

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1530th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 21 June 1967,  
at 3 p.m.

**FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION**

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 5:</i>	
<i>Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/6717) (continued) . . .</i>	1

**President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ**  
(Afghanistan).

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/6717) (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the first speaker this afternoon, I should like again to refer to the question of the inscription of speakers for the general debate. In my statement yesterday morning, I referred to this matter, which is of importance to the organization of our work. Most of the delegations that have inscribed their names on the list have done so in several places, thus making it very difficult to finalize the order of speakers. In order to remedy the situation, the Assembly may wish to decide, first, that no delegation be inscribed on the list more than twice; and second, that not more than two delegations be inscribed in the same place on the list at any one meeting.

2. I am sure representatives will agree that this procedure will be mutually beneficial to them and to the President in planning our work. The President will have to follow the order in which the names are inscribed. If any delegations wish to change places with other delegations, it is up to them to reach an agreement among themselves.

3. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the procedure that I have just outlined.

*It was so decided.*

4. Mr. MGONJA (Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania): This special session of the General Assembly has been convened specifically in order to deal with the serious threat to world peace and security arising from the recent conflict in the Middle East. The modern world had become so small that what used to be a general assertion that a threat to peace in one part of the globe is also a threat to peace in the rest of the world, has now become a grim reality in the international scene. People all over the world have been alarmed by this dangerous situation and international consultation has become urgent and indispensable.

5. The maintenance of world peace and security is a cardinal principle envisioned in the Charter of the United Nations. Consequently, we are here gathered from all parts of the world in order to register our points of view on the issue and also to endeavour to find ways to normalize the situation.

6. This Assembly, together with its various committees, has, over the years, gathered a substantial volume of irrefutable evidence showing the close collusion between capitalist exploitation and the policy of world imperialism practiced by some Powers. Any close analysis of troubled areas in the world today is sure to reveal the deep involvement of imperialist, and capitalist interests. Thus, for example, it is becoming increasingly clear to the world now that the same Powers and interests which sustain Portuguese fascist colonialism in Africa, the racist régime in Rhodesia and the apartheid racist system in South Africa, are the very same Powers and interests which lie behind the policy of territorial aggrandizement and ominous adventures in the Middle East.

7. In order to maintain their monopoly over wealth and material resources, the imperialist Powers use every means, including the humiliation of popular régimes and the waging of war against national liberation movements. In the view of the Tanzania delegation, the tragic events in the Middle East cannot be viewed in complete isolation from those which have caused untold suffering in Viet-Nam and in other parts of the Third World.

8. It is clear to us that the imperialist Powers and their capitalist interests pursue a policy of ruthless racial discrimination and suppression as well as attempting to subject a large section of mankind to perpetual economic degradation. And yet, we have lately heard too much protest aimed at denying the collusion of imperialist Powers against nationalist and progressive movements in the Middle East. Such denials may be acceptable in certain quarters where it is fashionable not to call a spade a spade, but in spite of the wealth and the propaganda machine at the disposal of the imperialist Powers, it is not easy for them to hide the truth of their collusion from the world. There has been open rejoicing displayed in some countries in the wake of the bitter agony which resulted from the latest developments in the Middle East. This fact does not only betray the stand of the countries concerned on the issue, but it also reveals their alarming disrespect for humanity.

9. Tanzania's view on this crisis is firm and even, and is based on the assessment of the facts of the developments in the area over a period of time. Tanzania has always endeavoured to maintain friendly relations with all the States in the region. It was in

the light of this spirit of goodwill to all that Tanzania had recognized Israel and, at the same time, Tanzania vigorously pursued and maintained fraternal and cordial relations with the Arab States. The Government and people of Tanzania cannot be accused of anti-Israel prejudices or hostility. It is possible we might have been persuaded to have a more lenient view if perhaps we could take the recent Israeli military adventures as an isolated incident, the only incident in the history of the relations between Israel and its neighbours and an accident which was the outcome of a desperate act of self-defence on the part of Israel. But do we honestly conceive this to be the true position? To answer this question, let us consult the evidence of history in the relationship of Israel and its Arab neighbours. Since its creation, Israel has undertaken one after another a series of acts designed to suppress the consolidation of the independence of the people of the Middle East. Israel, faithful to the interests of international imperialism, has time and again menaced the security of its neighbours. It has refused to implement the various resolutions on the armistice. It has refused even to honour its minimum human responsibility towards the refugees. It has also accustomed itself to the use of military adventures as an instrument of territorial expansion.

10. I do not wish to take much of your valuable time to list the various United Nations decisions in response to these aggressive acts. These sad episodes are so well known to members, that they require no further elucidation on our part. It is, therefore, clear, as an objective analysis of the historical facts will reveal, that these most recent events in the Middle East are not isolated. They form part of a pattern which ought not to escape the attention of all freedom- and peace-loving peoples of the world, and especially of the Third World and the United Nations as a whole.

11. It will be vividly recalled that, in 1956, Israel committed an act of aggression against the United Arab Republic. Recent events, therefore, constitute a part of the same trend whereby Israel behaves menacingly towards its neighbours.

12. The events of early June in the Middle East require the serious attention, again especially of the Afro-Asian nations. It is a well-known fact and a now open secret that the movement of United States and British military forces in the Eastern Mediterranean as well as the Red Sea whether by accident or by design, served as a cover-up, especially when the timing of the movement of the naval might of these two Powers not only constituted an open threat to the Arab countries, but, more important still, indicated an act of intimidation and mobilization in favour of Israel.

13. Small Member States, particularly those of Africa, Asia and Latin America, should take note of the use to which military force is put as an instrument of territorial expansion. One of the striking features which has accompanied the growth of Israel has been the use to which armed forces are put as a means of territorial expansion. This is a dangerous phenomenon in the relations between States. It is an instructive example to irredentist States. It is also a betrayal of international practice, and certainly an unfortunate

episode which threatens the security and the territorial integrity of small nations.

14. The central provisions of the Charter are peace, human dignity and social progress. The first provision—peace—is to be secured by the outlawing of war and the reduction and eventual elimination of all weaponry save that required by the United Nations for the purpose of taking military measures. A corollary to these provisions is condemnation of aggression and non-recognition of the fruits of aggression.

15. The truth in this debate on aggression is revealed not so much by what was said, but by what was left unsaid. Nowhere in the statement of the representative of Israel do I understand that he has categorically asserted or admitted who fired the first shot; but it is clear from a careful reading of the record of events who did. The surprise pre-dawn attack upon civilian and military airports in neighbouring Arab States and the destruction on the ground of most of their aircraft was reminiscent of Pearl Harbour. The success of the ensuing five-day campaign in the Sinai Peninsula, the west bank of the Jordan and the south-western areas of Syria may be intoxicating, but does not justify hyperbolic prose and excessive self-congratulation.

16. The Syrian charge that Israel continued its military activities after the cease-fire order had been issued by the Security Council and, ostensibly, accepted by all parties is a most serious aspect of this question. It reveals an attitude and policy of flouting the United Nations. This attitude and policy have been evident since 1948. They have been repeated most recently in the negative response to the call for the present emergency session of the General Assembly.

17. The second of the central provisions of the Charter—human dignity—is the foundation of the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist struggle in the world. The charge that world-wide imperialist forces had conspired and prepared a plan of attack against Syria is not dispelled merely by denying a concentration of troops on the Israeli-Syrian border. Recalling the 1956 Suez conspiracy and the well-known patterns of behaviour of international imperialist forces, one appreciates the defensive reactions of the Arab States, which were evidently justified.

18. After careful examination of the issue, the Government of Tanzania has reached the conclusion that Israel has committed aggression against the Arab States. Furthermore, it is clear to us that Israel is always aided and abetted by the colonialist and imperialist Powers in its acts of aggression against the Arab States. Israeli aggression in collusion with imperialist Powers has been rightly condemned by progressive people all over the world. Tanzania is convinced that the Israeli policy of territorial expansion through aggression, which has brought untold suffering to millions of people, and particularly to the Arab people, must be abandoned at once. There can be no doubt that if this policy is allowed to continue, it will one day bring total disaster to Israel itself and engulf the rest of the world in another cruel war.

19. It would be the height of hypocrisy to expect the Arab States and people to resign themselves to the acceptance of a situation in which, time and again, additional territory of the Arab homeland is taken away from them by the military conquest of Israel and its supporters. Tanzania unequivocally condemns this outmoded policy of territorial gains through conquest which was typical of the nineteenth century era of gunboat diplomacy and imperialist and colonialist expansion. Tanzania will, therefore, not recognize the fruits of Israeli conquest in the Middle East and particularly condemns the occupation by force of parts of Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic.

20. This Assembly is faced with two very serious choices. It could stand aloof without registering its vehement opposition to the recent Israeli military incursions which are the subject of our discussion. On the other hand, bearing in mind the cardinal principles upon which our Organization is founded, the Assembly must not and cannot escape its responsibility; namely, to condemn in no uncertain terms the premeditated and wanton acts of aggression by Israel and its proud disregard of the United Nations Charter, which provides for the peaceful settlement of disputes which arise among Member States.

21. Now, do the Members of the United Nations wish nations to help themselves in these matters? Is that really our wish? Relations among nations have known the phase of gunboat diplomacy. We would have liked to think that the dark days of that brand of world politics has passed for ever. Yet, by its own actions early this month, Israel has promoted a dangerous phenomenon which seeks to reintroduce the law of the jungle into international affairs, and must not be allowed to escape from meeting the full measure of its responsibility.

22. My delegation, therefore, would not gloss over the fact that Israel has committed by its most recent acts a wanton aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. If this has, indeed, been an act of aggression, and since the United Nations cannot tolerate it, there is no other course consistent with a realistic attitude on our part than to condemn it in a most unmistakable manner.

