not only commits an offence against basic principles of human coexistence but also adds further to the world's increasingly difficult and tragic refugee problems. To observe silence in the face of such events

would compromise the credibility of the struggle against racial oppression—one of the major commitments of the United Nations.

84. The systematic oppression which has been instituted and consolidated in southern Africa occupies a position of its own in the history of conflicts between races and peoples. There must be no weakening of international pressure against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa and its allies. *Apartheid* differs from other forms of oppression in that the system rests on an ideological basis of naked contempt for races other than the white. It consolidates an order where the prosperity of the white minority is derived from the poverty of the non-white majority. The policy of *apartheid* is far more deliberate, systematic and consistent than the manifestations of racial discrimination found in other parts of the world. By its very essence *apartheid* constitutes a challenge to the international community.

85. It cannot be accepted that *apartheid* should prevail also in Namibia. The Swedish Government welcomes the Secretary-General's recent actions with regard to this problem. We support all efforts to further real self-determination and independence for Namibia.

86. With deep concern we see the ideas of *apartheid* gaining ground among the white minority in Rhodesia. This minority openly defies the repeated decisions of the Security Council and aims at wearing down world resistance to its illegal régime. Effective sanctions against the Smith régime are still imperative. Every evasion of the sanctions must be condemned.

87. Portugal bears a special responsibility in this context, as it obviously allows its colonies to serve as a channel for illegal trade with Rhodesia. At the same time the Portuguese Government persists in its colonial policies, which have repeatedly been condemned by an overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations. These policies are in open conflict with fundamental principles of the United Nations. Humanitarian assistance to the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) in accordance with United Nations resolutions can be taken as a manifestation of the donor countries' opposition to the policy of oppression.

88. The United Nations has so far been unable to eliminate racial oppression in southern Africa. All the same, we must not underestimate the importance of the fact that through the United Nations world attention has been focused on this tragic problem.

89. Today the United Nations plays an important role in international development co-operation. My Government wishes to see this role increase in importance, because in the United Nations more than anywhere else this co-operation is based on respect for the right of all States to form their own destinies.

90. The normative function of the United Nations, which is central to its work, is manifested in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*]. One of the basic objectives of the Strategy is to ensure that progress in a developing country works to the benefit of all its citizens.

This objective has important implications for the policies of both poor and rich countries. It calls for far-reaching reforms of the social structure in many developing countries, as well as for greater economic independence. Demands for changes in the economic relations between rich and poor countries are an expression of this struggle for independence. The rich countries must respond in a positive manner to these demands. The primary and immediate responsibility of all developed countries is to fulfil their commitments concerning development assistance made in the Strategy for the Second Development Decade. The Swedish Government remains committed to the pledges made when the International Development Strategy was adopted. We note with regret that a number of industrialized countries are tending to cut back on their total development assistance.

91. The increasingly important role of development co-operation in the work of the United Nations is a reflection of the great changes which have taken place in the world since our Organization came into being. To a far greater extent than anyone could foresee when the Organization was created, the United Nations has become an indispensable instrument for overcoming those tensions inside and between nations which might be provoked by technological progress and industrial development.

92. The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm in June, focused our attention on problems which are of vital concern for both rich and poor nations. As the host country for the Conference, we noted with satisfaction the wide participation of States Members of the United Nations in the Conference, but regret that political disagreement prevented a truly universal representation. It is our hope that the Assembly as a whole will endorse the results of the Stockholm Conference, which can be considered as the first important step towards continuous and permanent co-operation within the whole United Nations family on problems of the human environment. My Government pledges its support for the establishment of a Governing Council for Environmental Programmes, for an environment secretariat and for an environment fund. We in the rich countries who contribute so much to pollution have a special responsibility to pursue the work that has just started. However, more and more Governments in developing countries are anxious to integrate active environment policies into their programmes for economic and social development. We are convinced that a general positive attitude will manifest itself as this Assembly now takes the next step towards an international environment policy. Our collective will to contribute to a better environment is a prerequisite for our being able to hand over to coming generations a world where life is possible and where life is worth living.

