

sanity of the renowned statesman and gratefully received the apologies of U.S. Labor Party representatives for his gross misrepresentation of the views and interests of the American people.

Forlani Replies to Kissinger

The speech by Italian Foreign Minister Forlani hit back at Kissinger's warmongering. On the Middle East and Africa, in particular, Forlani indicated clearly that Italian policy differs sharply from that of the U.S. under Kissinger direction. Forlani pointedly delivered his response to Kissinger's Africa policy by using as an example of Italy's "spirit of openmindedness and friendly cooperation with the developing countries" the visit to Rome of Angolan Prime Minister Lopo do Nascimento. While in Rome, at a press conference, Nascimento gave full endorsement to the call issued at the UN by Guyana Foreign Minister Wills for immediate debt moratoria and replacement of the IMF system with an alternative structure of "international development banks." On the Middle East, Forlani gave full support to a process of peace in Lebanon, warning that the failure to achieve that "involves obvious risks of repercussions on a larger scale which would be difficult to control." He linked a solution to the Lebanon crisis to a wider settlement of the Middle East crisis including support for the Palestinian movement.

French Foreign Minister Tries Scare

In a press conference at the UN Sept. 29, a frightened French

Foreign Minister Louis de Guiringaud reacted with empty bluster to a question about Guyana's support for Third World unilateral action on debt. "I don't believe that the developing countries will declare unilateral debt moratoria," he said bravely. "They would kill themselves by doing so. They would kill any possibility of credit for themselves or anyone else." With imperial candor, he then revealed to his audience that the Third World's debt problems "are due to defective structures in the developing countries."

In discussions at the UN, diplomats from the Third World indicated that they were either committed themselves to initiating unilateral action on debt, or — in some cases — to explore the possibility of such action. The deadlocked Paris North-South talks have become an object of derision by Third World delegates, and deep anger at the Kissinger-led refusal to discuss general moratoria is on the verge of being catalyzed into action, with Wills' speech on Monday setting the tone. "If we were pushed to the wall," said an Asian Diplomat, weighing the situation, "then we have no choice."

A broad layer of developing countries is that group which, while not ready to take the lead in dumping their debt, will quickly follow a handful that do. The example cited of this group is Egypt. One Arab delegate, noting that Egypt has de facto instituted a quiet moratorium on its huge debt, said, "If others move, I know Egypt will follow the next day."

Guyanese Foreign Minister:

"The Time Has Come For A Debt Moratorium"

Mr. President:

We are fortunate at this time to have you in the Chair where your long experience can so significantly assist in guiding our deliberations during this momentous session of the General Assembly. It is fitting, too, that your country, Sri Lanka, which has been charged with the task of coordinating the affairs of the Non-Aligned Movement, should provide an essential link to facilitate here at the United Nations the implementation of the mature decisions taken at Colombo. I entertain every hope that this Assembly will not be caught below the level of events and the results of our deliberations will reflect those tenets of justice for which we all strive.

Mr. President, it also gives me particular pleasure to welcome into our midst the new State, the Seychelles. We look forward to working with them in the years ahead in this organization in advancing the objectives of peace, security and development.

Mr. President, this session of the United Nations General Assembly, I feel, will go down in history as one of significance and importance to the question of freedom in southern Africa. As this question so well illustrates, all the difficulties which confront us in the contemporary international system can be traced to the strategic dilemma which faced the victorious powers at the conclusion of the Second World War. It was clear after Potsdam that the gravest threat to peace was the defence perceptions of those who saw the world in terms of an ideological confrontation between so-called free and unfree societies. This legacy informed all the important changes in the world since 1945—the Chinese revolution, the Algerian revolution, the Cuban revolution, the Vietnam revolution. Wherever a people strove to end the process of exploitation and to devise strategies of development that would increase their control over their natural resources, and to fully realize their

human dignity—wherever these existed the issues were approached from a standpoint of elimination or expansion of socialism. Looking back on this period we may well wonder at the prodigious expenditure of life-energy over matters of terminology and nomenclature.

The Rhodesian rebel leader Ian Smith said in a broadcast on September 24 this year:

"Dr. Kissinger assured me that we shared a common aim and a common purpose, namely, to keep Rhodesia in the free world and to keep it from Communist penetration."

