

them the Palestinian people, or in the absence of the rest of the international community. Developments have led us to believe that the United States by itself cannot exert a constructive influence in achieving a just settlement and the establishment of a durable peace as long as its policy is committed to supporting Israel by all political and material means and by supplying armaments, while Israel persists in refusing total withdrawal and the recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people on their national soil, as well as respecting the rights of all States in the region to live in peace and security.”...

King Hussein of Jordan, then stated: “If the Israeli forces withdraw completely, then the world community can arrange a smooth and lawful transfer of authority and responsibility to the people of the occupied territories—those living there now as well as those who belong there—through internationally recognized and voluntary means.”...

If the world community accepted those basic principles, which were indispensable for a just peace, then the way would be open for their implementation in a reasonable and appropriate manner. The Arab parties had in the past accepted the idea of an international conference in which the Arab parties would be represented by a unified delegation under United Nations auspices. During the past months, he had personally called for taking the problem back to the Security Council with the purpose of agreeing on a formula for implementing these accepted principles which should underlie a settlement. They were also ready to consider suggestions “from any quarter” with regard to the implementation of a just settlement, so long as they abided by the principle of withdrawal and an equitable solution of the Palestine question. The United Nations, its Charter, its flag and its successive resolution, were the natural framework for the achievement of the comprehensive settlement.

The Arab countries today had sufficient confidence in themselves to consider all suggestions and ideas leading to a just peace. They were fully capable of consultations and co-operation among themselves as well as with the rest of the world for the achievement of peace. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), through its international activities and announced positions in recent months, had proven that it wanted to participate, in the name of the Palestinian people which it represents, in steps leading to a just peace.

Jordan was cooperating in good faith with the leadership of the PLO and with the rest of the Arab countries.

“Our cause,” said the King, “is inseparable from the cause of the new world economic order, from the cause of détente, from the cause of those struggling against colonialism and international domination, from the cause of economic progress.”

---

## Secretary Vance: 'Progress not inevitable'

---

*In a speech that shocked many United Nations delegations for its blunt and unequivocal pessimism, U.S. Secretary of State Vance told the General Assembly that the problems facing the world may not have solutions. Rapid technological development—too rapid, Vance implied—as well as food shortages, the energy crisis, environmental problems, and the threat of World War III may overwhelm the human race in the next decade. Although “progress is possible,” intoned Vance, it is by no means “inevitable.” Ignoring the European and Nonaligned calls for reshaping the world monetary system, Vance sent instead an unmistakable signal. The U.S. will demand an expansion of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, he said.*

*On international diplomacy, Vance took a similar position of refusing to negotiate. He insisted that the discredited Camp David accords are the only basis for settling the Middle East conflict, for instance, and he said that the southern Africa crisis must remain in the hands of the British Government.*

*Again and again, Vance urged the delegations to be “realistic,” to dampen their expectations, and to avoid rancor. “We must resist the voices of international confrontation.... We must not react now in frustration, and unleash a spiral of rhetoric which can dampen rather than resolve our divisions.” But, said many delegates, Vance’s speech indeed creates legitimate grounds for frustration.*

Mr. President:

We meet in this General Assembly on the threshold of a new decade.

It will be a time of complex challenge ... a period in which, more than ever, cooperative endeavors among nations are a matter not only of idealism, but of direct self-interest.

The decade now drawing to a close has been characterized by rapid change—far-reaching and fundamental.

- Awesome technological developments are all about us.
- The assertion of national independence has reshaped the political geography of our planet.
- Within nations, we see an accelerating rise in individual economic, political and social expectations.
- The unrelenting hostility of the Cold War has given way to a more complex relationship between East

and West, with elements of both competition and cooperation.

- The simple notion of a bipolar world has become obsolete. Increasingly there is a profusion of different systems and allegiances, and a diffusion of political and military power.

- The world economic order is also undergoing inexorable transformations. Many nations, formerly among the disadvantaged, now are achieving global economic power. Economic interdependence has become a daily reality for the citizens of every nation.

These sweeping changes have, for the most part, worked in constructive directions—changing lives for the better and opening new possibilities for collective effort and creative diplomacy.

But while these developments demonstrate that progress is possible, they by no means demonstrate that it is inevitable. I say this for two reasons.

First, in a number of areas, the pace of current progress is dwarfed by the scope of coming challenges.

The next decade will decide whether we have the collective wisdom and the common will to surmount a series of imposing and interrelated problems which must be dealt with in a comprehensive manner.

- The need to develop new forms of energy will pose a continuing challenge. We have entered the difficult transition from a petroleum economy to one based on other forms of energy.

- Even without this added burden, we face an imposing task in providing for the basic needs of people and in narrowing the combustible disparity between wealth and despair. The food shortage facing developing countries, for example, was 12 million tons in 1975. It could be 70-85 million tons by 1990, unless productivity rises sharply.

- We must strike a decent balance between the burgeoning demands of more people for a better life, and the inescapable reality of a fragile environment.

- Such prospects carry the seeds of future discord. As these seeds ripen, and the growth and spread of weapons continue, regional conflicts become all the more dangerous—in their toll of lives and resources and in the heightened risk of wider confrontation.

- And despite our emergence from the days of unrelenting hostility, the East-West relationship can deteriorate dangerously whenever one side fails to respect the security interests of the other.

Our ability to meet these tests depends on a second issue: Will we confront such challenges together, and benefit together? Or will we let adversity divide us, and thus conquer? I must be frank to say that I am not sure what the answer will be....

North and South have made progress on financial, trade and commodity issues—far more progress than has been acknowledged. Agreement has been reached on a sharp increase in the resources of the International

Monetary Fund. Lending by the multilateral development banks has increased. Expanded trade opportunities have been opened by the recently concluded trade negotiations. We have moved ahead on other matters such as international debt and a common fund for commodities. We should recognize such progress, and build on it....

Beyond the search for peace, a second responsibility we share is to be sensitive to the international consequences of our national economic decisions, and resist the temptation to solve our economic problems at the expense of others.

The imprudence of economic nationalism has been harshly demonstrated in the past. The world depression a half-century ago was spread, deepened and prolonged by a wave of protectionism. That memory has spurred us towards a new multilateral trade agreement intended to open markets and keep them open, even in a time of economic strain.

Today, let me address one of those issues which most clearly reflect the direct connection between national decisions and global consequences. That issue is energy. In almost no area is the need for common action more apparent or more urgent. It is an issue which now threatens to divide us, economically and politically. In a future of greater scarcity, these divisions could weaken the fabric of international comity which this organization embodies....

Until the 1970's modern industrial economies operated on two basic assumptions, which also governed relations between oil importers and exporters—that oil is cheap and that supplies are unlimited. Now all nations realize that these assumptions no longer hold....

To meet this commitment to a better life for all peoples, we must each strive to move the North-South dialogue beyond grand themes and on to specific cases—to priority areas in which practical development goals can be met. Let me discuss in this connection our efforts toward a goal we should adopt as a matter of simple humanity: that by the end of this century, no person on this bountiful earth should have to go hungry.

Last year, I noted that we must not be lulled by good weather and plentiful harvests into losing our sense of urgency.

Since then, poor harvests in a number of countries have substantially increased the international demand for food. This situation underscores the need to accumulate adequate stocks to support world food security....

If new global negotiations are to succeed, their participants must be realistic about the political and economic capabilities of each other. We must assign priority to those issues on which concrete results are possible. And we should avoid duplicating the work of existing institutions. In this way, the negotiations could help build a global consensus for action....