93. The deterioration of the human environment inevitably raises questions concerning the amount of available resources on our earth and of their distribution. These questions have a vital influence on international relations. They can find a just solution only through co-operation between States on an equal footing. This applies, for example, to the problems how the resources of the oceans and the sea-bed—recognized by the United Nations as the common heritage of mankind—should be exploited for the benefit of all peoples, and how the results of the “green

revolution” can best be utilized to serve the masses of people in the developing countries.

94. In view of the immense problems confronting mankind it is natural to attach increasing importance to the United Nations. This is true not least for the problem of how the world's population growth can be regulated. A penetrating analysis of the population problems can be expected at the forthcoming United Nations World Population Conference. It is to be hoped that all Member States will make constructive contributions to that conference.

95. I have stated the views of my Government on some specific—but often interrelated—questions which are of special relevance for the international community at this time. Organized international co-operation for the maintenance of peace, of which the United Nations is the supreme manifestation, has aimed primarily at preventing changes of existing frontiers and treaty obligations by violent means. As a result, the preservation of *status quo* has often been regarded as the cardinal task of a policy for peace. But that cannot be the ultimate goal. The *status quo* alone cannot constitute the basis for a lasting peace. We must recognize at an early stage those tensions which necessitate change. We must continue to work for peaceful change in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. That is the only way in which we can proceed towards a world of greater equality and stability.

96. We all have a responsibility for the future of mankind. Our national and regional problems cannot be isolated from our common and global problems. The search for solutions must be a joint effort of all the peoples of the world. The hopes of mankind for a brighter future remain centered on the United Nations. The United Nations must not betray these hopes.

97. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues—the 115 of them who have spoken so far—in congratulating you on your election to the presidency. Under your guidance the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly has been carrying out its work—and will, I am sure, continue to carry it out—with seriousness and the utmost efficiency. Allow me also from this rostrum to convey our warmest greetings to your predecessor, Mr. Adam Malik, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, and once again to welcome our Secretary-General. It is less than a year since the then Ambassador Kurt Waldheim in this very hall took the solemn oath pledging loyalty to the Charter of the United Nations [2031st meeting]. I again wish him success. We again pledge to co-operate with him whole-heartedly, as we did with his well-remembered and respected predecessor, U Thant.

98. This annual general debate in our Assembly is, or should be, a time for a serious survey of the international actions of all Member States during the preceding year. As sovereign States, we have committed ourselves to the United Nations Charter and in doing so have willingly agreed to yield a portion of our sovereignty in order to set up this community of nations. We believe that, while each one of the Foreign Ministers is responsible before the proper organs of his country for the conduct of its foreign policy, he is also answerable to this Organization. This annual general debate should show that all Member

countries have seriously tried to live by the Charter and have not violated its principles and purposes.

99. The primary purpose of the United Nations, to use the Charter's words, is:

“To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.”

The Charter, furthermore, stipulates that Member States should unite their efforts in order to fulfil that primary purpose. Collective action, according to the Charter, is the main guarantee of international justice and peace. Super-Powers may not need such protection. The rest of us do. Some States have found themselves in need of it in the past; some have cause to seek it now; others may well need it in the future. To block this collective action and to flout the authority of the Organization is to direct a most serious blow against all of us. Do we have to be reminded of this basic and obvious principle?

100. The facts show, however, that our collective search for justice and peace is often sabotaged and frustrated. Important resolutions in this Assembly and other United Nations bodies are ignored. The effectiveness of the Organization itself is scoffed at and doubted. Our Organization seems at certain times to be surrendering to the rule of force in relations between nations. Indeed the principles and purposes of the Charter, the *raison d'être* of our Organization, unfortunately now need to be reasserted. The Organization must seriously and urgently consider how to regain its authority and its effectiveness.

101. Attempts to depoliticize the United Nations have been detected for some time, especially since the ranks of the third-world countries have been further strengthened by the emancipation of our sister African and Asian States and their admission to the Organization as full Members. Some of the more powerful States have shown their impatience and displeasure with certain of the political decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations. The view has been expressed that the United Nations should deal only with less ambitious matters. The Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries, meeting in Georgetown in August of this year, recognized that “an impediment in the way of the effectiveness of the United Nations is great power tendency to . . . bypass the United Nations in dealing with problems of vital importance” and declared that “this tendency must be resisted”.<sup>6</sup>

102. Referring to the seating last year of the lawful representatives of the great Republic of China, Mr. Waldheim, the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his report to the Assembly observed:

“Indeed, it is strange that, at a time when the United Nations and its main executive organ for international

peace and security—the Security Council—are becoming more representative of the power realities in the world, there is, apparently, a certain unwillingness to involve the United Nations in the reconciliation of some conflicts. . . . But when long-standing conflicts create vast humanitarian problems and may affect the peace and security of all mankind, the United Nations should surely be involved in the attempt to settle them.” [A/8701/Add.1, p. 4.]