It is significant, Mr. President, that Smith did not say that the United States and Rhodesia shared a common aim that the black majority should be free and that its will should prevail. That after all—black majority rule—should be the common aim. If this session of the United Nations General Assembly achieves anything, and I feel sure that it will achieve much, its most outstanding contribution to progress on this planet could be the universal acceptance that the fight for freedom and material equality is waged at a level beyond the strategic imperatives of competing ideologies.

Mr. President, individual freedom has this characteristic: its claims are universal. I say emphatically, Mr. President, that neither the present position in Rhodesia nor the position envisaged by the Anglo-American proposals is consistent with any definition of freedom, with any definition of democracy, with any definition of justice. Guyana wishes to make its position clear. We completely endorse the action taken by the five frontline States of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania in reaffirming the sole conditions under which majority rule can be installed in Rhodesia through negotiation. Either Smith accepts these now or the war will be intensified until inevitable victory. It was perhaps asking too much that the Secretary of State of the

United States of America should succeed where other fearless tigers failed ignominiously. In the sense that we are told that the so-called Anglo-American proposals stem from a desire to prevent a racial war in southern Africa—in that sense I do not impugn the motives of the architects of those proposals. What I question is their judgment.

The character, the attitude, stubbornness and shortsightedness of the rebel in Rhodesia have been well documented. Here is a man who had defied international opinion for more than a decade, has been buttressed by international monopoly capital and who has vainly sought to suppress in Zimbabwe those very instincts that led in 1776 to the birth of the United States of America. George Washington was not told on the eve of victory that he would have freedom in two years; Patrick Henry was not told that the alternative to immediate liberty was temporary quasi-slavery. Yet here 200 years later a solution is offered to a problem of freedom that envisages transitional government with built in minority power structures, with cessation of armed struggle, with the lifting of sanctions and—"the most unkindest cut of all"—economic aid as a sweetener and incentive.

It is unreasonable to expect Ian Smith to negotiate power away from himself except when faced with the final acceptable casualty. It is equally unreasonable to expect the armed fighters of the majority to lay down their arms before the acquisition of majority rule. Those are the lessons of December 1974 and those are the lessons of September 1976.

But, Mr. President, Rhodesia, important though it is, is not at the heart of the southern African problem. To discuss the freedom of the majority in Rhodesia it is necessary to speak to Vorster; to install freedom in Namibia it is necessary to confront Vorster; and it is Vorster who temporarily rides roughshod over the majority in South Africa itself. The core of the entire problem of southern Africa is **apartheid**—the economic, political, social and ethical justification for what passes for government in southern Africa.

It is hoped that no assurances were given to South Africa, expressly or implicitly, in support of the **apartheid** system in order to facilitate the so-called negotiations with Ian Smith. Guyana remains resolutely opposed to **apartheid**, implacably opposed to the Bantustan system, and firmly determined to ostracize those who have sporting and cultural links with South Africa as long as this modern day version of slavery persists. So long as there is white minority rule, whether in South Africa or in any part of southern Africa, the people of Guyana will ally themselves with all opponents of that system and will support the liberation struggles of the oppressed majority.

It has been announced that the first of the Bantustans will be given a kind of portmanteau independence on October 26 of this year. Needless to say, Guyana will not recognize any such puppet creation. We are aware that there are some who will seek to justify some kind of recognition on tactical political grounds, or perhaps on military strategic grounds. At Colombo, 85 countries of the Non-Aligned Movement denounced this maneuver for what it is—a transparent fraud. We feel confident that the rest of the international community will do likewise.

The continuing conflagrations in the Middle East have increased the value of the communications routes around the Cape of Good Hope. This fact together with the mineral wealth of South Africa has blinkered the vision of those who pay lip service to their opposition to **apartheid**. How much longer can they indulge such sophistry in the face of the intensive struggle in South Africa and the brutal continuing slaughter perpetrated by a fascist government in the segregated areas of South Africa? Is it not ironic that the freedom of the majority in Zimbabwe

should be considered in dialogue with those who bring to the negotiating table hands stained with blood from the massacres in Sialola, Soweto and Capetown?