23. The logical consequence of this would be to ask Israel to effect immediate withdrawal to the position it held before it embarked upon this military adventure. In other words, the territorial integrity of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, as is known in international law and by Members of this Organization, should be respected and restored forthwith. The people of the United Republic of Tanzania join with the people of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan in their legitimate demand to have their territorial rights restored. We are also conscious of the fact that, although Israel may rejoice in its recent military exploits, it has not won a comparable victory either politically or legally. On the contrary, it will be regarded by the present and coming generations not only as a trouble-maker but, worse still, as a breaker of international law and practice. This is certainly not a qualification for which any nation should strive.

24. We therefore appeal to Israel to co-operate with this Organization in ensuring that Israel does not

consider its boundaries as a temporary phenomenon which expand with the passage of time. Israel, too, should have an interest in the sanctity of international frontiers. It cannot be logical, legal or moral that, within a few days, the geographical area which is known to have constituted Israel can multiply through the occupation of other peoples' lands. This trend of thinking will have no sympathy in the international community, and it is the duty of this Assembly to pronounce the general sentiment of the nations of the world on this matter.

25. We are confronted with a real danger that others may wish to follow the example of Israel. We are also faced with a potential explosion in the Middle East which can easily form the beginnings of a terrible tragedy in the world. If Israel is allowed to get away with its adventures, then this Assembly will go down in history as one which has encouraged and abetted international banditry.

26. I now advert to another of the central provisions of the Charter relating to social progress. These provisions were designed to ensure not only general improvement in the standard of living of peoples all over the world, but also extension of social and economic benefits to all peoples and groups legitimately entitled to participate within States. Much has been said in this debate about social and economic progress in Israel since its creation. The flowering of the arts, the burgeoning of commerce and trade, and the achievement of high material living standards are, undoubtedly, praiseworthy.

27. We cannot ignore, however, that these achievements have been made with the accompaniment of—indeed, to a large extent, conditioned upon—immense human suffering. More than a million Arab inhabitants have been rendered homeless and destitute so that the State of Israel might have as homogeneous a population as possible. General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 1948, calling for the option of return or compensation to be offered to Palestinian refugees, has never been honoured.

28. In a repetition of the situation two decades ago, Israel's policy seems to be to encourage, if not to foster, the flight of the Arab inhabitants and then to sequester their lands and other properties while prohibiting their return. The International Herald Tribune, a widely read newspaper in Western Europe, reported in its issue of 19 June 1967, mass evictions of hundreds of Arabs from their homes in Jerusalem. Other Western newspapers have reported Israeli measures preventing the return of Arab inhabitants to areas whence they had fled the fighting.

29. My delegation believes that Israel has delayed too long in implementing General Assembly resolutions regarding the Arab refugees from Palestine. It should not now compound its former wrongs. We support the provision in draft resolution A/L.519 that Israel should make good the damage inflicted on the Arab States and their nationals and return their seized properties to them.

30. My delegation has been alarmed by reports of napalm bombing and torture of innocent villagers by Israeli forces in the area they have conquered. We have also been concerned by Israel's alleged dis-

respect for the various conventions which promulgate the practice of humane treatment of prisoners of war.

31. We should like this Assembly to appeal to Israel to cease forthwith its intimidation of innocent civilians and, furthermore, to adhere to the civilized concepts which govern the treatment of prisoners of war. It is unquestionably in its own interest, as well as in the general interest, for Israel to mend its ways and inflict no more misery on innocent villagers and captured soldiers who also have the right to protection in accordance with international practice.

32. Tanzania is convinced that the dangerous phenomenon in the Middle East is ominous for the territorial integrity and independence of all small States, and particularly for those of the Third World which are just freeing themselves from the chains of colonialism, imperialism and racial and economic degradation. It has already been suggested in some British and other Western papers that Smith, Vorster and Salazar might pursue similar courses vis à vis independent African States.

33. My delegation has no doubt about the ultimate success of the progressive peoples in the common struggle against imperialism and the forces of reaction. Indeed, in this struggle there will always be setbacks, but history has proved beyond doubt that the final victory lies in the hands of the revolutionary masses. The Arab people have experienced just such a temporary setback in their struggle which constitutes part and parcel of the universal revolutionary movement. But no amount of threats, intimidation or setbacks can prevent the ultimate success of the revolutionary peoples of the world. The imperialist Powers and the forces of reaction continue to make a series of errors by conceiving these temporary setbacks as a permanent feature. We have no doubt that the people will win eventually and that the aggressive forces will be crushed.

34. I should not like to conclude my statement without paying tribute to our eminent Secretary-General for the noble and tireless efforts he has made in trying to keep peace in the Middle East.

35. As this is an emergency special session, my delegation urges that a decision on this matter be taken speedily and positively.

36. In view of the position which the Tanzania delegation takes on this issue, we are convinced that the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a positive contribution which can lead towards a just settlement in the Middle East. The Tanzania delegation will therefore vote in favour of it.

37. Mr. MAHGOUB (Prime Minister of the Sudan): This Assembly session is sitting in judgement. It is sitting in judgement on one of its Members on a charge of naked, premeditated and wanton aggression. Israel denies both the charge and the competence of the United Nations to pass judgement. We should expect Israel to do so because it has never had any respect for the United Nations or for the values that the United Nations holds supreme. Israel denies its aggression. It proclaims that it has been provoked into undertaking a pre-emptive strike as an act of self-defence. In this attitude, if not in the action, Israel, as we all know,

has found sympathy and sustenance from those who created it and fostered its brigandage for their own ends. Some of the great Powers whose influence had dwindled in the Middle East as a result of the increasing national consciousness of the Arab people, were unwilling to reconcile themselves to their new status. They sought to regain their lost influence by all means, and they found in Israel a willing tool. Israel claimed that it was encircled by its enemies and had to be provided with the means of defending itself. It was supplied by the imperialist Powers with arms and military equipment. Israel claimed that it needed aid to build its economy that was being strangled by the Arabs. It was given all the aid it needed. It did not lack moral support and it received material support from the Western Powers. When the Arabs, in the exercise of their free choice as sovereign States, established closer relations with the socialist countries, the Western Powers found in this an occasion for retaliation. They retaliated by arming Israel still more, until Israel felt strong enough to withstand any pressure. But Israel, armed to the teeth and sustained by the West, and true to its doctrine that attack is the best means of defence, had to attack. Israel attacked brutally and in force.

38. Thus, on 5 June 1967, "little Israel", as it likes to be called, struck, at the same time, sixteen airfields in the United Arab Republic alone. By 7 June, the Israelis had completed their occupation of Jerusalem and advanced into Syrian territory. The story of the havoc and suffering Israel caused during those few days is now well known. It has been a source of pride to those who delight in suffering and take pride in vandalism.

39. On 6 June, Israel's Foreign Minister, glowing with the flush of victory, came in haste to the Security Council to announce success and to dictate his terms. The Foreign Minister of Israel, in his apologia for aggression before the Security Council, on 6 June 1967, cited the following reasons: first, the declaration by the United Arab Republic that it would block the passage of Israeli ships as well as foreign ships carrying strategic material to Israel along the Gulf of Aqaba; second, the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force; and third, the concentration of Arab troops in Sinai.

40. In his words, "These acts taken together... effectively disrupted the status quo which had ensured a relative stability on the Egyptian-Israeli frontier for ten years", <sup>1/</sup> and supposedly, in his opinion and submission, these acts taken together justified the aggression that followed.

41. Let us look more closely into these acts which Israel considers sufficient justification for its invasion and occupation. Let us take first the question of the Gulf of Aquaba. Israel has maintained before the Security Council and elsewhere that it had, for ten years, established a right of free and unimpeded passage along the Gulf of Aqaba. How did Israel come by that right? This alleged right was acquired as a result of a treacherous assault on Egypt in 1956, an act of aggression condemned by the whole world.

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1348th meeting.

When the other parties to that aggression were obliged to leave the soil of Egypt in ignominy, Israel insisted that it would not withdraw its troops either from Sharm El Sheikh or the Gaza Strip until its ships were guaranteed freedom of passage through the Strait of Tiran. They announced their determination to "shoot their way through". This is typical of Israeli vandalism.

42. However, the General Assembly resolution which brought the hostilities to an end, stipulated the return to the status quo ante, and recognized Egyptian sovereignty over its territory. This recognition was implicit in the operative paragraph of the resolution, urging the aggressive armies of Israel and its allies to withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines.

43. The Strait of Tiran, both historically and legally, has been subject to the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic, and it is therefore legitimate for the United Arab Republic to reclaim its sovereignty over the Strait at any time and to place its armed forces there.

44. Israel claims that its right of navigation through the Strait and across the Gulf of Aqaba has been consecrated by long, uninterrupted usage and the sailing of countless ships under many flags. But surely, neither the passage of years nor the passage of ships can change the facts of the geography. The Gulf of Aqaba is an inland sea the waters of which lie almost wholly within the domains of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia. Both countries have been at war with Israel. If either of these countries should block the passage of ships belonging to a State which is at war with them, they would be asserting only their sovereign rights and acting wholly within those rights.

45. Professor Roger Fisher of Harvard University wrote recently on this issue that, despite an Israeli request, the International Law Commission in 1956 found no rule which would govern the Strait of Tiran. And although the 1958 Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone<sup>2/</sup> provides for innocent passage through such straits, the United States representative, Mr. Arthur Dean, called this a new rule. Moreover, the United Arab Republic has not signed the treaty. However, Professor Fisher goes on, in the words of the Convention on the Territorial Sea, article 14, paragraph 4: "Passage is innocent so long as it is not prejudicial to the peace, good order or security of the coastal State." In April, Israel conducted a major retaliatory raid on Syria and threatened raids of a still greater size. In this situation, was Egypt required by international law to continue to allow Israel to bring oil and other strategic supplies through Egyptian territory, or supplies which Israel could use to conduct further military raids?