103. The tendency by certain States to ignore the United Nations is clear. For us, to disregard such a tendency is to condone it and to endanger further the useful existence of our Organization. All countries which wish to set their policies inside the shelter of the law of nations, our Charter, should pause and give this most serious problem the most careful consideration it commands.

104. To begin with, we must admit that our Organization itself has failed at times to assert its political authority. It is a fact, for example, that the Assembly has been reluctant to consider Article 6 of the Charter, dealing with the expulsion of a Member; it is a fact that the sanctions provided for in the Charter have seldom been imposed; it is a fact that certain permanent members of the Security Council have used or misused their veto power to block just and important resolutions and have thus frustrated the work of the Council; it is a fact that the United Nations had not yet overcome the serious difficulties that have prevented the creation of the enforcement machinery envisaged in Chapter VII of our Charter. The five permanent members of the Security Council, which, under the Articles of the Charter, have been given certain responsibilities for maintaining international peace and security, have not so far been able to agree on the creation of this machinery.

105. Over the last 12 months, since we last met here, the world has witnessed changes on the international scene. The summit meetings involving the three most powerful nations have commanded the attention, and perhaps raised the hopes, of all the countries of the world. Almost all the speakers at this twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly have alluded to a new atmosphere of international détente. It is obvious that the obstacles that have blocked the effectiveness of the United Nations—for example, with regard to implementing Chapter VII and giving the Organization the necessary machinery to do so—have been caused by the tensions among the big Powers, the permanent members of the Security Council. Now that major practical steps have been taken that should lead towards an atmosphere of tolerance and understanding, should we in this Assembly not seize this opportunity seriously and honestly examine the situation of our Organization? Should we not endeavour to find suitable and agreed upon remedies for its very serious ailments? This study would focus on means to make the United Nations stronger, strong enough to protect us all. It is time to do so. It is time that we, collectively, exert all our efforts to stop the deterioration and possible collapse of our world order and of this great structure for peace. Our silence and inaction are an encouragement to the dangerous tendencies to resort to the policy of violence, the policy that “twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind”. It is a crime by omission. The restoration to this Organization of its political effectiveness and its role in preserving world

<sup>6</sup> See Declaration adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown, Guyana, on 12 August 1972, para. 37.

peace obviously needs the full co-operation of the big Powers. Those Powers, however, shall not be indifferent to the will of the world as only we can manifest it.

106. Our Charter may be humanly imperfect, yet it does not need basic revisions in order to achieve this purpose. It is we, the Members of the Organization, who need to live up to its objectives. Should we fail to do so, we may be witnessing the beginning of the end, the horrible, tragic crumbling of this Organization.

107. In his speech before this Assembly in this general debate the Foreign Minister of Israel criticized the techniques, procedures and atmosphere of this Organization as having "clearly not been congenial to the craftsmanship of peace" [2045th meeting, para. 68]. The Assembly was told that all the "successes of diplomacy in the past year . . . had to take place outside the United Nations framework." [Ibid., para. 67].

108. What are these "real limits" that the Foreign Minister of Israel wishes to place on the capacity and strength of the United Nations, mankind's highest achievement? They are a bold attempt to strip this Organization of its most fundamental mandate, of its role in safeguarding peace and security and of its duty to bring them into being "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law", as the Charter says. According to his thesis the United Nations, set up to ensure that war and injustice would be no more, does not have it in its capacity to deal with such issues. In his concluding paragraph the Israeli Minister suggested that were the United Nations to temper ambition with restraint it might perhaps be able to play an enlarged humanitarian role. I remember our colleague Ambassador Castro, saying that we would then be a branch of the Red Cross.

109. The simple, regrettable fact is that political zionism, having used this Organization to realize its ambition of partitioning Palestine, cannot now suffer the nations of the world looking over its shoulder and trying to arrest its preconceived and preplanned expansionism.