In Namibia where the illegal occupation still continues and where the South Africans are smarting from the trouncing they received in Angola, a so-called constitutional conference has been held. My delegation denounces this conference as having no meaningful relationship to the future of Namibia. We support South West Africa Peoples' Organization (SWAPO) as the legitimate representative of Namibia and the continuing efforts of the United Nations to obtain majority rule and independence within a single unitary state. Guyana supports the armed struggle in Namibia as the only viable option left to the oppressed majority. The Caprivi Strip, bristling with modern armaments, remains a threat to international peace. It must be dismantled. So long as it exists, so long will it remain an instrument of repression of the aspirations of the Namibian people, so long will it remain a base of operations against the front-line independent African States.

In the Middle East the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people remains the sine qua non of a just and lasting peace. Huddled in refugee camps, subjected to the crumbs of international compassion, the Palestinians still await the restoration and exercise of their inalienable national rights. My delegation expresses its profound concern over the situation prevailing in Lebanon and will continue to support all efforts aimed at terminating the fighting among brothers, restoring peace and safeguarding the unity, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon.

We reiterate that peace in the Middle East must rest on the implementation of three principles: first, the right of the Palestinian people to a homeland; secondly, the right of all States in the area, including Israel, to exist within boundaries that are universally recognized; and, thirdly, the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since June 1967.

Mr. President, recently the Non-aligned Movement held its Fifth Summit meeting at Colombo, Sri Lanka, in the Indian Ocean. Aware of the threat to the security of the States in the area posed by the concentration of naval and aerial strength in the Indian Ocean and on the communications route between the two greatest expanses of water in the world—the Atlantic and the Pacific—the Movement repeated its call that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace. My delegation reaffirms its conviction that the implementation of the declaration on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace would contribute substantially to the relaxation of international tensions.

Mr. President, speaking from this podium last year I ventured the opinion that in Cyprus the question of peace was related to the achievement of a consensus between the two communities without duress or coercion. Today, nearly a year later little if any progress has been made in the inter-communal talks; colonization of the northern part of Cyprus has proceeded apace; foreign armed forces, despite the unanimous call of the General Assembly, remain entrenched in the island. **Force majeure** predominates. The resolution that this Assembly adopted unanimously two years ago continues to provide the only valid framework for a solution to this problem. Let us ensure that during the course of this Assembly that appropriate action will be taken to implement the decisions we have already discussed, formed and sought to have implemented.

The tragedy of Cyprus, Mr. President, is the tragedy of the *interference by other States in the affairs of a small State*. Techniques of de-stabilization are being mobilized against Governments which seek to free their economies from the stranglehold of imperialist control—Governments which seek to

create systems of development which would abolish hunger, disease and poverty, which would restructure their societies so as to provide their peoples with the quality of life for which they yearn. Mr. President, the immediate objectives of such campaigns of de-stabilization are clear and unmistakable. They range from the comparatively unobtrusive change of key personnel to bloody events which sometimes culminate in such tragedies as the assassination of political leaders.

The techniques used are equally clear and unmistakable. The promotion of internal unrest with a view to the breakdown of law and order; the fomenting of intra-regional conflicts through client States; the financing and organization of hostile propaganda campaigns; the attacking of embassies and consulates; the manipulation of international markets; the restrictions on export capabilities; the frustration of bilateral and multilateral aid; the subversion of economic objectives by the machinations of transnational corporations — all this arsenal of destabilizing techniques is aimed in the first instance at ensuring the continuation of a relationship of dependency between developed and developing countries, and in the second instance at yoking the legitimate aspirations of the peoples in developing countries to the strategic conceptions of larger nations.

Mr. President, most of the countries in the developing world were former colonies of western Europe and the radicalization of their liberation struggle has therefore been in anti-West terms. This does not necessarily mean that those terms are pro-East. Similarly, Mr. President, most of these countries have adopted socialism as an internal strategy of development. This likewise does not indicate that they are anti-West or pro-East. At Colombo the golden thread running through all the resolutions and discussions was the determination of 85 countries not to sacrifice their sovereignty and independence on the altar of ideological nicety. Mr. President, we of the Non-Aligned Movement have in effect chosen not to be for one side or the other. We have chosen to be ourselves. At Colombo Non-aligned countries denounced all forms of interference and emphasized the need for unremitting vigilance in this regard. Here in New York at this 31st session of the General Assembly I call on the Assembly to denounce these activities and I urge the international community to consider in earnest measures to safeguard the integrity and sovereignty of small States and to discourage all attempts to interfere with their right to pursue the paths they have freely chosen for themselves. This, after all, is one of the fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter to which we all subscribe.

