

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

**1531st  
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 22 June 1967,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

*Agenda item 5:*

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

*Page*

*1*

**President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHAWAK**  
**(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 in the general debate this morning, the  
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hashemite King-  
dom of Jordan, Mr. Ahmad Tuqan, has asked to make  
a brief statement. I give him the floor.

2. Mr. TUQAN (Minister for Foreign Affairs of the  
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan): The west bank of  
Jordan, occupied presently by Israeli armed forces,  
is now undergoing an unprecedented human experience,  
where Israel is executing a calculated plan that seeks  
to obliterate the demographic structure of the area.  
This act on the part of Israel is being perpetrated in  
order to expedite the incorporation of the occupied  
areas organically in the State of Israel. Villages are  
being wiped out and Jordanian populations are being  
forcibly uprooted and evicted. They are left without  
shelter and are being deliberately starved. This is  
done as part of a deliberate and preconceived plan  
to dislodge the Jordanian populations and to humiliate  
them. What looks like a scheme of piecemeal exter-  
mination is now being pursued.

3. The method of forcible eviction of the Arab popu-  
lation follows a pattern of behaviour on the part of  
Israel with which we are very familiar. It emanates  
from a complete disregard and even contempt for the  
most elementary human rights. The continued expul-  
sion of the Arab inhabitants of the west bank of the  
Jordan who are now, in constantly increasing numbers,  
flocking to the east bank for refuge, has created a  
fearful problem for the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan,  
a problem which is assuming an increasingly acute  
dimension.

4. In view of the seriousness of the problem created  
by the policy on which Israel has embarked for  
vacating the west bank of its Arab inhabitants, the  
Government of Jordan has decided to take the neces-  
sary steps to bring the matter to the attention of the  
Secretary-General of the United Nations. A letter was  
therefore sent to the Secretary-General last night.

I shall now, with your permission, Mr. President,  
read that letter:

"Upon instruction of my Government I have the  
honour to draw your attention to the continued acts  
of aggression committed by the Israeli authorities  
against Jordanian nationals within the west bank of  
the Jordan presently occupied by the Israeli armed  
forces.

"As of 7 June 1967, the Israeli authorities occupied  
the town of Qalquilia, evacuated its inhabitants by  
force and moved them to Nablus Mosque and to the  
olive groves surrounding that town. Having thus  
removed them, they commenced to demolish all the  
houses in the town, which demolition was still in  
progress as of 20 June.

"It is obvious that this is part of a well-calculated  
plan, which involved several other front-line  
villages, and which aims at obliterating the demo-  
graphic structure of the area.

"No fewer than 12,000 people of the above-men-  
tioned town are now living in the open air and in olive  
groves without food, shelter or clothes.

"The inhabitants of Qalquilia beseeched the  
military governor of Nablus and requested permis-  
sion to return to their town to secure some of their  
belongings. Their request was not granted.

"Only yesterday five bus loads of the inhabitants  
of this town"—Qalquilia—"were driven into the east  
bank of the Jordan, thus adding to the 150,000 refu-  
gees who have already been forced to leave the  
occupied territory.

"These inhuman and atrocious acts that are being  
inflicted upon peaceful civilians are part of a  
deliberate plan to dislodge the population in defiance  
of the Charter of the United Nations and Security  
Council resolution 237 (1967) and particularly opera-  
tive paragraph 1 which calls on the Government of  
Israel 'to ensure the safety, welfare and security of  
the inhabitants of the areas where military opera-  
tions have taken place and to facilitate the return  
of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since  
the outbreak of hostilities'.

"We, therefore, request that Your Excellency, by  
virtue of your authority under the Charter and opera-  
tive paragraph 3 of the Security Council resolution  
referred to above, take appropriate steps on this  
urgent matter.

"I shall also be grateful if this letter is circulated  
as an official document of the General Assembly and  
of the Security Council." [A/6725.]

