

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As you must have observed from the Journal, five speakers were listed to speak in the general debate today. We have listened already to three of them. This leaves the distinguished Foreign Ministers of Japan and Senegal. I understand that the Foreign Ministers of Japan and Senegal are both anxious to make their interventions this afternoon if possible, and I am sure that the Assembly would wish to hear them today. I therefore propose to observe the following procedure this afternoon: we shall begin our proceedings with item 66 of the provisional agenda: South West Africa. There are four speakers inscribed on the list of speakers for this item, and after listening to them, we shall revert to the general debate and listen to the interventions of the Foreign Ministers of Japan and Senegal. Before concluding our afternoon meeting, as I said earlier today, we have to make every effort to give the floor to all the speakers inscribed for today in the course of the day. I very much hope that this proposal will be acceptable to the Assembly.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning this meeting, I would like particularly to use this opportunity to thank all the distinguished delegates for responding this morning to my appeal of yesterday; and enabling us to start our meeting on time. From that time until now it was on my mind that I should thank them all.

The plenary meeting is adjourned until 3.00 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): As the General Assembly convenes in this twenty-first year of the United Nations, we of the United States of America are aware, as indeed every delegation must be, of the great responsibilities which all of us share in the work of this world Organization. No one, I am sure, feels these responsibilities more, or more keenly, than the Secretary-General, U Thant. In the past five years, he has filled his office with distinction and effectiveness. And indeed this is the most difficult office in the world. We know how much selfless dedication and energy have been exacted from him on behalf of the world community, and we can well understand how the burdens of his office led him to his decision not to offer himself for a second term as Secretary-General.

But the United Nations needs him. It needs him as a person. It needs him as a Secretary-General who conceives his office in the full spirit of the Charter as an important organ of the United Nations, endowed with the authority to act with initiative and effectiveness. The Members, in all their diversity and even discord, are united in their confidence in him. His departure at this crucial time in world affairs and in the life of the United Nations would be a serious loss both to the Organization itself and to the cause of peace among nations.

We reiterate our earnest hope that he will heed the unanimous wishes of the membership and permit his tenure of office to be extended. His affirmative decision on this question would give all of us new impetus to deal with the many great problems on our agenda.

The peoples of the world expect the United Nations to resolve these problems. With all their troubles and aspirations, they put great faith in our Organization. They look to us not for pious words but for solid results: agreements reached, wars ended or prevented, treaties written, co-operative programmes launched -- results that will bring humanity a few steps, but giant steps, closer to the purposes of the Charter which are our common commitment.

Realizing this, the United States has considered what it could say in this general debate that would improve the prospects for such fruitful results in the present session. We have concluded that, rather than attempting to review the many questions on the agenda to which we attach importance, we could make a more useful contribution by concentrating on the serious dangers to peace now existing in Asia -- particularly the war in Viet-Nam -- and by treating that subject in a constructive and positive way.

U.S.

Thurs. 20 Sept 1966
10:30 AM

647-1647-1412/21

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

The conflict in Viet-Nam is first of all an Asian issue, whose tragedy and suffering fall most heavily on the peoples directly involved. But its repercussions are world wide. It diverts much of the energies of many nations, including my own, from urgent and constructive endeavours. It is, as the Secretary-General said in his statement of 1 September:

"a source of grave concern and is bound to be a source of even greater anxiety, not only to the parties directly involved and to the major Powers but also to other Members of the Organization". (A/6400, page 3)

My Government remains determined to exercise every restraint to limit the war and to exert every effort to bring the conflict to the earliest end. The essential facts of the Viet-Nam conflict can be stated briefly:

Viet-Nam today remains divided along the demarcation line agreed upon in Geneva in 1954. To the north and south of that line are North Viet-Nam and South Viet-Nam. Provisional though they may be, pending a decision on the peaceful reunification of Viet-Nam by the process of self-determination, they are none the less political realities in the international community.

The Geneva Accord which established the demarcation line is so thorough in its prohibition of the use of force that it forbids military interference of any sort by one side in the affairs of the other. It even forbids civilians to cross the demilitarized zone. In 1962, at the Geneva Conference held that year, military infiltration through Laos was also forbidden. Yet, despite those provisions, South Viet-Nam is under an attack, already seven years old, by forces directed and supplied from the North and reinforced by regular units -- currently some seventeen identified regiments -- of the North Viet-Nam Army. A manifest purpose of this attack is to force upon the people of South Viet-Nam a system which they have not chosen by any peaceful process.

Let it be noted that this attack by North Viet-Nam contravenes not only the United Nations Charter, but also the terms of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) adopted unanimously only last December -- the resolution entitled "Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty".

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

That resolution declares, among other things, in its operative paragraph 1, that:

"No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State".

It further declares in operative paragraph 2 that:

"...no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow ... of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State".

It would be hard to write a more precise description of what North Viet-Nam is doing and has been doing for years in South Viet-Nam. Certainly, the prohibition of the use of force and subversion -- both by this resolution and by the Charter itself -- must apply with full vigour to international demarcation lines that have been established by solemn international agreements. This is significantly true not only in Viet-Nam but also in all divided States, where the recourse to force between the divided parts can have far-reaching consequences. Furthermore, solemn international agreements, specifically the Geneva accord, explicitly prohibit recourse to force as a means of reunifying Viet-Nam.

It is because of the attempt to upset by violence the situation in Viet-Nam and its far-reaching implications elsewhere, that the United States and other countries have responded to appeals from South Viet-Nam for military assistance. Our aims in giving this assistance are strictly limited. We are not engaged in a holy war against communism. We do not seek to establish an American empire or a sphere of influence in Asia. We seek no permanent military bases, no permanent establishment of troops, no permanent alliances and no permanent American presence of any kind in South Viet-Nam. We do not seek to impose a policy of alignment on South Viet-Nam. We do not seek to overthrow the Government of North Viet-Nam. We do not seek to do any injury to mainland China nor to threaten any of its legitimate interests. We do not ask of North Viet-Nam an unconditional surrender or indeed the surrender of anything that belongs to it. Nor do we seek to exclude any segment of the South Viet-Nameese people from peaceful participation in their country's future.

Let me state affirmatively and succinctly what our aims are. We want a political solution, not a military solution, to this conflict. I repeat:

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

we want a political solution, not a military solution, to this conflict. By the same token, we reject the idea that North Viet-Nam has the right to impose a military solution. We seek to assure for the people of South Viet-Nam the same right of self-determination to decide its own political destiny, free of force, that the United Nations Charter affirms for all, and we believe that reunification of Viet-Nam should be decided upon through a free choice by the peoples of both the North and the South without outside interference, the results of which choice we are fully prepared to support.