46. Israel claimed a belligerent's right of retaliation on Syria in April 1967. The United Nations found that Israel was not justified in this, and censured Israel. But even if it were justified, the United Arab Republic could certainly exercise a comparable—and

less bloody—belligerent right, namely to close the Strait of Tiran to strategic cargo for Israel.

47. Further, the port of Elath presents an example of illegal occupation by Israel. This port was established in violation of the Armistice Agreement of 1949. The Armistice Agreement was signed in February 1949. In March of the same year, Israel occupied Umm Reshresh, the site of the present port of Elath.

48. Israel has continued to enjoy the fruits of its illegal occupation all these years. But it was certainly mistaken in assuming that the passage of ten years, or twenty years, endows a wrongful usurpation with legality. Lately Israel became so confident and so arrogant as to assume that perhaps it was time to consolidate its position. Israel thought it was time to demonstrate its power, to teach the Arabs a lesson, since the Arabs have refused all these years to bow to injustice.

49. It was not the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, or the blocking of the gulf, as Israel claims, that precipitated Israel's aggression. It was actually the declaration by Israel of its intention and determination to invade Syria and the raid on Syria in April that led the Government of the United Arab Republic to ask for UNEF's withdrawal and to assert its undisputed right to deny the passage through its territory of war material to its enemy. How could the United Arab Republic have done otherwise? How could the Arab States have remained aloof?

50. The enemies of the Arab people, and sometimes some of our friends, wanted us to surrender, to be cautious, and to be realistic. We could not—Israel left us no option. Thus, when President Nasser was asked by journalists who thought the Arabs were not ready for a war with Israel, why he chose to confront the Israelis, he answered: "It was the Israeli Prime Minister Eshkol alone who chose the time. When Eshkol threatened to march on Damascus, when Eshkol threatened to occupy Syria, it became our duty to come forward to help our Arab brothers..." We heard so much from Israeli spokesmen about statements by Arab leaders threatening to destroy Israel. We hear so often in this country about Arab fanaticism. But do not let us forget that it was the Israeli threat and the Israeli action that were the immediate cause of this war. Mr. Levi Eshkol's statement of Israel's aggressive intention was made on 13 May—it was no empty threat because, as it turned out, he had the determination and the capacity to put it into effect. Mr. Eshkol said on 13 May that Israel was prepared to risk an all-out war in a military offensive to topple Syria's army régime. "We may have to adopt measures no less drastic than those of 7 April". And we remember what happened on 7 April. It was on 7 April 1967 that seventy-two Israeli military aircraft penetrated deep into Syrian air space and bombarded seven Syrian villages. There is absolutely no doubt of the occurrence of that attack, which was supported by tanks and machine-guns. There is no doubt about it because it was witnessed by United Nations Observers and reported to the Security Council by the representative of Syria.<sup>3/</sup>

<sup>2/</sup> United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Official Records, vol. II, Plenary Meetings, Annexes, document A/CONF.13/L.52 (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, Vol. II).

<sup>3/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7845.



51. What were the Arab countries expected to do in the face of that aggression? What were they to do in the face of the threat of an all-out war? They had to stand together because the threat to Syria was a threat to all of them. They had to be prepared. That was why they rallied their forces and proclaimed their determination to defend themselves.

52. Those were the circumstances that led to the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force and the blockade of the Strait of Tiran against Israeli ships. Those were the conditions that led to the mobilization of the Arab armies. It is evident, therefore, that the claim that the blockade itself constituted an act of war and called for Israel's massive assault is patently false because Israel had already started its war on Syria on 7 April. The blockade was just an excuse for the execution of Israel's plan to "teach the Arabs a lesson".

53. It is significant that when the Foreign Minister of Israel came to the United Nations to justify Israel's aggression he did not refer to the law and Charter of the United Nations in claiming that Israel considered the blockade an act of war. His justification referred to the practice of States prior to the existence of the United Nations. In his statement before the Security Council on 6 June 1967, he mentioned:

"Blockades have traditionally been regarded, in ... pre-Charter parlance, as acts of war."<sup>4/</sup>

54. Thus it becomes clear that Israel knows: (a) that within the meaning of the Charter of the United Nations a blockade, especially in the circumstances of the present case, is not *ipso facto* an act of war; (b) that Israel was determined to pursue its aggressive designs without regard to the United Nations Charter. That is why the Foreign Minister of Israel referred to "pre-Charter parlance", to justify actions that his country undertook in flagrant defiance of the Charter.

55. The Charter of the United Nations imposes on all Member States the duty to refrain from the use of force, including war and reprisals and even from the threat of force. Members of the United Nations are obliged under the Charter to refrain from the use of force except collectively, within the United Nations and by its authority. Israel knew all this but chose to disregard it, and to take the law into its own hands. The Foreign Minister of Israel confessed this disregard for the United Nations authority and his lack of confidence in its competence to keep the peace.

"...I confess"—he said before the Security Council—"that my own attitude and those of my colleagues and of my fellow citizens to the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations have been traumatically affected by this experience."<sup>5/</sup>

56. The experience that had this traumatic effect on the Foreign Minister and his colleagues was the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force whose presence Israel never accepted on its own territory. We now have some recent indisputable evidence of this in what Secretary-General Thant stated before this Assembly on 20 June 1967 in connexion with the

possibility of deployment of some elements of UNEF on Israeli territory. The Secretary-General reported that he had raised the question with the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations who told him that the idea was unacceptable. The dissemblance and audacity of the invaders did not stop at proclaiming their disappointment and lack of confidence in the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations and their refusal to admit its peace-keeping forces. They sought to justify their action as legitimate self-defence within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter. The provisions of Article 51 of the Charter, however, do not envisage such action as the Israelis embarked upon 5 June 1967. Article 51 of the Charter restricts the exercise of the right of self-defence to the case of the occurrence of an actual armed attack. Article 51 states:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

57. There is no mention anywhere in the Charter of acts that may be considered tantamount to an armed attack or regarded as a *casus belli*. The massing of troops and the supposedly menacing declarations on the part of the Arab leaders could not be regarded as equivalent to an armed attack justifying armed retaliation in self-defence in accordance with Article 51 or any other provision of the Charter of the United Nations. Further, the Charter of the United Nations stipulates that measures undertaken by Member States in the exercise of the right of self-defence shall be reported to the Security Council whose authority for the restoration of peace remains primary and supreme.

58. Thus even action that is legitimately and genuinely undertaken in self-defence is restricted in its scope and duration. It should be enough in its extent to ensure adequate self-defence and its effect should not go beyond the time necessary for the Security Council to intervene. The action taken by Israel was not legitimate self-defence within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter because no armed attack on her territory had in fact occurred. The action taken by Israel was so extensive in its destructiveness that it went beyond all reasonable limits of what might be considered necessary and adequate to deter an attacking enemy. Israel, moreover, had declared many times that she would not withdraw her forces from some of the territories she now occupies "even if 121 Members of the United Nations should so decide".

59. Israel must not be allowed to have it both ways. She must not be allowed to defy the authority of the United Nations, to disregard its most solemn resolutions as she has done for the last twenty years, to commit aggressive acts against the Arabs, and then to come to these halls to hurl accusations at those who have suffered her aggression.

60. The list of Israel's convictions during the last twenty years is so staggering that it becomes ridiculous for Israel to invoke the authority of the United Nations. Let me cite some instances where Israel's actions

<sup>4/</sup> Ibid., Twenty-second Year, 1348th meeting.

<sup>5/</sup> Ibid.

or infringements were condemned or censured or deplored by various organs of the United Nations.

61. The list starts with the assassination of Count Bernadotte, Security Council resolution 59 (1948) of 19 October 1948 and Israel's neglect to conduct an investigation. Then comes the Trusteeship Council condemnation of Israel's action in transferring some of the Ministries and government units to Jerusalem in 1949. The bombardment of Alhuma was condemned by the Security Council as a violation of the cease-fire provision in resolution 93 (1951) of 18 May 1951. The Israeli aggression on Qibya was strongly censured by the Security Council in its resolution 101 (1953) of 24 November 1953. The aggression on Gaza was condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 106 (1955), dated 29 March 1955. The aggression east of Lake Tiberius in Syria was condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 111 (1956), dated 19 January 1956. The aggression and subsequent occupation of Gaza and Sinai were condemned by the General Assembly on 2 November 1956 in its resolution 997 (ES-1). The Israeli aggression on Syria on 16-17 March 1962 was deplored by the Security Council in its resolution 171 (1962) of 9 April 1962. The Israeli aggression on the village of Sammou was condemned also by the Security Council, and so on and so on. But I think we do not need to go on enumerating Israeli aggressive acts in the past. Its present aggression overshadows all of them.

62. But let us note that during this whole period not a single Arab State was convicted or condemned by an organ of the United Nations for aggression against Israel.

63. Now, Israel maintains that there were Arab troop thrusts towards her borders and enemy planes were observed taking off in the direction of Israeli territory. This was claimed to have been enough reason for the brutal onslaught that followed. This was how the war that claimed, in the first few days, thousands of casualties, dead and wounded, thousands of refugees, and vast areas of occupied territory, was finally justified to the Members of this Organization as a legitimate response in "self-defence".