110. Instead of charting a mere humanitarian role for the United Nations, the Foreign Minister of Israel was certainly expected to tell this Assembly, to which he is answerable, what his country has or has not done with regard to resolutions of the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly especially with regard to Assembly resolution 2799 (XXVI), which clearly called on his Government to respond favourably to the principles of peace advanced in February 1971 by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring.

111. That, as we all recall, was done in conformity with the mandate unanimously given to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General by the Security Council in its resolution 242 (1967) and later supported by this Assembly [resolution 2628 (XXV)].

112. But not once did the Foreign Minister of Israel mention those resolutions. Not once did he mention any resolution adopted by the General Assembly or the Security Council concerning the Middle East—not on the question of the Palestinians; not on Jerusalem; not on the

occupied lands of Egypt, Syria and Jordan; not on the barbaric attacks against Syria and Lebanon; not on the mistreatment of the population under the military rule of his Government—not once. He has, however, obliquely warned us in Egypt, in the Arab world and in the United Nations not to entertain any hope that Israel will ever be subjected to any adjudication or coercion by the United Nations or anyone else.

113. Israel instead invites the conquered countries to meet their conqueror and to discuss the size of the fruits of conquest. Israel warns that any talk about any United Nations resolutions, about any African initiative, about any possible European initiative or about any other initiative will only be met with its displeasure. Today Israel is obviously confident of the military support of the United States of America, due to which it can sustain its occupation of our lands, and confident of the political support of the United States, which would protect it against any United Nations action. The question Tel Aviv asks is, Who is going to get us to do this or get us to do that? The pertinent question it does not ask and which no power-drunk people has ever asked is, Where are the conquerors of yesteryear? Where are the phantoms of the past? Any suggestion other than to accept Israeli demands is and, we are told, always will be, rejected with disdain.

114. What is it that the Israelis so disdainfully reject? It is not a secret that they reject the resolutions of the General Assembly. It is not a secret that they reject Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971. It is not a secret that Israel demands that the aide-mémoire be dropped and forgotten completely.

115. If Ambassador Jarring were ever to withdraw his aide-mémoire—although that would mean that the Assembly would also have to withdraw its resolution 2799 (XXVI) of last year—then, of course, our reply accepting the suggestions contained in that aide-mémoire would not exist. That is why I feel I am bound, as a responsible person not only before this Assembly but also before history, to bring to the attention of this Assembly what it was that Egypt agreed to, and up to this very minute still agrees to, in its search for an honourable peace, in its battle to win peace. Please excuse my taking a few minutes to do so. We here keep referring to documents by numbers and by dates, and in the end we do not really know what those documents contain. On 8 February 1971 Ambassador Jarring handed his aide-mémoire to me, and he presented it to Israel on the same day. He stated the following in that aide-mémoire:

"... I wish to request the Governments of Israel and the United Arab Republic to make to me at this stage the following prior commitments simultaneously and on condition that the other party makes its commitment and subject to the eventual satisfactory determination of all other aspects of a peace settlement, including in particular a just settlement of the [Palestinian] refugee problem.

"...

"Israel would give a commitment to withdraw its forces from occupied United Arab Republic territory to the

former international boundary between Egypt and the British Mandate of Palestine on the understanding that satisfactory arrangements are made for:

“(a) Establishing demilitarized zones;

“(b) Practical security arrangements in the Sharm el Sheikh area for guaranteeing freedom of navigation through the Straits of Tiran;

“(c) Freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal.

“... ”

“The United Arab Republic would give a commitment to enter into a peace agreement with Israel and to make explicitly therein to Israel, on a reciprocal basis, undertakings and acknowledgements covering the following subjects:

“(a) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency;

“(b) Respect for and acknowledgement of each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence;

“(c) Respect for and acknowledgement of each other's right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries;

“(d) Responsibility to do all in their power to ensure that acts of belligerency or hostility do not originate from or are not committed from within their respective territories against the population, citizens or property of the other party;

“(e) Non-interference in each other's domestic affairs.”

Ambassador Jarring added:

“In making the above-mentioned suggestion I am conscious that I am requesting both sides to make serious commitments but I am convinced that the present situation requires me to take this step.”<sup>7</sup>

He also said that by “security measures in Sharm el Sheikh” he meant the presence of United Nations forces in the area.