These then are our affirmative aims. We are well aware, as we have studied them carefully, of the stated position of Hanoi on these terms. But no differences can be resolved without contact, discussion or negotiations. For our part, we have long been and remain today ready to negotiate without prior conditions. We are prepared to discuss Hanoi's four points, together with any points which other parties may wish to raise. We are ready to negotiate a settlement based on a strict observance of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Agreements, which observance was called for in the communiqué which was recently issued by the Warsaw Pact countries in Bucharest. We will support a reconvening of the Geneva Conference or an Asian conference or any other generally acceptable forum. At the same time, we have also been soberly considering whether the lack of agreement on peace aims has been the sole barrier to the beginning of negotiations. We are aware that some perceive other obstacles, and I wish to make here today three proposals with respect to them. First, it is said that one obstacle is the United States bombing of North Viet-Nam. Let it be recalled that there was no bombing of North Viet-Nam for five years during which there was steadily increasing infiltration from North Viet-Nam in violation of the Geneva accords, during which there were no United States combat forces in Viet-Nam and during which strenuous efforts were made to achieve a peaceful settlement. Let it be further recalled that twice before we have suspended our bombing, once for thirty-seven days, without any reciprocal act of de-escalation from the other side and without any sign from them of a willingness to negotiate. Nonetheless, let me say that in this matter the United States is willing once again to take the first step. We are prepared to order a cessation of all bombing of North Viet-Nam the moment we are assured, privately or otherwise, that this step will be answered

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

promptly by a corresponding and appropriate de-escalation on the other side. We therefore urge before this august Assembly that the Government in Hanoi be asked the following question to which we would be prepared to receive either a private or public response.

Would it, in the interests of peace, and in response to a prior cessation by the United States of the bombing in North Viet-Nam, take corresponding and timely steps to reduce or bring to an end its own military activities against South Viet-Nam?

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

Another obstacle is said to be North Viet-Nam's conviction or fear that the United States intends to establish a permanent military presence in Viet-Nam. There is no basis for such a fear. The United States stands ready to withdraw its forces as others withdraw theirs so that peace can be restored in South Viet-Nam, and favours international machinery, either of the United Nations or other machinery, to ensure effective supervision of the withdrawal.

We therefore urge that Hanoi be asked the following question also: Would North Viet-Nam be willing to agree to a time-schedule for supervised phased withdrawal from South Viet-Nam of all external forces, those of North Viet-Nam as well as those of the United States and other countries aiding South Viet-Nam?

A further obstacle is said to be disagreement over the place of the Viet-Cong in the negotiations. Some argue that regardless of different views on who controls the Viet-Cong, it is a combatant force and, as such, should take part in the negotiations. Our view on this matter was stated some time ago by President Johnson, who made clear that, as far as we are concerned, this question would not be an insurmountable problem. We therefore invite the authorities in Hanoi to consider whether this obstacle to negotiations may not be more imaginary than real.

We offer these proposals today in the interests of peace in South-East Asia. There may be other proposals. We have not been and we are not now inflexible in our position, but we do believe that whatever approach finally succeeds, it will not be one which simply decries what is happening in Viet-Nam and appeals to one side to stop while encouraging the other. Such a position can only further delay a peace which we all desire and fervently hope for.

The only workable formula for a settlement will be one which is just to the basic interests of all who are involved. In this spirit, we welcome discussion of this question either in the Security Council, where the United States itself has raised the matter, or herein the General Assembly, and we are fully prepared to take part in such discussion. We earnestly solicit the

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

further initiative of any organ, including the Secretary-General, or any Member of the United Nations whose influence can help in this cause. Every Member has a responsibility to exercise its power and influence for peace, and the greater its power and influence, the greater is this responsibility.

Now I turn to another problem related in part to the first, the problem of how to foster a constructive relationship between the mainland of China, with its 700 million people, and the outside world. The misdirection of so much of the energies of this vast, industrious and gifted people into xenophobic displays, such as the extraordinary, difficult to understand and alarming activities of the Red Guards, and the official policy and doctrine of promoting revolution and subversion throughout the world -- these are among the most disturbing phenomena of our age. Surely among the essentials of peace in Asia are "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies" and, specifically, "a peaceful mainland China".

Let me say to this Assembly categorically that it is not the policy of the United States to isolate Communist China from the world. On the contrary, we have sought to limit the areas of hostility and to pave the way for the restoration of our historically friendly relations with the great people of China. Our efforts to this end have taken many forms. Since 1955, United States representatives have held 131 bilateral diplomatic meetings in Geneva, and later in Warsaw, with emissaries from Peking. We have sought without success to open numerous unofficial channels of communication with mainland China. We have made it crystal clear that we do not intend to attack, invade or attempt to overthrow the existing régime in Peking. And we have expressed our hope to see representatives of Peking join us and others in meaningful negotiations on disarmament, a nuclear test ban, and a ban on the further spread of nuclear weapons.

But the international community, if it is faithful to the Charter and our resolutions, cannot countenance Peking's doctrine and policy of intervening by violence and subversion in other nations, whether under the guise of so-called wars of national liberation against independent countries, or under

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

any other guise. such intervention can find no place in the United Nations Charter nor in the resolutions of the General Assembly. Yet dozens of nations seated in this Hall have had direct experience of these illegal activities. It is in the light of these facts and of our ardent desire for a better atmosphere that the United States has carefully considered the issues arising from the absence of representatives of Peking from the United Nations.

Two facts bear on this issue and on the attitude of my country towards any attempted solution. First, the Republic of China on Taiwan is a founding Member of the United Nations and its rights are clear. The United States will vigorously oppose any effort to exclude the representatives of the Republic of China from the United Nations in order to put representatives of Communist China in their place. The second fact is that Communist China, unlike anyone else in the history of this Organization, has put forward special and extraordinary terms for consenting to enter the United Nations. In addition to the expulsion of the Republic of China, there are also demands to transform and pervert this Organization from its Charter purposes -- some of them put forward as recently as yesterday.

What can be the cause of this attitude? We cannot be sure, but we do know that it comes from a leadership whose stated programme is to transform the world by violence. It comes from a leadership which openly proclaims that it is opposed to any discussion of a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam. It would also seem that these leaders wish to isolate their country from a world, and from a United Nations, that they cannot transform or control. Indeed, they have brought their country to a degree of isolation that is unique in the world today, an isolation not only from the United States and its friends and allies, but from most of the non-aligned world, and even from most of the Communist nations. Many, not only the United States, have sought improved relations and have been rebuffed.

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

At this moment in history, therefore, the basic question about the relation between Communist China and the United Nations is a question to which only the leaders in Peking can give the answer. And I put the question: Will they refrain from putting forward clearly unacceptable terms; and are they prepared to assume the obligations of the United Nations Charter, in particular the basic Charter obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State?