64. Such equivocation is not unusual for Israel who has always held the United Nations in utter contempt. This surely needs no further proof. Israel's protestations of peace have always been used to disguise its aggressive designs. But, let us recall how Israel came into being. Was not Israel created through the terrorist activities of the Irgun gang, the Stern gang and the Haganah—the armed brigands who had started their terrorist activities long before the British evacuated Palestine? At the time of the Balfour Declaration on 2 November 1917, the number of Jews in Palestine was about 57,000. Most of these Jews, while professing the Jewish faith, considered themselves Arabs. By 1922, however, their number had increased through immigration to about 84,000. They at that time owned about 2.5 per cent of the land. Just after the partition the population of the Zionist State was estimated to have consisted of slightly more Jews than Arabs. But two months before the British Mandate over Palestine came to an end and Israel could be proclaimed, the Israeli armed gangs

had already illegally occupied much of the territory reserved for the Arab State.

65. Through acts of terror and intimidation the Zionists drove away the Arab population. They usurped most of their lands. More than half of these dispossessed and destitute people came from areas that the Zionists occupied in defiance of the United Nations. And they dare to accuse the Arabs of being hostile and unwilling to accommodate them.

66. The tragic events of twenty years ago are being repeated today. In these few days of war and pillage, the relentless Israeli armed forces have again made thousands of Arabs homeless. It was reported in The Times of London on 13 June 1967, that the military governor of the west bank territories of Jordan conquered by Israel last week had announced that anyone wishing to cross over to Jordan would be helped to do so. No proof of identity was required. This was an ominous piece of news. This was how the Israelis evacuated the land of its inhabitants under dire threats of starvation and mortal danger so that they could take possession. This is how Israel was created and how its territory is now being expanded.

67. According to The Times of London of 14 June, the number of refugees who had fled the Israel army to Amman, capital of Jordan, was already around 100,000. 56,000 of these came from Jericho alone. The same paper states that the fate of the Egyptian soldiers who were left stranded in Sinai was even more grim. Thousands of them were struggling desperately to get back to the Suez Canal, "fighting one another for the few pools of brackish water and suffering from the fearful heat of the desert".

68. This is the condition to which the dishonourable army of Israel has reduced its adversary. They did not take many prisoners; most of them they abandoned in the desert to starve without any means of conveyance or communication. And yet, we are asked to come to an accommodation with Israel; we are asked to come to an accommodation, not by uninformed statesmen and misguided Zionist sympathizers, but by statesmen who want to build their fame and their great name on the ruins of the dignity of the Arab Nation. Do they not see how the "little Israel" that they created to ease their troubled conscience has grown with their aid to be a most implacable and fearsome monster?

69. In this city, the home of the United Nations, a United States statesman proclaimed on 10 June 1967: "Our commitment"—meaning the American commitment—"to Israel is clear and must be clear." He went on to praise Israel as a tiny out-post of western culture and "a gallant democracy".

70. Does he not know that this gallant democracy is a State built on militarist expansion and the concept of racial purity? I am certain that he is well aware of these facts, which are not denied even by Israel's friends. It is well known that every immigrant to Israel is trained as a soldier and all immigrants are expected to dedicate all their endeavours and their very lives to the achievements of the aims of Zionism. This outpost of Western culture is wholly and completely based on the racial myth of a chosen people. Its nationality laws grant citizenship auto-

matically to all Jews and relegate the Arabs to a secondary place. It is well known even to Israel's friends that the Arab in Israel is less than a second-class citizen.

71. The Zionists have not abandoned the dream of creating "Eretz Israel," which in their distorted vision encompasses the whole territory of Palestine and Jordan. Indeed, we do not need to go far back into history to realize why the Arabs have always doubted Israel's proclamations of peaceful intentions. "All that we have taken we shall hold", Mr. Ben-Gurion declared in a radio broadcast on 10 June 1948. "During the cease-fire we shall organize administration with fiercer energy, strengthen our footing in town and hamlet, speed up colonization and... look to the army", or again, "to maintain a status quo will not do. We have set up a dynamic State bent upon... expansion".

72. The voices of Levi Eshkol and Abba Eban are now echoing the voice of Ben-Gurion. On 9 June 1967, the Israeli Defence Minister, Moshe Dayan, declared that he did not think that Israel should relinquish its hold on the Gaza Strip or "give the western part of Jordan to King Hussein". "... Jerusalem which is our capital was divided", he said, "now it is united".

73. Jerusalem is not the Israeli capital, nor should it be. "The Farthest Mosque", the Mosque of Omar in Jerusalem, is the third holiest place in all the world of Islam. It is mentioned in the Koran that its precincts are blessed by God. Moslems from all over the world go to this Mosque in their pilgrimage as the Christians go to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. These places the Jews have now usurped. For centuries the Arabs had guarded the holy places for Moslems, Christians and Jews in the city of Jerusalem—until the Zionists came in 1948 and expelled both Moslems and Christians and seized half the city. Now they have usurped the rest of it and have declared it their capital.

74. In this seizure alone we have ample proof of Israel's aggressive acts and its expansionist intentions. And yet some of us here, some of the great Powers, persist in condemning—I am sorry, they will never condemn—incondoning Israel's usurpation. They justify Israel's aggression while denying that they have had any part in its design or execution. It was "little Israel", they tell us, that did it alone, while their fleets and aircraft carriers were docked and stationary hundreds of miles away from the scene of the crime, when the treacherous attack on the United Arab Republic occurred on 5 June 1967.

75. Let us mention some names, even at the risk of provoking vehement denials. Let us start with the United Kingdom. We should not give the United Kingdom the benefit of the doubt even though they claimed that their only aircraft carrier was stationary and therefore incapacitated. We should not give them the benefit of the doubt although they were quick to declare, after the United States had made a similar declaration, that they were ready for United Nations observers to board their ships and inspect their logs. We have heard such protestations of innocence before. But we are asked to forget the past and look to the future.

76. Mr. President, it would be unwise to look to the future without regard to the lessons of the past. We were here, Sir, both you and I, and many of our colleagues, in 1956, and we heard then, as we are hearing now, denials of the charge of collusion with the aggressors. This collusion has since been proved and confessed. It has become part of history. It must serve as a constant reminder to us that it could happen again.

77. As for the United States of America, the position is clear. We know that they are committed to protect Israel. Many of their leading statesmen have said so. In fact, President Johnson only recently reaffirmed this commitment when, in a statement on 23 May 1967, he addressed "the leaders of all the nations of the Near East" in the following words: "I wish to say what three Presidents have said before, that the United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all nations of the area".

78. This commitment was reiterated in President Johnson's address on 19 June as one of five principles for the achievement of a lasting peace in the Middle East. The same five principles were incorporated in the draft resolution [A/L.520] introduced in this Assembly on 20 June by the representative of the United States. And we notice that the same commitment that President Johnson proclaimed is not only to protect Israel, but all nations of the area.

79. But the performance of the United States does not seem to support these words. For, if the United States is in fact committed to the preservation of the territorial integrity of all nations of the area, its representative would not have found any difficulty in voting for the resolution introduced in the Security Council by the Soviet Union condemning Israeli aggression and demanding the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territory. But the United States and its allies did not vote in favour of this resolution in the Security Council. They even failed to vote for its operative paragraph 2 that called for withdrawal of Israeli troops, leaving open the question of Israeli aggression. Even the President of the United States was critical of the Soviet demand for condemnation of aggression and withdrawal of Israeli aggressive forces. This was called "a prescription for belligerency".

80. The position of the United States clouds over, in the vague phraseology, the central fact about this situation; namely, that it is neither legal nor equitable to allow the aggressor to enjoy the fruits of his aggression and use the position of strength so acquired in imposing his will. This is the tenor and purport of the draft resolution introduced by the United States on 20 June. This draft resolution speaks of the objectives of a durable peace—the objectives of a durable peace achieved through negotiated arrangements. We are asked by the United States to negotiate with Israel on the terms of a peaceful coexistence while the enemy still occupies our ravaged lands. We are asked by the United States to negotiate, while thousands of our people are homeless and destitute. It is inequitable and unjust to allow the aggressor to dictate his terms.



81. The legal principle that by an illegal act no legal result can be produced and no right can be acquired should be axiomatic. I do not deny that it has been contested in many cases where states had vested interests in providing legal sanction for illegal acquisitions of territory, but we are not dealing here with questions of political expediency. We are dealing with the Charter and practice of the United Nations. Members of the United Nations have pledged themselves to suppress acts of aggression and other breaches of the peace, to settle their disputes by peaceful means and refrain even from the threat of the use of force, and to abstain from giving any assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking enforcement action. It is not possible, therefore, that the recognition of illegal acquisitions can be compatible with those obligations.

82. The former Secretary-General of the United Nations, the late Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, set the seal on this question in his report of 24 January 1957, which he submitted to the Assembly in pursuance of the resolution of 19 January 1957, in which he was requested to continue his efforts to secure the complete withdrawal of Israel from the Sharm El Sheikh area and the Gaza Strip. The Secretary-General stated in his report:

"To help towards solutions of the pending problems in the area, United Nations actions must be governed by principle and must be in accordance with international law and valid international agreements. ...

"(a) The United Nations cannot condone a change of the status juris resulting from military action contrary to the provisions of the Charter. The Organization must, therefore, maintain that the status juris existing prior to such military action be re-established by a withdrawal of troops, and by the relinquishment or nullification of rights asserted in territories covered by the military action and depending upon it." <sup>6/</sup>

83. Now, to conclude the argument on this point, let us refer to American jurisprudence and practice. As late as 1948, the American States, in the Charter of their organization, reaffirmed in Article 5 the principles: "The American States condemn war of aggression; victory does not give rights." Article 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States provides that

"No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized".