116. Egypt's answer was “yes”. What was Israel's answer? All those who are of my age know that for 25 years every Zionist leader, every partisan and defender of Israel, has repeatedly said that this is exactly what Israel is thirsty for, that this is why it is fighting and struggling, that this is why it is collecting all the money it can from everywhere and everyone, and that this is why it is exacting taxes from every Jew in the world. And that was given by our answer of “yes”. However, Israel's answer—regardless of how obliquely it was given—was “no”.

117. How can the international community stand idly by when faced with Israel's defiance? “No” was the answer to

the General Assembly resolutions. “No” was the answer to the Secretary-General. The Special Representative Ambassador Jarring, got the same answer: “No”. “No” was the reaction to the effort of the four permanent members of the Security Council to draw up guidelines for Ambassador Jarring. “No” was the answer even to the continuation of these consultations. “No” was the answer to the attempts of the 10 distinguished leaders of Africa last year. “No” was the response to the considered views of the non-aligned countries. Western European views are similarly confronted by this ominous “No”. In short, Israel says “No” to everyone and everything that will not bring about submission to its will. This is a cold, calculated policy seeking to assert that in the Middle East Israel's word as the dominating power will henceforth be the law.

118. As has been repeatedly stated in previous years, the history of Palestine in the past half century reveals that political zionism is bent on expansion in an endeavour to dominate as much of the Middle East as it possibly can. It never lacked pretexts for expansion. It does not lack them now. It will not lack them in future. Following the Second World War, humanitarian considerations were used to plead for the partition of Palestine. At that time Israel's leaders did not preach the irrelevance of the United Nations. They considered the United Nations General Assembly the most suitable and legal vehicle they could use to achieve their objectives. Talk about the necessity for direct negotiations between the parties and the inadmissibility of adjudication and coercion was not yet fashionable in those days. Considering the United Nations General Assembly as the vehicle which would give them partition, the Zionists fought for partition and declared themselves content with the resolution they got on 29 November 1947, 181 (II).

119. Political zionism was not really satisfied with the boundaries allotted to the Jewish State in that resolution. Further expansion to usurp other parts was needed to satisfy the Zionist dream of dominating the totality of Palestine. This was brought about by terrorizing the Palestinians. Women and children were massacred, houses dynamited, villages razed. These actions were perpetrated by specially organized terror groups directed by some of the better-known Israeli leaders of today.

120. Terror and violence—organized and premeditated—were thus introduced by the Zionists into peaceful Palestine. On 8 February this year—exactly one year after Israel was offered peace and refused to commit itself to it—at an open meeting in Tel Aviv under the sponsorship of one of Israel's former cabinet ministers, the two men who blew up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem in 1946, killing 95 residents, were publicly identified. They gave a press conference describing their action in detail. At that press conference, the two Israelis revealed how they had disguised themselves as Arabs, wearing Arab dress, in order to carry out this operation. Despite their open confession, the Israeli Government took no action against them and did not even criticize their public glorification. That was in February 1972.

121. There will always be a pretext for Zionist expansionism and the Israeli reluctance to face the possibilities of real peace. This year the pretext brought to this Assembly is terrorism—a terrifying word. But who is using it? Who is

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10403, annex 1.

complaining? Is it the State of Israel, a State of terrorists run by terrorists which is encouraged and protected in order to terrorize the nations around it lest they should ever decide to live for themselves, independent of colonial States. As time goes on, other pretexts are sure to be found as and when needed.

122. The Palestinian people, some two and a half million of the Middle East's most civilized and energetic people, are all now either living as third-rate subjects under Israeli domination or in sordid camps that can hardly protect them from the wrath of the Phantom jets in the hands of Israel, or else in a diaspora, promising themselves and their children never to forget or forgive, looking with bitterness and scepticism—and who can blame them?—at this world and at the United Nations, and at our resolutions adopted annually during the past quarter of a century.