The world -- and my Government -- will listen most attentively for a helpful response to these questions. We hope it will come soon -- the sooner the better. Like many other Members here, the United States has the friendliest historic feelings toward the great Chinese people, and looks forward to the occasion when they will once again enrich, rather than endanger, the fabric of the world community, and, in the spirit of the Charter, "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

I have dwelt on these great and thorny issues of Asia because they are of more, far more, than regional importance. Progress towards their solution would visibly brighten the atmosphere of international relations all over the world. It would enable the United Nations to turn a new corner, to apply itself with renewed energy to the great tasks of reconciliation and peaceful construction which lie before us in every part of the globe.

Surely, peaceful construction is needed above all in the less developed areas. It is needed in South-East Asia, today a region of conflict but also a region of vast under-developed resources, where my country is prepared to make a most substantial contribution to the development of the whole region, including North Viet-Nam. It is needed in the Western Hemisphere where, under the bold ideals of the Alliance for Progress, the States of Latin America are already carrying out a far-reaching, peaceful process of economic and social development.

Indeed, in no area are the tasks of economic development more important than on the continent of Africa -- represented in this hall by the representatives of thirty-seven nations. Last May, in commemorating the anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, the President suggested ways in which the United States, as a friend of Africa, might help with some of that continent's major economic problems. Our efforts in this field are now entering a new

stage as we begin to carry out the recommendations of a special committee appointed to review United States participation in African development programmes, both bilateral and multilateral.

But the economic side of this picture cannot stand alone. The time is past when either peace or material progress could be founded on the domination of one people, or one race or one group, by another. Yet attempts to do this, and just this, still continue in southern Africa today. As a result, the danger to peace in that area is real and substantial.

My Government holds strong views on these problems. We are not, and never will be, content with a minority Government in southern Rhodesia. The objective we support for that country remains as it was stated last May: "to open the full power and responsibility of nationhood to all the people of Rhodesia -- not just 6 per cent of them".

Nor can we ever be content with such a situation as that in South West Africa, where one race holds another in intolerable subjection under the false name of apartheid.

The decision of the International Court, in refusing to touch the merits of the question of South West Africa, was most disappointing. But the application of law to this question does not hang on that decision alone. South Africa's conduct remains subject to obligations reaffirmed by earlier Advisory Opinions of the Court whose authority is undiminished. Under these Opinions, South Africa cannot alter the international status of the territory without the consent of the United Nations; and South Africa remains bound to accept United Nations supervision, submit annual reports to the General Assembly, and "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants".

This is no time for South Africa to take refuge in an overly technical finding of the International Court, which did not deal with the substantive merits of the case. The time is overdue, the time is long overdue, for South Africa to accept its obligations to the international community in regard to South West Africa. Continued violation by South Africa of its plain obligations to the international community would necessarily require all nations, including my own, to take such an attitude into account in their relationships with South Africa.

Many other questions of significance will engage our attention during this session of the General Assembly. Foremost among them are questions of disarmament and arms control, of which the most urgent are the completion of a treaty to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons and the extension of the limited test ban treaty. Remaining differences on this issue can and must be resolved on the basis of mutual compromise.

Finally, I wish to speak of one further matter of great concern both to the United Nations and to my country, and that is the draft treaty to govern activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies.

Major progress has been made in the negotiation of this important treaty, but several issues remain. One of these concerns the question of reporting by space Powers on their activities on celestial bodies. A second issue concerns access by space Powers to one another's installations on celestial bodies. On both of these points the United States, at the most recent meeting of the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on Outer Space -- again reaffirmed in the parent committee -- made significant compromise proposals in the interest of early agreement.

Unfortunately, and regretfully, the USSR has not responded constructively to these proposals. Instead, it has insisted on still another matter: a provision requiring States which grant tracking facilities to one country to make the same facilities available to all others, without reciprocity and without regard to the wishes of the granting State. The obligation proposed by the USSR, as was apparent in the Space Committee, was unacceptable to many countries participating in our negotiations, and was supported indeed only by a very small number of Eastern European States.

Tracking facilities, our discussions demonstrated, are a matter for bilateral negotiation and agreement. The United States has held such discussion and reached such agreements with a number of countries on a basis of mutual commitment and common advantage. France and the European Space Research Organization have also established widespread tracking networks on a similar basis. It is, of course, open to the USSR and any other space Power, without objection from my Government, to proceed in exactly the same way.

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

I should like to state today my Government's interest in bilateral co-operation in the tracking of space vehicles on the basis of mutual benefits, and I should like now to make an offer to help resolve this dispute. If the Soviet Union desires to provide for tracking coverage from United States territory, we, on our part, are prepared to discuss with Soviet representatives the technical and other requirements involved, with a view to reaching some mutually beneficial agreement; and our scientists and technical representatives can meet without delay to explore the possibilities to this end.

For indeed, the outer-space treaty is too important and too urgent to be delayed. This treaty offers us the opportunity to establish, in the unlimited realm of space beyond this planet, a rule of peace and law -- before the arms race has been extended into that realm. It is all the more urgent because of man's recent strides towards landing on the moon.

By far the greater part of the work on the treaty is now behind us. We have agreed on important provisions, including major obligations in the area of arms control. We should proceed to settle the remaining subsidiary issues in a spirit of conciliation and understanding, so that this General Assembly may give its approval to a completed treaty before the Assembly adjourns.

I conclude by expressing our earnest hope that the words of the United States today on all these issues may contribute to concrete steps toward peace and a better world.

We know the difficulties but we are not discouraged. In the twenty-one turbulent years since the Charter went into effect, we of the United Nations have faced conflicts at least as great and as difficult as any that confront us today. The failure of this Organization has been prophesied many times. But all these prophecies have been disproved. Even the most formidable issues have not killed our Organization -- and none will. Indeed, it has grown great and respected by facing the hardest issues and dealing forthrightly with them.

There is no magic in the United Nations save what we, its Members, bring to it. And that magic is a simple thing: our irreducible awareness of our common humanity, and our consequent will to peace. Without that awareness and that will, these great buildings would be an empty shell. With them, we have here the greatest instrument ever devised by man for the reconciliation of conflicts and the building of the better future for which all mankind yearns.

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

The United Nations will live. We, its Members, must and will make it live and flourish, and whatever the troubles we face, we must and will make its purposes of peace more and more come true.

Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): First of all, Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation I wish to offer you my warmest congratulations on your brilliant election to the Presidency of this session of the Assembly. I take even greater pleasure in doing so because I have had the privilege of knowing you for a certain number of years in the course of which, together with many others, I have admired your great intelligence, the power of your imagination and your keen analytic mind, your ability to see all sides of a problem and your genius for compromise -- all qualities that equip you quite naturally for confronting the tasks that will be yours in the course of the examination of the items on the agenda of this session. There is no doubt that, armed as you are, you will know how to guide our labours towards constructive solutions acceptable to all, in justice, in fairness, and with proper respect for the rules.

My delegation would also like to express its joy at seeing our Assembly welcome a new Member, Guyana, a multi-racial country only recently troubled and disturbed, but now acceded to independence amid the joy and unanimity of its people. We wish Guyana to remain thus so that it may be able to go on working -- independence being only a beginning and a means -- in harmony and peace towards its full flowering, and we hope further that, with its youthfulness, it may bring to this Assembly a new vitality, thus enriching our Organization.

May I also be permitted to celebrate another entry into the Organization -- the return of Indonesia. This is indeed a pleasure for me on the occasion of my first return to the United Nations. While I was here before, with great sadness I saw Indonesia leave, and I am sure this sadness was shared by all those who were here. Therefore our satisfaction at its return is as great as was our regret to see it leave.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

The annual meeting of the General Assembly is, for the States represented here -- actually almost the entire human race of today ---the opportunity for taking stock of relations in our society; that is to say, to consider their development during the interval between two sessions, to evaluate the causes of tensions, and to seek out ways of assuring to the international community conditions of coexistence and co-operation beneficial to all, as stated and desired by our Charter.

All this requires of each of us that he come to this rostrum for the purpose of depicting life as it is in his part of the world -- as was so excellently done here yesterday by the President of the Republic of the Philippines and as was done in the fable The Animals Suffering from the Plague, that is with the basic purity, of intent of La Fontaine, but without the hypocrisy of his characters.

It is evident, of course, that this Assembly for some years now, has each time, at its opening, been involved in a crisis. We might even say, to come nearer the truth, that it suffers from crises endemically. To be sure, none of these crises resembles any other, nor are they all of the same degree of intensity.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

But a year ago, we were celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the creation of the United Nations. At the very solemn celebration of that event, many hoped -- and my delegation had the candor in San Francisco to voice this -- indeed, all men of good will hoped -- for the rebirth of our Organization, its renewal, the submission of all to the Charter, the determined aspiration of all for peace through respect for the sovereignty of others, the agreement by all to apply honestly and without ulterior motive all the resolutions of the General Assembly, and the commitment to the respect of law and justice.

Instead of that, what do we see? We are witnessing apprehension and a progressive deterioration of relations among States, an exacerbation of frictions and conflicts; we are witnessing the recrudescence of violence; but worse yet, even an apologia, almost a denial of the law, even in those international institutions which had been labouriously erected precisely to spell out and defend justice.

And this has been occurring throughout the world. In order not to offend anyone I will merely refer briefly to what has happened in my own continent, Africa, where, all things considered, and despite the malevolent forces which are trying to find a favourable place for all their nefarious adventures, there are still no hotbeds of war.

That continent, the one which in the course of history has been exposed to the greatest traumas, the most grievous humiliations, which has even lost count of its periods of invasion and slavery, which has lost the cream of its race and exported its most resistant specimens for the enrichment of others -- this Africa which has valiantly re-awakened, had believed, at the beginning of the 1960's, that the day was dawning when it would be able to devote itself to its peaceful development and expansion after the liberation of the great majority of its peoples.

We were wrong.

In the interval between two sessions, very few Governments among its various States did not feel shaken or threatened. Many, even the more solid ones, trembled on their foundations, and a great number of them actually crumbled. We can take inventory merely by glancing at the map to realize how unstable the generally prevailing situation is. It is not that the elite have failed. On the contrary, suffice it to be acquainted with or simply cross Africa in order to see the contrast between the considerable achievements obtained in so few years and the

great stagnation under colonial occupation. Everywhere, almost without exception, the new national powers have understood their duty and have resolutely embarked upon the ways and means for the construction of States, in spite of the colossal difficulties confronting them.

Of course the recent accession to independence carries within itself internal causes of disintegration of the newly established entities. We are faced with ethnic and linguistic differences, the impatience of the masses to acquire everything immediately, as if Rome were built in a day; and the thirst for change among certain elite which has rapidly turned into a simple thirst for power. This is something which we all know and do not forget.

The basic problem is that Africa has had to bear the brunt of a great offense to subvert the liberation obtained after great struggle in these last few years. At the same time, the last bastions of colonialism and racism have gained strength as if by magic. Portugal and South Africa may cast malicious winks at each other in the satisfaction at having been able to stand up to and brave victoriously a condemnation which was universal only on its face but which contained tacit and powerful complicity inside.

How can one be surprised that, strengthened by this state of affairs, Ian Smith in the shelter of the sanctions which Great Britain had declared would be fatal to his regime, followed the example of South Africa and set up a carbon copy of that regime? The embargo demanded by Africa has been ignored and defied; organized maritime smuggling came into practice. What has happened to the days of maritime expeditions? Perhaps the precedent established by the United States, which has become such a great Power, is the decisive element that incites the United Kingdom Royal Navy to battle their overseas rebels only through loudspeakers.

Even international organs have become engaged in this combat against Africa. On 18 July, the International Court of Justice rendered its verdict on South West Africa. The unanimous world-wide condemnation to which it gave rise, and the jubilation which followed in South Africa, are eloquent testimony and call for no further comment. The administration of justice does not consist in mere legal dissertations. It is in the conscience and in popular espousal that the just cause and the good law are defended. On this occasion, the verdict clearly means

that Ethiopia and Liberia should mind their own business; South Africa is right in annexing South West Africa; the mode of administration is in accordance with the Charter and in line with its objectives. It is quite simple, the jurists will say. But to that I reply: this is a translation of scientific subtleties into practical and concrete realities.

Even without being a jurist it would be easy to discuss the legal basis of the decision, because what is involved is the final future of that Territory, which is the object of an international mandate and which has never been an integral part of South Africa. The Charter and the historic Declaration 1514 (XV) of this Assembly both prescribed the granting of independence to all countries and territories still dependent. How can this future be guaranteed by the verdict of The Hague?

That decision demonstrated once and for all and in clearest terms the sort of crisis through which certain organs of the United Nations are passing. Here you have an organ, an organ based upon the Charter, which gives a verdict contrary to that Charter. It is quite simple. It is because the law itself is violated, and the mechanisms set up by the law declare the "law" to those by whom they were created. The privilege of the veto held by certain members of the Security Council is a result of this same concept.

Why then should it be astonishing that international problems remain unsolved? Their settlement can be equitable only if it is satisfactory to the great Powers alone; too bad if that hurts the population directly concerned. This singular subjective morality could be summed up in one sentence: "Everything is fine which does not oppose the great Powers".