But Mr. President, the security of developing States is inextricably linked with their economic survival and their economic advance. My delegation feels that there can be no meaningful economic advance without the implementation of the New International Economic Order as adopted at the Sixth Special Session. The Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77—have tirelessly sought to bring home to those in the developed world ever resistant to change, that the economic progress of the developing countries is in the security interests of the developed countries. The billions on this planet who live in the developing countries and whose existence is subjected to the constraints of the few who manipulate to their advantage the present day economic system, have pinned their hopes on the modest programme put forward in Nairobi and elsewhere. Their determination is adamant, inexorable and relentless. The IMF and the Bretton-Woods monetary system must give way to alternative structures like international development banks, which are not geared to the revival and reconstruction of Europe nor preferential arrangements for the developed

market economies, but rather to the just distribution of the gains of an equitable global system.

The crippling problem of debt and the servicing of debt has assumed a special urgency. Developing countries cannot afford to depart from their basic and fundamental demand made in Manila and Colombo earlier this year calling for measures of cancellation, rescheduling and the declaration of moratoria. We must eschew all attempts to deal with this problem by the divisive tactics of a case by case approach. We cannot afford to mortgage the future of unborn generations to the obligations of burdensome capital repayments and crushing debt servicing. The time has come for a debt moratorium.

Mr. President, on the important question of commodities, we reaffirm our unwavering commitment to the integrated programme. We therefore deplore the equivocations on the part of some developed countries in respect of the negotiations to be held on the establishment of a Common Fund for bigger stocks which remains the cornerstone of a viable integrated program. While we naturally hope for a change of attitude on the part of these countries during the forthcoming negotiations within the framework of UNCTAD to permit the establishment of a Fund supported by all countries—both developed and developing—we are firmly committed to proceeding with the establishment of a Fund as advocated by the Non-aligned countries should the forthcoming negotiations fail to yield satisfactory results.

Mr. President, the Paris Conference on International Economic Cooperation, although hailed by some as the ideal forum for producing definitive solutions to the crucial international economic issues has, after months of debate, produced only halting and insignificant progress. My delegation therefore fully endorses the concern expressed by the Non-aligned Summit in Colombo over the slow progress made at the Conference. I wish to reiterate my delegation's well-known scepticism about the attempt to find solutions to the critical international economic issues outside the framework of the U.N. system such as is being attempted in Paris. Instead, Mr. President, my Government considers that the United Nations is the legitimate forum for the settlement of such issues.

Mr. President, there is a clear need for restructuring and technically improving the United Nations system. Basically the United Nations is a political organization and changes must reflect the political realities. If the Security Council is to become more effective, its authority must not be diminished by the misuse of the veto in the service of narrow national interests. The early admission of the Peoples Republic of Angola and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam would mark and advance the universality of the membership of the United Nations and would enable it to deal more effectively with the global issues that confront mankind.

Non-aligned countries have always insisted on the importance of the United Nations as an effective instrument for promoting international peace and security and for harmonizing the interests and objectives of its Member States. The work of its various organs constitutes a coordinated attempt to shape the future for the better condition of mankind on this revolving planet of ours.

In the onward march of Man there have been many obstacles, many hurdles. There have been many Vorsters; Smiths have abounded. We must not assign the attributes of victory to an ignominious surrender to false perceptions of defence.

Peoples against whom the doors of meaningful negotiations have been closed have no other recourse but to resort to arms. The bell is tolling in southern Africa. The last call to prevent the bloodbath has died away, buffeted by the winds of insincerity.

Soon — very soon — majority rule will prevail throughout southern Africa. Those who have sought to temporize and accommodate with the forces of oppression and reaction must heed these basic truths. Those who have died in this struggle have hallowed the ground beyond any powers of oratory and rhetoric. Guyana reaffirms here at this 31st session of the General Assembly its untiring support for those who strive for justice in southern Africa, for those who strive for the removal

of racism as an ethos of government, for those who strive for the reaffirmation of the authority and respect of the United Nations organization, and for those who would perceive the unfolding logic of events. History is not side-tracked by spec-taculars. The internal dynamics of the progress of mankind are dictating the results in southern Africa. We are proud to identify with those dynamics.