123. Having occupied all of Palestine, the Israelis invaded the international borders of the neighbouring Arab States in June 1967. This time the pretext for the invasion and the following occupation was Israel's so-called security requirements. For Israel, security obviously means the perpetuation of a state of superiority in armaments that should ensure that the Arabs will never be able to regain anything that Israel may decide it needs or likes. With this superiority in armaments, and in pursuance of its expansionist designs, Israel has had an open-ended opportunity to effect all the changes it wishes to bring about in the occupied territories.

124. The increasingly deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian territory of Gaza is evidence of this Israeli policy. Gaza has been subjected to a premeditated policy of depopulation and change of demographic structure and geographic composition in a manner fitting Israeli expansionist plans, but certainly contravening the 1949 Geneva Convention, which strictly prohibits the establishment of settlements in occupied territories, the forcible deportation of the civilian population, the destruction of houses and villages and changes in the geographic structure and demographic composition of the occupied territories.<sup>8</sup>

125. Similar acts have been and are now being committed by Israel in Egyptian Sinai, in the Syrian Golan heights, Jerusalem and on the west bank. The reports of the Red Cross, the United Nations committees of investigation, the various articles published in the world press and the statements issued by many international humanitarian organizations—all attest that the situation in those territories is intolerable. Consequently, the measures undertaken by Israel in the occupied territories have been considered war crimes and an affront to humanity by the Commission on Human Rights. The Foreign Minister of Israel calmly tells us, however, in his speech in this debate, that Israel applies humanitarian principles. Israel has, according to him, increased the number of television sets in the hands of the people under its occupation.

126. Yet we in Egypt are for peace. We are for the full implementation of all United Nations resolutions on the

Middle East. To achieve this objective and in pursuance of our determination to support the United Nations efforts, we have co-operated with the United Nations and its Secretary-General; we have extended unreserved co-operation to his Special Representative.

127. In order further to facilitate the realization of a just peace, the President of Egypt proposed on 4 February 1971 an initiative providing for the evacuation of Israeli occupation forces in two stages. The President declared that, upon Israel's withdrawal to the lines of the first stage, Egypt would be willing to accept a cease-fire for a specific period, during which the Secretary-General's Special Representative would prepare a time-table for the implementation of all the provisions of the Security Council resolution. During that stage Egypt would start clearing the Suez Canal with a view to opening it to international navigation. Egyptian forces would cross the Canal to assume their national responsibilities on the eastern bank and protect the Canal and the Egyptian cities along its side. The second stage would then follow. The Israeli occupation forces would evacuate the territories they occupied after 5 June 1967, and all the other provisions of the Security Council resolution would be fully carried out in conformity with the aforementioned time-table. The evacuation of Egyptian territory can only mean the withdrawal of Israeli forces of occupation to the Egyptian, internationally recognized, borders with Palestine under the British Mandate.

128. United States Secretary of State Rogers once alluded to these international borders as being "some 50 years old"—that is twice the life of the Israeli presence in the area. This may be its age according to modern history, but anyone who has learned his history from a French or an Arabic book—I do not know about English books—knows that these boundaries are exactly 4,250 years old, these internationally recognized borders between Egypt and Palestine, all of Palestine, which was partitioned in 1947.

129. It is relevant to recall here what two Presidents, the President of the last session of the Assembly and you yourself, Sir, said at the opening of this session. Mr. Adam Malik said:

"I remain steadfast in my belief, however, that the only road to a peaceful settlement will have to go by way of strict compliance, by all concerned, with all Security Council and General Assembly resolutions adopted with regard to this problem." [2032nd meeting, para. 13.]

As for you, Sir, you said:

"In the Middle East region, too, there are still no signs of a lasting peace. The United Nations has committed its authority to help settle this long-standing dispute. We have a right to demand that the will and the decisions of our Organization be respected, decisions which, if fully complied with, should bring about the solution so earnestly desired, most of all by the population of that region." [Ibid., para. 35.]

130. Israel's utter disregard for the United Nations and its resolutions has already been exposed by many speakers. For example, this morning the Hungarian Foreign Minister,

<sup>8</sup> See Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949. United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

Mr. János Péter, has given us a short, precise exposé on the question. Most of the speakers have gained our gratitude for all they have said on the matter. However, the question will be examined later by this Assembly when the items on the Middle East [*item 21*] and Palestine [*items 40 and 42*] are considered. We shall have more to say at that time. At this stage, it seems only proper to stress that merely extending views and advancing proposals would not be adequate. It also seems important to declare that to hope that the mere passage of time will bring Israel more and more concessions, other than those made to it in February 1971—and to wait for that—is an idle hope. That will never happen.