I have just briefly referred to the negative aspect of present-day Africa. It would have been easy for me to apply the same judgement to everything taking place elsewhere in the world. Why are there so many divided countries -- Germany, Korea, Viet-Nam? Why are there these latent hotbeds? The cannons are silent as soon as the so-called great Powers have found a modus vivendi acceptable to them, even if the people directly concerned must suffer martyrdom; and the cannons begin to boom again as soon as one of the "great Powers" is no longer satisfied with the situation.

A/CONF.171/191-11/93

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

This dangerous and explosive situation, at its peak, governs even the machinery of our work and the life of the United Nations, to the point that the disorganization and lassitude thus created finally claimed our Chief Executive, the Secretary-General himself.

The entire world has paid tribute to the eminent services which the Organization owes U Thant, who has imparted to this work the indelible mark of his own lofty personality. My delegation wishes to be associated, in all modesty, with this work which will long be remembered in the international community; and we will regret, along with all the other delegations in these precincts, his eventual departure from the Organization. That is why we wish to join all those who have already asked him to remain in his post. It is true -- and we have noted with satisfaction -- that he has already accepted the beginnings of a compromise.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

If, however, U Thant, to our regret, remains adamant, my delegation hopes that the Organization will be able to find a worthy successor. But in that case, we have to issue the following warning: that the same causes will always produce the same effects. Another Secretary-General, with a different temperament but no less inspired, had already served the Organization until his final supreme sacrifice -- Dag Hammarskjold of sad memory. We cannot help but compare these two terminations of office and find a parallel between them. One fell, and the other is leaving us. In both cases, their work was not completed. The international community must immediately examine its own conscience in order that it might realize the error to which both these men were subject. If the present Secretary-General reaches the conclusion that he is powerless, it is difficult to imagine that, as long as the mechanisms of the United Nations remain as they are, his successor will not find before him the same insurmountable obstacles.

For many years, the small and medium-sized countries have constantly denounced this situation. The conception of United Nations, intended to prevent war only between the great Powers, must be succeeded by an organization to prevent war altogether. War always begins with the small; in 1914, the First World War began with Sarajevo; in 1939, the Second World War began with Ethiopia and Spain. That is why what is happening in Viet-Nam is dangerous and carries with it the risk of a generalized war, as was so well stated by the Secretary-General, when he said:

"The pressure of events moves relentlessly to a major conflagration whereas the efforts to reverse this trend are disastrously slow."

Of course, the advances of space science have brought with them the possibility of open sky espionage by means of observation by satellites. Yet this, in the opinion of the most capable of strategists, lessens the danger of a total war. But the danger of escalation remains real, because it can bring into the conflict both China, which is close by, and the Soviet Union, which is not too far away. In the meantime, and since 1939, poor Viet-Nam, whether South or North, has been in the midst of war and suffering martyrdom. It is obvious that this situation is due solely to the fact that Viet-Nam is close to the giant China. Moreover, all the small countries which are situated in the orbit of that country remain in the same uncertainty -- Korea, Laos, Cambodia and so on.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

What is important is for the United Nations to reverse this trend, to adapt its structures in order to prevent war between the small Powers. That would be tantamount to destroying the evil at its roots and removing the causes of the temptation to the great Powers to intervene; in short, to defend those last Powers against themselves. The danger of power and of force resides in the demon of expansion. The possession of power engenders a propensity to use it. If the opportunity to use arms is removed, they may be set aside.

It is only in that atmosphere -- where the United Nations, being dynamic again and active, and not passive as at present, will have brought home to all the uselessness of armaments -- that it will be possible to speak of disarmament. Why should the great Powers, since they are the only ones involved, disarm themselves? They live in a state of perpetual war through localized wars introduced in small countries. By all means let us continually improve the weapons and the engines of war, because a final confrontation is not excluded. That day must be forestalled, and in the meantime the adversary has to be exposed more and more by presenting his acts in the various theatres of war. It is no surprise, therefore, that at Geneva the diplomats meet each other and chat -- if I may so put it -- interminably while here and there machine-guns open up and sow death.

It is, of course, very wrong for some to minimize these so-called "small" wars. They are the sporadic and localized manifestation of a very great tension and of a very dangerous psychosis which elsewhere takes the form of an arms race and nuclear and thermonuclear tests. That competition, by the grace of God and thanks to the Moscow Treaty, has now passed from the atmosphere into the laboratories and underground, but is it more reassuring because our atmosphere is less contaminated? Not at all. The laboratories are preparing the death ray. We still live always under that threat, at the mercy of an incident which might bring the moment of the destruction of the earth. Then there is still the stock of armaments which represents a permanent danger, and no progress towards an agreement to destroy these armaments is yet contemplated.

Fortunately, we see not only these indices of despair and universal suicide. Throughout the world, we see that increasing forces of goodwill are gathering, the determination of men of peace is rising and is resounding on high. This voice, more powerful than thunder, will finally become louder than the clamours for war.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

In Africa at the end of last year there was held the vast, unique and significant gathering of the First World Festival of Negro Arts. It was certainly an exceptionable jubilee dedicated to beauty, the mass of the sublime, the exaltations of Negro cultures. The people of the Negro race who met there did not wish simply to create a cult of admiration of a concept of racial pleasure or superiority. On the contrary, and it will be sufficient for me to quote the President of the Republic of Senegal who said at the opening of the gathering:

"We feel very profoundly the honour that is ours to welcome here the First World Festival of Negro Arts, with so many talents from all the four continents and the four horizons of the mind. What is honouring us above all and what is our great merit is that we will have participated in an enterprise that is far more revolutionary than the exploitation of space, the elaboration of a new humanism, which includes, this time, the totality of men on the totality of our planet, Earth. Because we are aware of the fact that the humanism of the twentieth century, which can only be a civilization of the universal, would be impoverished if it was only of value to a single people, to a single race and to a single continent. Once again, the problem is posed in complementary terms, of dialogue and of exchange, not on opposition or on racial hatred. As a matter of fact, how could we Negroes reject the scientific and technical discoveries of the European and North American people, thanks to whom man is now transforming man himself, together with nature?"