84. The United States representative to the United Nations asked the Assembly in a rather picturesque metaphor not to entertain the idea of running the film backward in the projector; the Assembly should not say to the aggressor, "Withdraw your troops and let everything go back". Those are the words of the United States representative to the United Nations. We all heard his statement on the 20th of this month [1527th meeting].

85. The General Assembly should reject this position, which is contrary to the principles of the United

Nations Charter and which has been repudiated in no uncertain terms, as we have seen, by the Charter of the Organization of American States.

86. The Assembly has before it another draft resolution [A/L.519] introduced by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on 19 June, which states that Israel's premeditated aggression should be condemned and that its aggressive forces of occupation should be withdrawn. Why do the Members of this Assembly hesitate to condemn Israel's aggression? Has it not been amply proved? Why should the United States of America persist in making the withdrawal of Israel's aggressive forces conditional on the realization of its territorial ambitions? How are we to interpret this attitude in the light of the declaration by the President of the United States and three Presidents before him of their commitment to support the independence and territorial integrity of all nations in the area? The territorial integrity of the Arab countries has been grossly violated, but the United States does not seem to think that its commitment encompasses that violation. Is the United States proclaiming that Israel can usurp unlimited territory under its protection and guarantee?

87. Perhaps the analysis of the United Nations correspondent of The New York Times provides an answer for these questions. He writes of President Johnson's statement of 23 May as follows:

"Since President Johnson's statement was read, the Israeli Information Minister, Yisrael Gailille and Major General Moshe Dayan, the Defence Minister, have indicated that their Government intends to keep some of the territory it has won."

88. So now we know. We know now that when the solemn commitment of four Presidents of the United States conflicts with the policy of Israel, the United States supports the policy of Israel. This may appear to be a rather extravagant conclusion, but in the circumstances of this issue, it seems inescapable. That is why it has become important for this emergency session to be held and for the United Nations to redeem itself through a clear pronouncement condemning Israeli aggression and demanding its evacuation. Should the United Nations fail to do so, it will have failed its Charter and its well established precedents. Let us have no doubt about this.

89. We are confronted here with the refusal by some of the western Powers, namely the United States of America and the United Kingdom, to recognize that a violation of the territory of three Arab States has been committed, or, if they recognize this, they are not willing to seek or agree to any redress through the United Nations except on the terms that the aggressor dictated. Those terms have been clearly set out by Israel and endorsed and formalized by the United States draft resolution.

90. The Foreign Minister of Israel came to the United Nations, as I mentioned earlier, to dictate his terms. Let me quote his words:

"The situation to be constructed after the cease-fire must depend on certain principles. The first

<sup>6/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 66, document A/3512, para. 5.

of these principles surely must be acceptance of Israel's statehood...<sup>7/</sup>

which, incidentally, was described as an axiom requiring no demonstration.

91. The second principle according to the Foreign Minister of Israel is the peaceful settlement of disputes, by which is envisaged direct contact and negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. But on what basis should those negotiations be conducted? Not on the basis of the 1948 cease-fire lines, not even on the basis of Israel's position in 1956, but on the basis of the present occupation of the Arab lands.

92. That is the position which was outlined in veiled terms by the Foreign Minister of Israel and formulated in the draft resolutions submitted to the Security Council<sup>8/</sup> and the General Assembly [A/L.520] by the United States.

93. The substance of the United States draft resolutions where the withdrawal of the aggressive army of Israel is encompassed only by some over-all arrangements is also the substance of the Israeli position. The cease-fire is not linked to the withdrawal of the belligerents to positions occupied before hostilities began, as has always been the practice in the United Nations. No, in this case withdrawal is made conditional upon the establishment of viable arrangements. We are meant to understand, as indeed we do, that Israel will not put an end to its aggression until the Arabs have made certain concessions.

94. Let me mention in passing that this was not the position taken by the United States in 1956. The United States then insisted, as it is doing now, that certain arrangements must be made to establish a permanent peace in the Middle East. That is creditable and necessary. But it did not then suggest that withdrawal of Israel's troops be made contingent on the realization of its territorial and other ambitions. The draft resolution that the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, introduced in the General Assembly on 1 November 1956<sup>9/</sup> urged, in its second operative paragraph, that the parties to the Armistice Agreement promptly withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines and desist from raids across the Armistice Lines into neighbouring territory.

95. This was a clear precedent. And there are other precedents in similar cases. In a more recent dispute between India and Pakistan, the Security Council in its resolution 214 (1965) of 27 September 1965 demanded that the parties urgently honour their commitments to the Council to observe the cease-fire, and called upon the parties promptly to withdraw all armed personnel. Why have these precedents been neglected? Why is the case of Israel now different? Is it because the United States is committed to the defence of Israel and the support of its territorial claims?

96. Let us tell the United States that the United Nations is not willing to follow its lead and make a mockery

of justice. Let us remind the United States that the United Nations is committed to justice and equity and to the condemnation of aggression.

97. The United Nations, in its twenty-one years of existence, has passed through many trials. We have seen its shining light flicker many times and we were often afraid that it might be extinguished for ever. But it has survived; and our hopes were rekindled. Now the United Nations is passing through one of its most severe tests. Two of the great Powers are doing their utmost to hide its light. Two of the great Powers, aided by some of their allies, are trying to impose their will on the majority of the Members of the United Nations so that they may favour a position that is essentially unjust and unlawful.

98. The United Nations should be a forum where the smallest nation could speak its mind and state its position without fear, a forum where the highest ideals are proclaimed and defended. We know that it has not always been such a forum because many times the realities of political life and international relations have imposed their own logic. The present case, however, is not one of these instances. We are dealing here with fundamental principles about which there should be no compromise. This is a clear case of aggression which should be condemned in the clearest terms. This is a case of usurpation which should be remedied by and through the United Nations.

99. If the United Nations should falter, if the United Nations should succumb to pressure and sponsor an unjust cause, then it will not only be setting a most dangerous precedent, it will undermine its very foundations. Power will then be the only sanction and justification of action. Usurpation will need only adequate force for its vindication. The smaller nations will have no recourse and the weak will be defenceless.

100. This is why it is important, this is why it is vital that the United Nations should not fail; because if it fails, its failure will be without redemption. What we expect from the United Nations is justice. We ask for no more and we shall accept no less.

101. Mr. ZAHEDI (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iran): Events in the Middle East in the last few weeks have caused the people and the Government of Iran much anxiety, an anxiety mixed with apprehension at the results of the outbreak of violence which has afflicted the peoples of the area in which we live and with most of whom we have ties of faith, culture and fraternity.

102. In view of these affinities which bind us to the Arab peoples, there is small wonder that we look with anguish at the losses and dislocation that have come to them through the clash of arms. It is out of that fellow-feeling that my Government, at the prompting of His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah, has rushed to help the people of Jordan and Iraq in binding up the wounds of war.

103. We are appalled by the addition to the already large numbers of refugees who have remained unsettled for nearly two decades of new refugee victims of the recent trial of arms. There is little of substance that we ourselves can do to alleviate this most tragic of the consequences of war. We take some comfort, however, in Security Council resolution 237 (1967)

<sup>7/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1348th meeting.

<sup>8/</sup> Ibid., Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7952/Rev.3.

<sup>9/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, First Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/3256.

of 14 June calling upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities. In this connexion we would only remind the Government of Israel that its people have known what it means to be refugees and express the hope that it will not be lacking in swift compliance with the call of the Security Council.

104. I come now to the problem to which this emergency session of the General Assembly must find a satisfactory and enduring answer if it is to be equal to its great responsibilities under the Charter. The question before us is whether we have the resources of wisdom and devotion to justice needed to make a reality of the main principle of the Charter: namely, that the relations of peoples and States are no longer to be governed by war and that the differences which are bound to arise in an imperfect world will be settled peacefully and on the basis of respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of each member of the international community.

105. If this principle is not to be falsified and if the structure of international organization which rests upon it is not to crumble, it must find specific expression in the context of the present Middle East calamity. The Assembly can do this only by adopting as its concrete aim the restoration to each of his own. The idea that territorial change can be the outcome of armed conflict cannot be accepted by this body. These were the principles that inspired the Shahanshah when he observed on 7 June:

"The days of occupation and retention of one country's territory by another are over. Undoubtedly, arrangements should be made whereby that part of Arab territory occupied by Israel during the present hostilities should be returned to them as soon as possible."

I am here to reaffirm that policy.

106. Gains made in this way are bound to be illusory, for the wheel of fortune is ever turning and is likely to be moved all the more rapidly when given impetus by the deepest of all resentments, that caused by the presence of the foreigner on one's native soil. Prudence, therefore, if nothing more, would dictate to Israel that it is urgent to quit Arab territory. The longer the occupation of Arab territory continues, the more rancorous the feeling will be; if it is peace we seek, one of the first steps towards it is to remove justified grievances.

107. The summoning of the General Assembly to deal with the crisis in the Middle East has an unhappy aspect of which I think we are bound to take notice if we expect to accomplish something useful here. For several years now, we have heard that the General Assembly's activities in the domain of international peace and security amounted to a usurpation of the Security Council's functions and of the responsibilities of the great Powers. The Organization has wrestled unceasingly with this matter without result until now. It is not my aim in referring to this to demand an enlargement of the role of the General Assembly. But is it not curious that the General Assembly should

have been called into emergency session after all the representations that have been made concerning the readiness, willingness and ability of the Security Council to deal with the problems of maintaining international peace and security?

108. No one surveying the world scene could have doubted that crisis would continue to be with us for a long time, or have failed to spot the places where it would originate. This was evident to everyone who was willing to see; yet we were not prepared when the crisis came, and the flames of war erupted.