I thank you, Mr. President.

Forlani: Italy Convinced of Need for New World Economic Order

The following are excerpts from the speech of Italian Foreign Minister Arnaldo Forlani before the 31st session of the United Nations General Assembly Oct. 1:

Mr. President,

In speaking for the first time from this rostrum in my new capacity as Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Italian Republic, I wish to convey to you, also on behalf of the Government of which I have the honour to be a part, the warmest congratulations on your election to the Presidency of the United Nations General Assembly....

It is in our opinion particularly significant that such an eminent international personality has been chosen to discharge the highest responsibilities of the thirty-first session of this Assembly, the Representative of a country known and appreciated for its active and incisive work on behalf of the strengthening of peace and the development of world cooperation.

This year, the Republic of Sri Lanka has rightly occupied the centre of world attention for the dignified and successful way it organized and acted as host for the Fifth Summit Conference of Non-aligned Countries.

My Government has followed carefully the work of this important meeting and has noted its conclusions with great interest.

In recent years world history has evolved more and more into a single pattern in which all States, the various economic systems, and the prospects of progress and peace for all peoples of the world are united in interdependence.

Italy is convinced of the need, which was also stressed at Colombo, to achieve a new international economic order which will allow every nation to follow the path of development most appropriate for its own requirements and traditions and to enjoy a fair share of the world process of the production and distribution of goods. This objective will be attained only in an economic system in which the basic problems of raw materials, trade, the indebtedness of the developing countries and the transfer of technology have been solved.

An essential component of this new international economic order is the development of the emerging countries. Italy, within the framework of the European Community, but also in its own right, intends to continue making every possible effort to ensure progress in this direction.

In particular, we intend to continue giving our financial and political support to the initiatives taken by the United Nations in favour of development.

We support those programmes in the emerging countries which are designed to promote the balanced development of the economy, i.e. which promote not only the expansion of the in-

dustrial sector, but also are aimed at achieving a modern agricultural sector capable of ensuring self-sufficiency in food....

Italy, in agreement with the other countries of the European Community, will continue to make an active and concrete contribution to the establishment of an equitable and stable system of international economic relations, working in the various appropriate forums and primarily in UNCTAD and other United Nations bodies, as well as in the Conference on International Economic Cooperation.

The field of international economic relations is, in our opinion, and I want to stress it, one where the United Nations and its dependent bodies have an essential role to play, a role which we think should be strengthened, extended and deepened.

This spirit of open-mindedness and friendly cooperation with the developing countries has just been significantly reaffirmed by my Government on the occasion of the welcome visit to Rome of the Prime Minister of Angola, Mr. Lopo do Nascimento.

A condition which is necessary — though not sufficient in itself — to bring about the desirable strengthening of the role of the United Nations in this as in other fields of the Organization is the **universality** of the United Nations. Further progress has been made also this year towards the achievement of this goal with the admission of a new member, the Republic of the Seychelles, to which the Italian Government wishes, through me, to convey its warmest greetings hoping at the same time that other countries, whose aspirations are well known, will soon be able to join the Organization....

The Italian Government, Parliament and public opinion are deeply concerned at the tragic events which have brought mourning and ruin to a country (Lebanon-ed.) to which Italy has been and remains linked by ancient ties of solidarity and friendship.

In Lebanon there has continued for too long a situation which is further undermining security in an already very troubled region and which involves obvious risks of repercussions on a larger scale which would be difficult to control. Also in accord with other countries of the European Community, we have done our utmost to encourage every initiative to secure a truce and to support all efforts to settle the crisis, particularly those undertaken by the Arab League. The process of political settlement of this crisis can be started only if based on respect for the unity, integrity and independence of Lebanon which, in our opinion, are essential for the establishment of a just and balanced peace in the Middle East....

Now that President Sarkis has assumed the office of Head of State, I wish to confirm Italy's hope that the convergence of views necessary to achieve a truce and the beginning of a process of détente and peace may be built up, in a new climate, around his person.