131. I am confident that I need not remind the General Assembly that according to Article 1 of the Charter one of the primary purposes of the United Nations is to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the common ends. The examination of this question must lead to effective collective action to uphold our Charter. Inaction would only be condoning aggression. What is required now is the taking of action—joint international action—to restore United Nations credibility and to save the United Nations as the world organ for the maintenance of peace.

132. Other important problems facing the world of today will, of course, be discussed by the Assembly. In all these, and in other problems not before the United Nations, the confrontation is between the rich and powerful nations, on the one hand, and the subjected, poor, weaker and less advanced nations, on the other. In every situation the strong and rich seem to be seeking to get stronger and richer at the expense of the poor and less advanced. This is a tragic state of affairs, a sad heritage of the pre-Charter era, showing an unbelievably retarded mentality that fails to understand that the world as a whole can never now live half free and strong and half subjugated and poor.

133. The exploiters of the valiant peoples in South Africa should be made to know that sooner rather than later Angola will be free, Mozambique will be free, Guinea (Bissau) will be free, Zimbabwe will be a sovereign African State, and Namibia will have its own representatives in this family of nations. What the rulers of Portugal and Rhodesia and the racists in South Africa are trying to do is simply to stop the irresistible winds of change. We regret the lives and energies that are being needlessly sacrificed and the time that is irretrievably lost. Vicious attempts against Senegal and Guinea have already been defeated. Left to themselves, the countries of Africa were able to put a quick end to the disputes which could no longer be fanned from outside. We rejoice in the successes obtained by the States of Somalia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire in their latest efforts for conciliation and peace. We hope similar successful efforts will be repeated everywhere, in all areas of tension—and not in Africa alone.

134. In Asia, the movements for liberation and unity shall be victorious. In Indo-China, in Viet-Nam and in Korea the determination of those brave and ancient peoples to reach their objectives will certainly bring their struggle to a successful end. What a loss of time and lives to resort to such bombardments as those alluded to by the Foreign Minister of Sweden today—and we know that colleagues in

the diplomatic missions of France and Algeria have been victims of that indiscriminate attack.

135. In Indo-China, in Viet-Nam and in Korea, I repeat, the determination of their brave peoples will bring their struggle to a successful end. An end to the era of colonialism and exploitation is sure to come everywhere. Let us all try to shorten this useless struggle. Let us welcome all these freedom fighters not only as observers, as we have fortunately decided to do, but also as full Member States.

136. The United Nations stands to gain in strength if the principles of universality are fully respected. No sovereign, peace-loving country should be barred from membership in our Organization. Divided countries wishing to join the United Nations should, and I hope will, be admitted.

137. To fight racism, efforts are currently being undertaken to launch a decade for vigorous and continued mobilization against racism and racial discrimination. We know that the majority of Member States will fully co-operate. The decade should lead to real progress towards the elimination of the miserable evils of racism and racial discrimination.

138. The economic and monetary situation in the world obviously affects the well-being and future of all States. Judging from the meagre results attained during the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [*UNCTAD*] it is hardly possible for the developing nations to look to their future with confidence. When we add the adverse influence of the era of colonialism to that of international monopolies, it appears that concerted action on the part of the developing world is long overdue. All developing countries should fully exercise their sovereign rights over their natural resources in order, first, to accelerate their own national development and, secondly, to strengthen their positions in transactions with foreign enterprises.

139. The economic situation would certainly be greatly improved if the fabulous sums spent on armaments were ever to be curtailed. While multilateral negotiations on disarmament have achieved a number of important agreements, their partial scope and the fact that not all countries have adhered to them has put severe limitations on their effectiveness and has caused some countries to delay their ratification.

140. The strengthening of the United Nations as an effective international machinery for safeguarding world peace and security should help the efforts to achieve these disarmament goals, goals which now seem too far away.

141. The Egyptian delegation will naturally deal with all these problems as they come up for discussion in the plenary meetings of this Assembly as well as in committee. As a non-aligned nation our attitude in those discussions will always be guided by the spirit and letter of the Charter.