There is also the resurrection of OCAM, the Joint African and Malagasy Organization, which was buried by some before it was dead. In our opinion, it is a good thing that in a continent as diversified as ours the States which have affinities between them should group together and regroup and organize in common the possibilities for their co-operation. Yes, as long as there is no exclusiveness directed against anyone, this is a positive contribution to regroupment and, consequently, it represents a landmark towards African unity. This unity cannot be monolithic, all of a piece with identical elements and interchangeable elements.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

We are aware of this in Cameroon, which is a country so diversified that an illustrious African has called it the microcosm of Africa. Varied in its physical conformation, it is varied also in its inhabitants, among whom Bantus, Semi-Bantus, Sudanese and people of the Nile region live together. These human, ethnic and linguistic differences have also superimposed upon them by colonial division the English and French cultures and we ultimately became a Republic which, by nature, had to be a federal republic. The temperament and the emotions of the inhabitants led to the belief that perhaps it might be difficult to set up a viable State on the basis of the variety of opinion and the great number of political parties. My country -- those who were here in 1959, on the occasion of the special session which was called to settle its future finally, will remember this -- showed this to be wrong, and disquiet was voiced then.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

However, peacefully, by persuasion, without governmental law or decree, the whole country became aware and, willingly, and freely, all the political parties came together and decided to become fused into one great national party, the Cameroon National Union. With enthusiasm and alacrity, all the Cameroonians celebrated on 1 September -- only a few days ago -- this great victory over themselves. Announcing the event over our national radio, the Chief of State, His Excellency El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, declared:

"Thus 1 September 1966 -- five years after reunification -- marks the advent of the Cameroon National Union. Every 1 September will be full of significance and will constitute in the eyes of future generations at the same time an example and a symbol...

"How much we Cameroonians need audacity, self-denial, patriotism and clairvoyance, savoir-faire and tenacity in order to achieve together in the face of so many difficulties."

On 21 August, at the closure of the Congress of dissolution of the Cameroon Union, the majority party of French-speaking East Cameroon, he stated:

"On 1 September next we shall have won a great battle. Indeed, instead of voting a law in the National Assembly, in Parliament, in order to create a single party although since independence, we have a comfortable majority if not unanimity in Parliament, we have succeeded, through free discussion and consent, in gathering together all Cameroonians in one great unified national party."

This authentic internal revolution, peaceful and fruitful, apart from the healthy character of its political atmosphere constitutes a factor of mobilization of our population at a time when we are launching our second five-year plan.

In the report of the Chief of State to the National Assembly, we read the following:

"The plan deals with total investments of 165,000 million francs CFA, being at least 33,000 million francs a year, which represents a considerable effort if one bears in mind that investments in 1963-1964 were 19,000 million francs. The distribution of these investments by sectors is as follows:

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

1.4 per cent for studies, 2,000 million; 45.6 per cent for production, 75,500 million; 35.1 per cent for infrastructure and transport, 60,000 million; 15.8 per cent for social equipment, 26,000 million; 2.1 per cent for administrative equipment, 3,500 million."

It is obvious that this five-year plan is ambitious. That is why political unification was greeted with indescribable enthusiasm as a factor for peace and stability, because it is not possible to build in conditions of disorder.

If we have accorded to the fortunate evolution taking place in Cameroon a character worthy of mention from this rostrum, it is because it represents a test which proves on its scale that African unity -- and perhaps even harmony throughout the world -- is possible in diversity and not necessarily in uniformity. That is why, faithful to the Joint African and Malagasy Organization, we remain faithful also to the Organization of African Unity, all of whose sessions we have attended, even those where certain difficulties presented themselves and provoked certain defections; because, just as the best is the enemy of the good, the seeking of full unanimity is often the best means of preventing a large majority.

Parallel to the indices constituted by national events or the action of groups of States, one can recognize as a positive contribution more and more initiatives on the part of the eminent personalities of our world.

Among these, and in the first rank, the voice of His Holiness Paul VI still resounds in this hall. Each one of us hears that voice resounding in his own soul in favour of peace and hears his objurgations against war, his fervent call to the rich so that their hearts and their minds may be influenced by the duty of solidarity towards other men. In his paternal solicitude, has he not just called for a novena of prayers by all believers to ask the Lord for peace in Viet-Nam?

It is not without pride that I recall the recent visit of our Chief of State to the Pope -- just last week, to be exact. In defining the scope, the Holy Father himself said:

"We, for our part, should like to see in your visit a solemn homage to the spiritual values on which all civilization rests. We have always appreciated the sympathy with which you have followed developments in the Ecumenical Council, at which you were officially represented from the opening to the closing of those solemn sessions from which a current of affection and admiration has resulted in the modern world. And it is with joy that we

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

ourselves recently gave our consent to diplomatic relations between the Federal Republic of Cameroon and the Holy See. We are pleased to see in this a new factor for concord and understanding between nations and, therefore, a further landmark on the way to peace among all men." It was indeed the purpose of the visit: to place a further landmark on the road towards peace among men. In replying to him, our Chief of State concluded:

"We bring to Your Holiness the fervent wishes of our people for the personal health and the spiritual force necessary in order to pursue, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the vigilance of the Church of Christ to which we wish to contribute effectively in the establishment of an era of peace and fraternity among all men."

This, of course, is the ardent wish of our delegation.

The political problems which we have just evoked, from the point of view of our Government, are of importance only in the perspective of our common will, the will of the Members of the United Nations to create a harmonious international society, devoid of injustice and offering to the man of this century the conditions essential for his fulfilment.

This desire, it can easily be understood, cannot become a reality if the disparity in the conditions of existence remains in our world of today. We shall continue to repeat that the lofty ideals of peace, justice and brotherhood, solemnly proclaimed in the Charter of this Organization will remain as dead letters and pious wishes as long as adequate solutions are not found to the agonizing problem of under-development, as long as the majority of mankind, victim of particular historical conditions, are not given the opportunity of participating equally in the material and moral riches of the world, which today more than ever is our common right.

The problem arising from the disparity in living conditions within the international community is a major one, if not the most important problem which this Organization must examine and resolve if it is to be faithful to its vocation. Thus we must be grateful that this problem, among the preoccupations of the United Nations, occupies the prominent place which it deserves as a testimony to this decade of development which has given rise to so many hopes. Launched in 1961, it would seem that, after five years, sufficient ground has been covered to enable us to measure the results thus far attained.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

The basic idea of the ten-year plan is, of course, that under-development can be overcome only through close combination of the internal efforts of the developing countries themselves with international co-operation, both bilateral and multilateral.

People who are in a hurry or seeking excuses have always minimized the gigantic struggle on the part of our countries against under-development. That is why, with some satisfaction, we shall quote the Secretary-General, who declared in this connexion:

"The most recent study of the world economy, for its part, has disproved the statements of those who claimed that the developing countries had not done much in the last five years to mobilize their national resources. It shows, on the contrary, that during the first half of the Development Decade the Third World, overcoming disappointments and setbacks, succeeded on a large front in contributing to its own development."