109. It is not as if there had not been enough signals of what was coming. Nevertheless, those who bore the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security were not prepared to close ranks in the name of the international community in whose behalf they are supposed to act to prevent the calamity that has overtaken us. And so, having allowed the damage to occur, the task of re-establishing that peace with justice promised by the Charter has again been consigned to the General Assembly.

110. We should, I suppose, be grateful that the Security Council finally brought about a cease-fire, but one's gratification is diminished by the fact that this agreement came only after tens of thousands of lives had been lost, with hundreds of thousands of human beings driven to flee their homes, the economies of the warring States disrupted, and hatred reaching a higher level than ever before. The reflections which this outcome induces can be only of the bitterest kind, and this is the situation in which the General Assembly is asked to intervene.

111. Permit me to recall what the representative of Iran said on this subject in the General Assembly little less than a year ago:

"When speaking of the primary responsibility of the Security Council it is customary to emphasize its primacy. This reflects the importance and the prestige of the permanent members. I should like to see equal emphasis, at least, laid on the word 'responsibility' in order to give appropriate weight to the interest and concern of the rest of us who depend on the conscientious discharge of that responsibility for our peace and security."<sup>10/</sup>

112. Like some other Members of the United Nations, Iran offered to place permanent peace-keeping forces at the disposal of the United Nations. No use was made of these offers nor has any other way been found to interpose the United Nations into situations which threaten the peace.

113. Because of this failure, the General Assembly is now faced with a much more difficult task. We now must find arrangements which the States lately engaged in the hostilities can accept as consistent with their honour and with their need for security and peace. That task has fallen to the General Assembly, which should approach it in a spirit of candour.

<sup>10/</sup> This statement was made at the 517th meeting of the Special Political Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

114. In conclusion, let me make it clear that, in order to have meaning, the cease-fire should be followed by the withdrawal of troops. A precedent for this action has already been established by the United Nations. There was no justification, therefore, either in law or justice, for the Security Council to stop short of the demand for the withdrawal of troops. It is now the responsibility of the emergency session to rectify this situation by calling for the immediate withdrawal of troops from occupied territory. Only then can we have a climate for reason and a viable peace-keeping arrangement.

115. Mr. MORO (Prime Minister of Italy):<sup>11</sup> This is the first time that I have had the honour to take the floor in the General Assembly of the United Nations. I do so not without emotion, conscious that it is the highest embodiment of the world Organization. This is the furthest point that has been reached in the evolution of the international community, under the impulse of the political and moral thought of our countries. The world looks to the United Nations, and the peoples place their hopes in it, both in times of peace and in times of crisis. It is incumbent on us to ensure that it discharges its exalted tasks effectively.

116. The hour is grave and our first duty is to set forth and compare our ideas and views on the situation in the Middle East, hoping, and indeed confident, that the dialogue now taking place and the consultations accompanying it will bring about a favourable climate for formulating the recommendations and taking the decisions which the situation demands.

117. But first, Mr. President, permit me to convey to you the congratulations of the Italian Government for the decision of the General Assembly in calling upon you, for the third time, to preside over its work. Your name, and the role played by you at the twenty-first regular session and at the fifth special session, now form part of the history of the United Nations; we are therefore more than happy to associate ourselves with the congratulations and good wishes which have been offered you from this rostrum.

118. It is also my duty to express the sincere appreciation of the Italian people and Government to the members of the Security Council and its President who last month, and in particular during the last few weeks, together with the Secretary-General, joined in a supreme effort to preserve peace in the Middle East and who, when armed conflict unhappily broke out, endeavoured to obtain a cessation of hostilities, calling on all the belligerents to comply with the wishes of the United Nations.

119. Our gratitude goes likewise to the representatives of Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia who introduced a resolution with the humanitarian purpose of ensuring the protection of the civilian populations.

120. I can assure the representatives of the fifteen States which are members of the Security Council that the Italian people followed their deliberations anxiously, hour by hour, and are grateful to them for the high sense of responsibility which they showed and for the success which they achieved.

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Moro spoke in Italian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

121. The recent tragic conflict which we saw building up, becoming more threatening and finally erupting in a region so close to us, profoundly shocked and disturbed the Italian Government and people who are well aware of the historic spiritual values of the Israeli nation and of their sufferings during the Second World War. Israel's statehood has been recognized by the United Nations of which Israel, together with all of us, is a Member. The Italian Government and people are also aware of the movement for renewal and development among the Arab peoples, a movement to which Italy, together with many other Members of the United Nations, has offered understanding and friendly co-operation.

122. It was with deep distress that the Italian people and Government, which have not forgotten the horrors of war, followed the tragic developments, shared the sorrow of the populations involved, feared a widening of the conflict and—most of all—felt acutely conscious of the tragedy of an armed confrontation between Members of the United Nations which, by their acceptance of the San Francisco Charter, are committed "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

123. The Italian Government, as soon as the crisis began to develop, took every possible step, both at the bilateral and at the multilateral level, to support the efforts of the United Nations, to interrupt the chain of actions and reactions, to defuse the explosive elements and to bring about a breathing spell which might have prevented the outbreak of hostilities.

124. When, alas, the armed conflict which had been feared became a reality, the Italian Government redoubled its efforts in the capitals of the belligerent countries, with the Secretary-General and with the members of the Security Council in order to see to it that every attempt was made to limit the scope of the conflict, to issue a cease-fire appeal and to obtain prompt compliance by the parties with the decisions of the United Nations.

125. Once the cease-fire was achieved, the Italian Government took initiatives for the speedy relief of the victims on all sides and promoted at the international level, both in the United Nations and in the European Economic Community, measures of organized assistance.

126. The task now, as the Secretary-General stated in his report to the Security Council of 26 May, is to lay the foundations for "reasonable, peaceful and just solutions"<sup>12</sup> to the basic problems which have beset the Middle East for so many years. The task is to settle a conflict, while safeguarding the rights and expectations of the parties concerned and of the international community and to create, with the free acceptance of the parties, the necessary conditions for co-operation and the development of the whole region.

127. This is an immense task in which all of us without exception must join, in proportion to our means and capacities. It will be necessary, however, to avoid all elements which may divide us and to concentrate rather on what unites us, namely, the

<sup>12</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7906, para. 19.



principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, our common faith in the capacity of peoples to live and advance together and, above all, the deep conviction that peace is a prerequisite and precondition for the pursuit of all other significant objectives. For us it is essential to reaffirm the great principles contained in the first two Articles of the San Francisco Charter which have been accepted by all Members of the United Nations. We therefore feel that it would not be worth while to indulge in recriminations and condemnations; we must look resolutely to the future and make this emergency session of the Assembly an Assembly of peace.

128. The Italian Government pledges itself today to strive for the solution of the problems which still confront the Middle East and which indeed have become more acute; and it intends, through both multilateral and bilateral channels, to lend its determined and concrete co-operation for the progress of a region which is so burdened with difficult human, economic and political problems and whose peaceful development is so important for the peace of the Mediterranean and of the world.

129. The problems are well known to all of us and are in all our minds. There are immediate needs which urgently require appropriate measures: relief for the wounded, for the new refugees and for the populations so heavily tried. Then—once this urgent task of human solidarity has been fulfilled—the more basic unresolved problems must be attacked. The General Assembly will have to concentrate its attention on these, resuming earlier efforts and endeavours, wherever necessary and possible.

130. First of all, the Assembly must reaffirm that, under Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter, every Member State has the right to political independence, territorial integrity and protection against the threat and use of force, which is incompatible with the principles of coexistence on which the United Nations is based.

131. This is the framework in which we must deal with the problem of disengagement and withdrawal of troops and that of an equitable territorial settlement in the region, which ought to be freely accepted by the parties and be permanent in nature.

132. The withdrawal of troops is certainly a necessary step, but it is not sufficient. If the United Nations confined itself to this, it would share the blame for a return to the situation which has been the cause of two wars in two decades. It should instead give thought to creating the necessary conditions for a settlement which will at the same time protect the Middle East and the world from the danger of a new regional conflagration which might even expand into a general war. If the United Nations should shirk this responsibility, it would be compromising its very reason for existence.

133. The Assembly will also have to tackle the long-standing problem of the Palestinian Arab refugees. Their presence and their tragic situation constitute one of the factors of the existing instability and tension in the area. This is a human, social and political problem the solution of which demands generosity, imagination, and courage.

134. There are, moreover, questions which affect the more general interests of the international community. I have in mind the problems of international waterways, the freedom of which is guaranteed by international law and is a matter of primary interest for the whole world and particularly for those countries which, like Italy, are separated from the oceans by canals and straits. A similar problem exists with regard to the Holy Places, which have long awaited a special status that will guarantee free access to them. Jerusalem should be not a cause of division but a centre of high spiritual value that can promote reconciliation.

135. Even broader problems are those of the economic development of the entire Middle East. This economic development, transcending all national barriers, seems to be one of the elements which not only would meet the legitimate aspirations of the peoples concerned but also could contribute to the peace and stability of the area.

136. I have mentioned only the most important problems; the list is far from complete. Perhaps the time has not yet come to offer specific solutions or formulæ for dealing with these problems. The Italian delegation, at the proper time, will state its views and offer a contribution of ideas and initiatives.

137. For the time being, it seems to me that the essential prerequisite for the establishment of peace is the creation of conditions which will enable the Arab States and Israel freely and without reservations to recognize each other's existence, independence and territorial integrity, and to agree to live in peace with each other, as prescribed by the Charter of the United Nations. This will depend, to a great extent, on the spirit in which the parties tackle the problems confronting them and on their readiness to reconcile their legitimate interests. If the settlement which we all desire can be freely negotiated and accepted by the parties, it will certainly be possible to provide whatever international guarantees may prove necessary.

138. I should like at this point to try to outline the role which the United Nations may be called upon to play in the long and difficult process which, we all hope, will lead from the situation as it exists today, after the close of the military conflict, to genuine peace.