142. As a member of the Arab League and of the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*], as a Moslem and a Mediterranean country and as a non-aligned member of our United Nations, Egypt seeks to intensify its co-operation



with all nations in order to live in greater dignity and freedom and to strive, in a context of peace, towards progress and advancement. This is the real test of the success or failure of our foreign policy.

143. In the 12 months since we last met in this Assembly hall, and as a step following our federation with the Syrian Arab Republic and the Libyan Arab Republic, Egypt and Libya have been studying steps towards achieving greater unity between themselves. With all other Arab States Egypt actively works for, and sincerely seeks, co-operation to the extent they desire. In order to achieve our common objectives, first, to defeat aggression, and then to accelerate our steps along the road to progress, we will not spare any possible effort.

144. In the African family we are as active as we can be in the service of the objectives of the charter of the OAU. We remember and register our gratitude for the efforts of the African States and their great leaders' endeavours last year to bring justice and peace to our land. We also express our deep appreciation, because at its last meeting in Rabat last June the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU again clearly manifested its solidarity with and loyalty to the concepts of freedom, justice and peace—the concepts of both the charter of the OAU and the Charter of the United Nations.

145. Together with our African sister-States, we go on co-operating with the great and ancient nations of Asia in our wider African-Asian group, serving the same ideals and defending the same concepts.

146. We turn to our other partners in the third world, the States of Latin America, and express our gratitude and appreciation for their stand for what is legal and right and for their opposition to the dictates of arrogant power.

147. The visits that my predecessor made to some of these Latin American countries provided us with an even clearer picture of their correct and sympathetic attitudes and policies.

148. The family of the non-aligned, at their last meeting in Georgetown in August 1972,<sup>9</sup> assured us again that those who wish to live by the law of nations would never fail strongly and firmly to uphold its principles in the face of any situation.

149. The situation in Europe is developing towards increased rapprochement and co-operation. This is a welcome trend, which will contribute towards promoting a more comprehensive and stable peace. The convening of a European security conference is no longer an idle dream. We are convinced that conditions prevailing in Europe are bound to affect other areas within the immediate vicinity. Instability in Europe has in the past adversely affected our region. Similarly, a stable and durable peace in Europe would affect our peace. Europe has a direct stake in a just peace in the Middle East.

150. I wish to refer in passing, but with profound personal gratitude, to the visits I paid to Rome, London and Brussels, and to the visits that my predecessor paid to the great cities of Paris and Belgrade. I hope that all obstacles will soon be removed so that our renewed relations with Bonn will be as strong and fruitful as we sincerely wish them to be.

151. All the socialist countries of Europe, as you well know, have stood, together with the Soviet Union, by our side since the 1967 aggression and have extended to us in our hour of need their unforgettable assistance. A grateful Egypt will not forget this support and will always seek to strengthen its friendship with these and all other peoples.

152. Yet Egypt has no more fervent wish than to live in freedom and at peace in a world ruled by law. We wish to develop closer ties of co-operation and friendship with all States Members, of this Organization which, faithful to its Charter, desire to live by its concepts and strive to serve its purposes.

153. In this context, Egypt believes it to be in the interest of every nation to try to preserve the United Nations as the political organization whose main work is the attainment of justice and peace for all. Rather than placing limits on its competence, we must all seek to strengthen its role. The United Nations should remain our hope for the future, it should not be a burden from the past.

154. The general debate is approaching its conclusion. We have listened to the valuable remarks, views and suggestions made by the majority of the wise Foreign Ministers of the world and chiefs of delegations, almost all of whom have expressed their loyalty to the United Nations and its Charter, and have renewed their confidence in them.

155. At previous sessions we have been called upon, in many documents, to assert that confidence and faith: in the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*] and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], in the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations [*resolution 2627 (XXV)*].

156. We also have before us two new items which show the concern of its authors about the same subject: we have items 24 and 25, submitted by Romania and by the USSR, respectively. In each case the motivating concern was the same, and the purpose almost identical: having fought the wars of the past, we wish to win peace for the future. For centuries in the past, nations have been subjected to the misery brought about by violence. We all look ahead now to a world advancing in peace under the protection of the law. Let us make it absolutely impossible for anyone to live outside that law.

<sup>9</sup> Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown, Guyana, from 8 to 12 August 1972.

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*