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

We quote that text with satisfaction, as we have said. We have done so not in order to draw from it the illusion that the battle of development can be won solely through the efforts and the means of the countries that are underdeveloped, but also in order better to assign the responsibilities. It is agreed that, in spite of the efforts deployed by the developing countries themselves and the progress made here and there, the objectives of the Decade could be attained in 1970 only if the developed countries, abandoning what the Secretary-General calls "their immediate and relatively narrow interests" agreed to give to international co-operation an impulse that is both vigorous and without any reservation. The results of international co-operation during this first half of the Development Decade are indeed rather disappointing. The first observation to make, in this sense, concerns the inadequacy of the financial resources placed at the disposal of developing countries by the developed countries. These not only have not attained the hoped-for volume, but have seen their options become more rigid and compelling to the point of leading to an aggravation of the deficit of the balance of payments of the developing countries which is prejudicial to the development of those countries.

It is urgent -- need we reiterate -- that measures be taken in order to overcome these difficulties. The developed countries have approved the idea and the objectives of the Development Decade and it does not seem that it is beyond their ability to free one per cent of their net national product in order to help in the development of the less favoured countries. The proof is that certain developed countries such as France have already attained this minimum objective and that others, such as Japan, are not very far from it. Without minimizing the problems posed by the reform of the international monetary system and the interest of creating new liquidity, it may be hoped that it is not the means that are lacking among the developed countries, but, rather, we are forced to say, the political will to eliminate underdevelopment from the structures of the modern world.

This lack of will also emerges from the difficulties encountered by the developing countries in the field of international trade. We were right to expect that the developed countries, which are all more or less adherents of the very respectable maxim "trade, not aid" would make it possible for us to find in this area, through a rational, stable and equitable organization, world markets for our

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

main exports, the supplementary resources necessary for the promotion of our economies. It is in this light that we hailed with enthusiasm the creation of UNCTAD, whose essential purpose, let us not forget it, is precisely to make the international community aware of the decisive impact of international trade upon development.

The experience of UNCTAD, although it is limited in time, nevertheless makes it difficult to think that developed countries have decided to open their markets to the products of developing countries at remunerative and stable prices. We need not repeat to what point we regret the failure of the United Nations Cocoa Conference, which, whether one likes it or not, is considered by the underdeveloped countries as a test of effectiveness for UNCTAD. In the interests of the international community, it would be dangerous to let linger in the minds of those countries the suspicion that the developed countries give their preference to direct aid, which is politically manipulable and easy to maintain at a desired level, rather than to an organization of markets based upon mutual interest which would give developing countries great security in their political development. As far as we are concerned, we would see no difficulty in each of the developing countries choosing the kind of aid that is best suited to its national temperament and best suited to its particular possibilities. What appears to be totally revolting to us is the permanent deficit -- in our eyes deliberately maintained -- of aid to development in relation to our needs and also the lion's share of the benefits drawn by the developed countries from international exchanges which takes the form of different development of prices for manufactured products on the one hand, and for raw materials on the other.

How else are we to interpret this attitude of the part of the developed countries -- which are also the principal consumers -- with regard to the financing of regulative stock, the keystone of an effective organization in the marketing of cocoa. Only adequate financing on the part of the developed countries could convince the developing countries of the determination of the developed countries to make international trade an effective stimulant in the development of the under-developed countries.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

The failure of the Cocoa Conference is not the only subject for concern which we see in the attitude of the developed countries vis-à-vis UNCTAD. Generally speaking all, thus far, have only tipped their hats to the principles stated by that organ. With the lucidity and the courage we all know him to possess, the Secretary-General has again indicated where the responsibility lies. He said that the slowness of progress made in the implementation of practically each of the recommendations of the first conference of UNCTAD -- without excepting the recommendations adopted unanimously -- seems to be in part due to that preoccupation which the countries have over their immediate and relatively narrow interests.

Of course, we know full well, since La Rochefoucauld, that interest speaks many languages and that it is most frequently behind the acts of States, like individuals, and that it has little to do with the great principles proclaimed in charters. But how can we keep from feeling a certain frustration when we see how far the cup is from our lips at such a decisive moment in the history of mankind? I think it is time for all of us to make our acts and our words accord because the interests involved, after all, as history has amply shown, are those of mankind as a whole.

If we are disappointed by the results accomplished thus far in the framework of the Development Decade, we cannot deny the importance of the initiatives that have been born of it. Indeed we must be gratified with the creation of the UNDP, UNCTAD, the World Food Programme, the Institute for Research and Development, the regional development banks in Africa and Asia, etc. But what is most positive in the field of international co-operation, of course, is without a doubt the spirit and the very methods that have been introduced by the Development Decade in international relations. As was stressed by the representative of Canada at the last session of the Economic and Social Council, the virtually universal acceptance of its objectives represents in itself a step forward and exercises an influence both on the work of the organs of the United Nations and on the national policy of governments. It converts the struggle against underdevelopment into something which is the business of each and all, a concrete field for experimentation in human solidarity, and not only implies the highly stimulating idea of evaluation of the contribution of each to the common task of emancipating man from the servitudes of hunger, ignorance, disease, but, above all, represents a step in the direction of fixed objectives.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

We also hail as a positive initiative the establishment of UNOID. That marks the end, we must hope, of the gratuitous theory that the mission of our countries must be limited to agriculture and the supplying of raw materials to the industrialized countries. UNOID must contribute to accelerating the industrialization of the developing countries. All progress in those countries -- and even the most backward economists admit this today -- must intimately be linked to industrial development, without which there can be no possible "take-off" of the economy nor any rapid growth in the productivity of work. The very multiplicity of institutions arising from the Development Decade and undertaking the achievement of its objectives poses in an ever-greater fashion the problem of the co-ordination of the United Nations activities in the field of development. Indeed, it appears to us necessary that the rationalization work resulting from the United Nations Development Programme should be pursued in order to avoid duplication and in order to leave in place only bodies meeting real needs and having effective means of action.

But if co-ordination is desirable, **excesses** must nevertheless be prevented. Excessive centralization could bog down the action of the development organs of the United Nations -- organs that we wish to see flexible, quick-acting and effective within the meandering paths of a bureaucracy. No matter what solutions are retained, we are convinced of the necessity to maintain, if not to enlarge, the autonomy of the regional commissions. The results already achieved by those commissions are, in general, remarkable. Closer to the problems confronting our countries, they are more capable of translating into concrete programmes our aspirations to development and to the organization of indispensable regional co-operation.