139. To begin with, I should like to say that the United Nations ought to play primarily a political and subsequently an economic role. This Assembly is familiar with the Italian position concerning peace-keeping operations, which we regard as a valid instrument for discharging the Organization's responsibilities. These operations have ensured peace in the Middle East for ten years, but experience has shown how short-lived their usefulness can be if there is no clear determination by the two opposing parties to take advantage of the respite they provide in order to settle their differences. Peace-keeping operations are, by definition, provisional measures, whereas what we are seeking in the Middle East is a lasting settlement.

140. In our view, therefore, the United Nations has a fourfold role in this field.

141. First, the United Nations is the forum in which it should be possible to secure a solemn pledge from

all Members of the Organization to facilitate the process of rapprochement and détente between the parties. I think it would not be unreasonable to call upon all the Powers, great and small, which are engaged in Geneva and in New York in a search for general and complete disarmament, to see to it that what they are trying to accomplish over the entire globe and in outer space is not frustrated by an arms race in the Middle East.

142. Second, the United Nations should provide the first meeting-ground for the parties, for it is incumbent on this Assembly, as the embodiment of the world community, to promote a just and lasting peace in the area. Some interesting ideas have already been advanced in the Security Council with regard to methods and instruments that could facilitate a resolution of the present impasse and permit a return to normality. The representative of India has advanced a proposal, taken up and expanded by many other speakers, to appoint a special representative of the United Nations for the region, with the task of assisting in reducing tension and restoring peaceful conditions, while the United Kingdom representative has suggested a mediator who could facilitate the starting of discussions with the Governments concerned, with a view to laying the foundation of a just and lasting peace.

143. These points deserve to be explored by the interested parties as well. The work done by the United Nations personnel thus far in connexion with the cease-fire has been commendable; they could therefore be assigned to carry out such further tasks as may be found desirable in the present circumstances.

144. Third, the United Nations can and should have a part in the settlement of those problems which, while having their geographical basis in the Middle East, affect interests which are important to the international community as a whole.

145. Fourth, the United Nations can serve as the instrument for dealing with the problems of humanitarian assistance arising out of the recent conflict or originating in the unstable Middle Eastern situation.

146. Moreover, the United Nations should take the initiative in setting up a broad plan for the economic development of the entire region. To this plan all the States Members of the United Nations should, with the assent of the peoples of the Middle East, contribute their technical skills, their economic resources and their physical and spiritual energies.

147. I have outlined the steps taken by the Italian Government first to prevent and later to contain the crisis caused by the armed conflict; I have stated our views concerning the problems of the Middle East, the best course to follow towards a solution for them, and the part which the United Nations should be called upon to play.

148. I should like, in conclusion, to reaffirm the all-important need for peace, and therefore to make an earnest appeal to the Arab States, Israel and all the Members of this Assembly. We believe not only that peace is the supreme good and a historical necessity, but also that it can be achieved provided that there is the will for a courageous step, a constructive initiative which will open a new path before

us. Reconciliation between peoples who were in conflict until yesterday can be attempted and achieved if everyone is prepared to lay down not only the weapons of war but also those of intolerance and recrimination.

149. We are confident that Israel and the Arab States will be able, after their recent tragic experiences, to adopt a highly humanitarian and civilized outlook and to build, on the ruins of war, a peaceful and equitable settlement, which is an essential prerequisite to their peoples' welfare, development and security, and to co-operation among them. It is incumbent on all of us to promote and facilitate such a turn of events in a spirit of friendship, and we are certain that all peace-loving peoples will be able to answer this call of conscience.

150. Mr. CHAGLA (Minister for External Affairs of India): Mr. President, we have met here in this emergency special session of the General Assembly to discharge the responsibilities of the United Nations, in what you yourself, in your opening statement called "a crisis of world proportions". It is significant that ten Heads of Government and eighteen Foreign Ministers from all over the world have considered it their duty to come to the United Nations Headquarters at very short notice. Even in this gloomy hour it should perhaps hearten us that the international community has so spontaneously, and with such a measure of unanimity, agreed that the United Nations is the proper forum for arriving at decisions which ensure that the principle gets established that in the second half of the twentieth century, aggressors are not permitted to retain the reward of their aggression, however successful on the field of battle they might be. It would be an understatement to say that peace in West Asia is in peril. Barely a week ago a short but savage war in that area was brought to a halt by continuous and persistent efforts of the Security Council, and unless the world community can arrange—and arrange firmly and speedily—a durable and just peace, it is not inconceivable that a world conflagration may follow. We therefore hope that the return of peace to the area will be such as to guarantee that there shall be no recurrence of war again; that the human problems created by this war, further compounding the tragedy which already existed in the area as a result of the happenings in 1948 and 1956, will be redressed with the help of all men of goodwill, all over the world, and through the instrumentality of the United Nations.

151. Conditioned by the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi during our struggle for independence, and conditioned earlier, through the centuries, by the tradition of the deep and abiding philosophy of humanism, centuries that produced Buddha and Ashoka, our land has been a crucible for integrating people of different faiths and diverse ethnic origins. For centuries, people have lived in India who practised all the major religions of the world: Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Zoroastrianism. To us, therefore, the philosophy of tolerance, peace and co-existence is natural and the ideas of violence and war repugnant. Settlement of international disputes through peaceful means, respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty of States, the right of all

nations to live in freedom and enjoy fruits of freedom, are all cherished articles of faith with us. Where peace is threatened, or aggression committed, we find it impossible to remain silent and passive. We have, therefore, voiced our sincere and whole-hearted sympathy for and solidarity with the Arab peoples in their hour of trial and tribulation.

152. During the weeks preceding the outbreak of hostilities, it was our constant and earnest effort to counsel restraint to all the parties to this strife and to all the other States which, one way or the other, were involved in this crisis. It was our hope that there would be no headlong rush towards an Armageddon, and that peace in West Asia would be preserved. When U Thant made his noble, and nearly successful effort to gain a breathing spell, during which quiet diplomacy could help solve the crisis, India stood stolidly behind him. While those efforts were going on, and while the crisis itself was under examination and consideration by the Security Council, Israel struck a lightning blow against its Arab neighbours. Once hostilities broke out, our effort was directed towards a restoration of peace and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the lands they had occupied. The establishment of the various cease-fires between Israel and its Arab neighbours followed, haltingly, almost hesitatingly. And just then Israel mounted an invasion of Syria annexing further territory even as an uneasy cease-fire settled down in other theatres of war. I should like to recall that we had repeatedly urged in the Security Council that cease-fire will not be effective unless it was coupled with withdrawals. We adhere to our belief that the cease-fire itself cannot be considered complete as long as an alien armed force occupies large areas of land belonging to its neighbours, and as long as large masses of Arab peoples live and suffer in subjugation in those occupied areas. The foundation of a lasting peace in the region can be based only on total, immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the areas now under its occupation, and rightly belonging either to the United Arab Republic or to Jordan or to Syria. We must distinguish between peace and mere cessation of fighting.

153. The fact that Israel struck the first blow is incontrovertible. The concept of a pre-emptive strike or a preventive war, is contrary to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter. Nobody denies that there are many disputes between Israel and its Arab neighbours, and that those have remained unsolved through the last two decades. Was it those disputes, perchance, that Israel was trying to solve through a war of its choosing? If it was, then, its attack was as much on the Arabs as on the principles enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter.

*Mr. Solomon (Trinidad and Tobago), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

154. The Charter states unequivocally in Article 2, paragraph 4 that:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State".

155. The only permissible exception to this prohibition is in case of armed attack, as provided in Article 51. And, as I have just indicated, the circumstances for Article 51 being operative in favour of Israel certainly did not exist in the present instance. What Israel has done is to confront the world with a fait accompli, to attempt to impose a new status quo and to achieve a new balance of power in that region. In these circumstances Israel now demands a new Middle East settlement on its own terms. Its terms, it claims, must be accepted in advance, if a peace settlement in the area is to be arrived at. If its demands are not accepted, it threatens to consolidate its ill-gotten territorial gains. These manoeuvres of Israel are intended to force the international community to acquiesce in what must be called a perpetuation of this new status quo.

156. We have no quarrel with the people of Israel, and our record shows the objective attitude that we have adopted towards the State of Israel. But it is also a matter of record and deep regret to us that Israel has, over the years, through violations of General Armistice Agreements, strengthened its position, added territory to its area, and used its modern powerful military machine to expel Arabs from their lands and homes. It has ignored United Nations resolutions and has been censured by the Security Council for violation of the General Armistice Agreements.

157. I shall not dwell, in detail, on this sorry record. But I wish to refer to one tragic consequence of the disregard of General Assembly resolutions in respect of Palestine refugees. It has neither allowed them to return to their homes nor compensated them. But I must dwell at some length on Israel's attitude to the United Nations Emergency Force, which is relevant to the present crisis. Having refused to allow the stationing of a United Nations force on its soil, and having later enjoyed the full benefits of its presence on Egyptian territory for more than ten years, Israel has now proceeded to defame the United Nations and to criticize Secretary-General Thant's correct decision to withdraw the Force, on the ground that he did not first consult Israel. What are the facts?

158. On 18 May 1967, the Secretary-General agreed to a request from the Government of the United Arab Republic asking for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force. The presence of the Force in the region has been made possible in 1956-57 by the United Arab Republic Government agreeing to have it based on its soil. This had been done at a time when Israel had refused to have any United Nations peace-keeping force on its own soil. As the Assembly will recall, the original proposal in this context, at that time, had been to locate elements of an international emergency force on both sides of the armistice demarcation line, that is, both on the soil of the United Arab Republic and that of Israel. U Thant's report to the Security Council, dated 26 May 1967, in its paragraph 7 makes the situation clear. He says there:

"If the Force had been deployed on both sides of the line as originally envisaged in pursuance of the General Assembly resolution, its buffer function

would not necessarily have ended. However, its presence on the Israel side of the line has never been permitted. The fact that the Force was not stationed on the Israel side of the line was a recognition of the unquestioned sovereign right of Israel to withhold its consent for the stationing of the Force. The acquiescence in the request of the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the Force after ten and a half years on United Arab Republic soil was likewise a recognition of the sovereign authority of the United Arab Republic."<sup>13/</sup>

159. The Secretary-General recognized that any United Nations force could remain on the territory of a Member State as long as this consent continued, a position with which my Government is in complete agreement both on legal and practical grounds.

160. I am proud to represent a country which has contributed the largest single national contingent to the Force for all the ten years from its inception to its withdrawal. I am, therefore, speaking in the name also of those gallant Indian sentinels of peace who served in the Middle East and died at their posts as martyrs. We supported the position of the Secretary-General that the Force, by staying on in the region once the consent of the United Arab Republic to its presence had been withdrawn, might have become an army of occupation. On this point, speaking in the Indian Parliament on 19 November 1956, the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"We made it clear that it was only if the Government of Egypt agreed that we would send them"—the Indian Contingent to the Force—"We are not prepared to agree to our force or any force remaining there indefinitely ..."

He added that the position stated by him was in consonance with the agreements arrived at by the Secretary-General of the United Nations with the Egyptian Government. It is on this basis that my delegation deplores the Israeli criticism which our Secretary-General, U Thant, was compelled to rebut in his statement yesterday. We fully support the stand taken by U Thant. I am sure the Assembly will endorse what he has stated.

161. The extraordinary charge has been made that the withdrawal of the Force precipitated the recent conflict. This is baseless. It is in this context that we have to look at the problem of Sharm El Sheikh which overlooks the Strait of Tiran. Once the Force was withdrawn, the task of ensuring the security of Sharm El Sheikh and wherever else the Force had been located became once again the sovereign responsibility of the Government of the United Arab Republic. From this arose the so-called question of free passage through the Strait of Tiran. The United Arab Republic has always maintained that the Strait of Tiran is part of its territorial waters. India, along with a number of other countries, has supported this position for a decade and more. There are other Member States, however, who have maintained that the Strait of Tiran constitutes international waters in which the right of innocent passage must be respected. Immediately before hostilities broke out in the Middle East, some rather hasty suggestions

were canvassed that this latter claim could perhaps be asserted, through a show of might by the maritime Powers. However, better counsels prevailed and no such action was taken.

162. The point to examine now, therefore, is whether the control of the Strait of Tiran by the United Arab Republic in itself could justify the use of force against several Arab States by Israel. In considering this, we, in this Assembly, must keep the following points in view.

163. First, the United Arab Republic is not a party to any agreement recognizing the Gulf of Aqaba as an international waterway or guaranteeing the freedom of passage to Israeli ships.

164. Second, there is no universally recognized rule of international law on freedom of navigation applicable to such bodies of water as Aqaba.

165. Third, the status of this body of water is still a matter of controversy. I should like to refer to a recent publication of the United States State Department, released by the Department of State in April 1965, containing a Memorandum by the office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, on historic bays. On Aqaba, the Memorandum states as follows: "The Gulf of Aqaba—the exact status of this body of water is still a matter open to controversy."<sup>14/</sup> I am sure there are many international lawyers in this august gathering and I make them a present of this quotation, from an authoritative American textbook.

166. Fourth, even under the Geneva Convention, which is being quoted often, innocent passage of foreign ships through the territorial water of another State, is not an absolute right, but remains subject to the security requirement of that State.

167. Fifth, the General Assembly did not recognize, much less accept, the conditions which Israel attempted to attach in 1957 to its withdrawal from Sharm El Sheikh.

168. From what I have stated very briefly above, it is not established that under international law there is a right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran. And, therefore, there is no warrant for asserting that this is a right which could be enforced by the arbitrament of arms.

169. Leaders of Government, the armed forces and public opinion of Israel have recently made public statements to the effect that some of the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan which they occupy now will not be vacated by them under any circumstances whatsoever. As regards certain other territories, also at present under their occupation, they have graciously indicated that they would be prepared to consider vacating them, but only after certain conditions have been met by the Arab Governments, and indeed by the international community. The latest and the most defiant in this series of statements is that by Mr. Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel. I think it was already quoted this morning, but I will quote it again. He told the *Jerusalem Post*:

"If the General Assembly were to vote by 121 to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the Armistice Lines

<sup>13/</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 7.

<sup>14/</sup> *Digest of International Law*, (Department of State Publication 7825, April 1965), vol. 4, p. 233.



tomorrow, Israel would refuse to comply with that decision. This has been made clear to major Powers."

170. On 12 June 1967, in a policy speech made in the Knesset, but quite explicitly addressed to "all nations of the world", Mr. Eshkol, Prime Minister of Israel, said:

"Be under no illusion that the State of Israel is prepared to return to the situation that reigned up to a week ago... We are entitled"—says the Prime Minister—"to determine what are the true and vital interests of our country and how they shall be secured."

171. All this bears out what the Permanent Representative of India said on 9 June 1967, in the Security Council:

"You, Mr. President, and all my colleagues in the Council here, have read enough history to know what to expect next. The aggressor, having occupied all its military vantage positions, all its objectives—Sharm El Sheikh, Gaza, Jerusalem, the western bank of the Jordan River, and now the heights of Galilee—will, after a show of reasonableness in negotiations, offer to split these gains half and half, perhaps." <sup>15/</sup>

172. It is a universally recognized and honoured principle of law that the rewards of aggression must not be permitted to remain with the aggressor. The United Nations was based on this principle. The founding fathers of its Charter did not write the Charter so that the scourge of war should be considered as an investment by anyone who was strong enough to overcome his neighbours. Faith in the cardinal principle that disputes can be solved only through peaceful means must not be allowed to be eroded. The international community, therefore, cannot acquiesce in Israel keeping the fruits of its conquest. We have indicated clearly in the Security Council how the path towards a composite cease-fire-cum-withdrawal resolution was blocked. The General Assembly now must, therefore, ensure that Israel vacate immediately the vast territories which it has overrun. First things must come first. We must not allow ourselves, in the General Assembly, to be confused and befuddled by the attempts of Israel, which is raising ancillary issues before agreeing to the withdrawals. There are some problems which have to be settled, but they must await their turn. The first thing to be insisted upon, and to be implemented, has to be withdrawal, total and unqualified, immediate and unconditional, of all Israeli forces from all Arab territories. This, I submit, is the only position which this Assembly can justly, prudently and appropriately take. Resolution 233 (1967) of the Security Council, which was the first one of the series of resolutions on cease-fire, adopted by the Security Council, in the context of the strife in the Middle East, explicitly stated that cease-fire was merely a first step—I must emphasize, a first step—which should lead immediately to the next most important step, which is the withdrawal.

173. Reference has also been made both here and in the Security Council to the other measures necessary to strengthen and ensure lasting peace in the area. Our ideas in this respect were first set out by my delegation in the Security Council on 9 June. While summarizing them briefly, I should like to caution that none of these ideas can be singled out for immediate application without relating them to the most important step, which is withdrawals.—The United Nations Truce Supervision Organization will have to be enlarged and strengthened in order to ensure strict compliance with the various provisions of the General Armistice Agreements. A special representative of the Secretary-General may also be appointed to help reduce tension in the area and to assure the safety and security of the civilian Arab population under Israeli occupation, and facilitate the return of those who were forced to leave their homes.

174. We are second to none in desiring a return to peace in the area, and it must be a lasting one. It is important for us to remember, however, that an enduring peace can be established in West Asia and elsewhere only if in this world body we can all act together to ensure strict adherence to certain basic values and fundamental principles of international law, practice, morality and behaviour.

175. I shall attempt to summarize some of these cardinal principles. First, it is not open to a country to start a war merely because it feels that a threat to its security exists. If it thinks that such a threat exists, the Charter prescribes various courses of action open to it, through peaceful means. And of course it can come to the Security Council. But it is, in the spirit and letter of the Charter, illegal to deal with a threat which one State thinks is being held out by a neighbouring State through recourse to arms. Secondly, no aggressor can be permitted to retain the fruits of aggression. Thirdly, it is not permissible for a country to acquire territory of another State in order to be able to bargain from a position of strength. Fourthly, rights cannot be established, territorial disputes cannot be settled, boundaries cannot be adjusted, through armed conflict.

176. In this second half of the twentieth century, after we have passed through the holocaust of two world wars and after we have succeeded in painfully building up a fabric of international conduct under the United Nations Charter, we must consider any attack on the four principles which I have just mentioned as an attack on the international community. This Assembly can do no less, in the present situation, than to declare unequivocally that no country can be permitted to end or solve its own disputes through recourse to war, for that would be a return to the law of the jungle and that also would be an end of the international rule of law and morality.

177. If we acquiesce today in the proposition that a victor in an armed conflict can defy the United Nations mandate, can violate the basic principles of the Charter, then we might as well tear up the Charter and admit to ourselves that the idea of a world community living in peace was only a dream and the reality is that might is right, that the strong and victorious shall prevail, and that justice and right must

<sup>15/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1352nd meeting.

submit to the behests of the party to a military conflict which has been victorious in the field of battle.

178. I make no apology in emphasizing again that the duty of this Assembly is to recommend immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Arab territories.

This is the central issue which we have to face and decide. We should further request the Security Council to take necessary and adequate steps forthwith to effect these withdrawals.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*