Indeed, we feel that regional co-operation is capable of making a decisive contribution to the development of national economies. The struggle against underdevelopment requires the co-ordination of the efforts of the developing countries themselves, in order to join to external assistance and modern techniques of production the structures that are adequate and the optimum conditions of efficiency and in order to rationalize their process of industrialization. That is why we have established the Economic and Customs Union of Central Africa. That institution, which already has to its credit encouraging achievements, will at the

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

appropriate time be harmoniously inserted within the sub-regional structures of Central Africa under the management of the ECA. For it is not a question of organizing for selfish purposes, but, rather, of enabling the universal effort of mankind to emerge from underdevelopment, of leaning on a series of ever-more concrete circles of solidarity.

The problem of development must from now on be of concern to us collectively and individually, in a world in which technical progress is accelerating unification at a dizzy pace. It would be a grave error for the developed countries to go on thinking that what is involved is charity when we appeal for their contributions in the struggle against underdevelopment. What is involved is, not charity, but man's responsibility to his fellow man, a supreme duty of solidarity, without which there can be no hope for humanity.

In an impressive statement, full of significance, His Holiness Pope Paul VI recently said that development is peace. Indeed, the peace of the world is inseparable from the reign of justice, and injustice is incompatible with universal brotherhood, which is the final aim of this Organization. It is incomprehensible that the large developed countries, animated by an outmoded desire for power, should continue to spend enormous sums for atomic or conventional weapons, or for wars about which the least that can be said is that they are without result -- in a word, for destructive work -- and that they should be less concerned about accomplishing their duty to see mankind develop -- each man and every man, as François Perroux said.

We are well aware that humanity is not yet morally ripe for a worldwide tax for development; yet that is the inevitable consequence for our community in the world of today. But how can one resist the temptation of citing to this august Assembly the magnificent gesture of the Shah of Iran, the sovereign of an underdeveloped country, who recently offered to UNESCO the equivalent of the military expenditure of his Government for one day? The theoreticians of European socialism have time and again emphasized the moral superiority of the proletariat over the self-satisfied bourgeois of the developed societies. Must it be thought today that the underdeveloped countries, the proletariat of international

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

society, from now on must hold up the torch of the highest ideals of humanity? If that idea fills us with pride, it is nevertheless a privilege which we would joyfully share with all men of goodwill, for the stake is so important and our destinies are henceforth so linked together that we can never make too many mutual efforts to restore hope to mankind. However, whatever may be the echoes of this gesture by the Shah of Iran within the universal conscience, it remains true that new methods must be found to ensure that the second half of the Development Decade will be a success and that the majority of mankind may finally envisage the possibility of a world in which man will regain all his dignity, a world rid of injustice, hunger, ignorance and disease, this brotherly world which all of us most ardently desire.

These methods can emerge only from an honest dialogue within this Organization. Of course, the developed countries must agree to renewed efforts in proportion to the needs of the non-committed world. Of course, the rationalization and co-ordination of the economic bodies of the United Nations are conditions essential to the effectiveness of their action towards development. But it may perhaps be necessary as from now to think of giving the Development Decade a basic philosophy indispensable to its success. The result of that could be a limitation on its initial ambitions, but there would certainly be a gain in effectiveness.

It is far from our intention to claim here and now to give a definition of such a philosophy. Nevertheless, I should like to share with the Assembly some ideas which we regard as basic in this connexion.

Any dispersal of efforts is always harmful to any human undertaking. We feel that it is desirable to apply the resources at the disposal of the Development Decade to specific and limited projects, chosen so far as possible in a way to exercise an educational effect on the national economies of the developing countries. In that connexion, UNOID could play a valuable role in the choice of such projects, to the extent that the latter will be above all industrial, since industry lends itself more to such ends. Of course, there is no question of minimizing the importance of other aspects of development, including the infra-structural equipment. But in our opinion that should be left to the Equipment Fund, which would deal with such long-term projects, as opposed to the Development Decade, which must basically envisage an immediate and considerable increase in the standard of living of the developing countries.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroon)

Since the creation of new liquidity within the framework of the reform of the international monetary system is involved, we would add that in our opinion the creation of such liquidity can have no real value unless it is conceived as a supplementary method of assisting the developing countries in their efforts to break the vicious circle of underdevelopment.

In that connexion, we believe that the new liquidity must serve in the first place to finance the sector of equipment, which would result in accelerating the "take-off" of our economies, while at the same time considerably improving our balance of payment. Indeed, the fundamental objective remains the same: to engender, by the appropriate machinery of solidarity, a transfer of the true resources of the developed countries, taken as a whole, to the developing countries.

I am about to conclude.

I have tried to summarize our principal difficulties and to the extent possible to diagnose the deep illness: the anachronism between the principles of the Charter and the machinery established for their implementation.

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroun)

Thus in Africa apartheid continues, the Republic of South Africa has seized South West Africa by force with the blessing, which no one can understand, of the International Court of Justice; war and violence are becoming more and more widespread, the Secretary-General of the United Nations has resigned out of discouragement and impotence, the Development Decade is stagnating and even going backward and the economic situation of the small countries is making no improvement at all.

Nevertheless, there was a strong current of enthusiasm over the twentieth anniversary celebration of the United Nations because twenty years is sufficient time for one to proceed to some reflection and calm judgment. Those twenty years show quite clearly how short is the memory of man. In fact in 1966, some twenty years after 1942, the latter year, which is really quite close, nevertheless seems far away. Yet in 1942, at the famous Atlantic Conference, the world was divided into two camps: that of law and justice, in other words of good and that of racial superiority, brute force and violence; in other words, of evil.

It was because of this division that the great principles of our Charter were founded and solemnly written for posterity. But very soon it all fell into disuse, and that is why we find ourselves confronted with our present difficulties.

The remedy is nevertheless very simple. Let us examine our consciences together; let us go back again to the Charter. Let us meditate upon its noble and solemn preamble which I should like to quote once again:

"We the people of the United Nations determined

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and
to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

(Mr. Bindzi, Cameroun)

"And for these ends

to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and
to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and
to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and
to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,".

I know, moreover, that each of the representatives present here knows this text by heart. I say that the remedy is in this preamble because it must be recognized today that the machinery which was established after this preamble had as a result the neutralization of the lofty objectives set forth there. To err is human.

Thus is it so difficult that once we recognize our mistakes, and basing ourselves on such recognition as on a lever, according to the eternal principles of Archimedes, we put an end to the evils of our century?

Thus, in our turn, we would be like those angels in the song of those blessed spirits, and we would sing that we are blessed spirits which have come down from our heavenly thrones to show ourselves on earth. Having seen the world delivered to such evils and waging such a cruel war for such futile motives, we wish to show those who have strayed how pleased Our Lord would be if the nations of the world would lay down their arms and live in peace.

The PRESIDENT: The last speaker inscribed on my list this morning is His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Guatemala. However, due to the lateness of the hour, he has agreed to make his statement tomorrow.

The General Assembly will meet again at 10.30 tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.