Thus ends the letter that was sent by Jordan to His  
Excellency U Thant.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now continue the general debate.
6. Mr. WANE (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Planning of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania) (translated from French): The Israel aggression and its consequences in the Middle East and in the world at large are a source of profound concern to the Government and the people of Mauritania. That is why we welcome the happy initiative taken by the Government of the Soviet Union in requesting the convening of the present emergency special session of the General Assembly.
7. The Mauritanian delegation wishes to express its sincere gratitude to the Secretary-General for the manner in which he is discharging his important and difficult mission, thereby earning the respect and recognition of the peoples of the world. We should like to assure him of the active support of the Mauritanian Government and people in his courageous and determined struggle to gain respect for the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. The irrefutable legal basis of the reply made by the Secretary-General to the request of a sovereign State that the United Nations Emergency Force be withdrawn from its territory, and the conformity of the Secretary-General's decision with a sound concept of peace-keeping operations as well as with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter are both so clear that no insinuation on the part of the Zionist aggressors or their North American and British accomplices can stand up to them.
8. The admirable statement which the Secretary-General saw fit to give before the General Assembly two days ago [1527th meeting] in reply to the accusations of those who expect the United Nations to capitulate in the face of obvious and treacherous aggression will, we are convinced, suffice to expose the duplicity of those who have seriously prejudiced the basic principles of the Charter and to put them to shame for seeking even today, with typical effrontery, to challenge the integrity and impartiality with which U Thant is working for peace and for respect for human rights.
9. The people and Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania are deeply concerned over what is happening in the Territory of the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordanian.
10. As a small country and a non-aligned African State, we stand firmly on the side of those who are fighting against the forces which essentially imperialist colonial countries are using to conquer those who have refused their domination. Our effective support goes unhesitatingly to the peoples of the world who are struggling to defend their dignity, their territorial integrity, their freedom and their independence.
11. On several previous occasions we have explained the position of the Mauritanian Government and people with regard to the grave crisis which the Israel authorities, by an act of brutal, deliberate and treacherous aggression, have brought about in the Middle East with the blessing and the active support of the imperialist West, particularly the United States of America and Great Britain.
12. In our opinion it is inconceivable that the United Nations, held powerless as a result of the enormous pressure exercised by the United States of America, should agree to Israel's continued and unrestrained enjoyment of the fruits of its criminal and treacherous aggression against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Arab peoples without the slightest censure on the part of the Security Council. What, in fact, is the deeper significance of the serious developments now taking place in the Arab Middle East? What lesson can be drawn from Israel's obvious act of aggression, which some seem to be viewing with regrettable lack of concern?
13. This disgraceful act of aggression, committed in complete contempt for the most sacred principle of the United Nations Charter, proves, if proof were necessary, that a handful of Zionist fanatics, or for that matter any handful of fascists fed on expansionist ideas, can plunge any part of the Third World into chaos before placing it at their mercy.
14. We are well aware of the intentions of those who help Israel in its aggression against the Arab countries and within the very heart of our Organization continue, with revolting duplicity, to seek out justifications and excuses for this deliberate aggression. Those who are seeking to profit from the ill-gotten gains of this aggression see in it, above all, a means of arresting the progress of the Middle East and destroying its progressive régime, thus securing the wealth of that region for their benefit alone. From the point of view of those who support Israel's aggression, there can be no doubt that the treatment being applied at the present moment to the Arab Middle East can perfectly well be applied to any area of the Third World which may be a source of concern to the imperialist Powers.
15. The grave crisis created in the Middle East is undoubtedly designed to achieve yet another purpose. In the minds of the active accomplices of the Israel Zionist aggression, it represents a temporary means of diverting the eyes of the world from what is happening in Viet-Nam and from the dirty war in progress there. For it is a fact that the peace-, freedom- and justice-loving peoples of the world are reacting more and more violently to the monstrous crimes being committed every day by the American armed forces in Viet-Nam.
16. The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania wishes to pay a special tribute to General de Gaulle, the President of the French Republic, for the position he recently took on France's behalf with regard to the grave crisis deliberately created by Israel in the Middle East. France's unequivocal condemnation of the aggression of 5 June shows its respect for the ideals of peace and for the dignity and sovereignty of the peoples whose cause General de Gaulle has long championed. We would have expected no less from so eminent a statesman, one whose policy of decolonization and whose acute awareness of the realities of our time have earned him the respect and admiration of all who hold dear the ideals of peace, justice and freedom.
17. The Mauritanian people and Government have already made it very plain that racial and religious

considerations alone do not account for our unequivocal stand with regard to the grave crisis through which the Arab peoples of the Middle East are now passing. Our considered position is based primarily upon an awareness of our solidarity with the peoples of the Third World and their destiny, and upon our devotion to the fundamental principles governing relations among members of the international community.

18. We are not racists. On the contrary, our people is basically opposed to Zionist expansionism.

19. We resolutely condemn all injustice and all violation of the fundamental principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. We should remember that the State of Israel was born out of a grave injustice committed against the Arab people of Palestine. Israel owes its existence and the very extent of its territory to repeated violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the neighbouring Arab States.

20. It can never be too often repeated that the massacres and the inhuman treatment, the frightful suffering of great numbers of people in the Jewish communities of Europe under the yoke of German Nazism outraged the feelings of the Arabs just as they did the rest of the world. But the Arabs are not responsible for the crimes of German Nazism.

21. I think we are within our rights when we say that the planting of a Zionist State in the heart of the Arab Middle East, an action accompanied by massacres of the inhabitants of the region, whose survivors are reduced by force to the condition of refugees living in squalid camps, was as tragic and abominable a crime as any committed by German Nazism against the Jewish communities of Europe. Filled with hatred and actively encouraged by their protectors, chief among whom were the United States of America and the United Kingdom, the Zionist elements gathered on the Arab soil of Palestine ruthlessly expelled more than a million Arabs from their land and their homes. Since that time, the Zionist authorities of Israel have expanded their territory by means of an uninterrupted series of violations of the rights of neighbouring Arab countries.

22. Seen in this light, the action of Israel and the tragedy of the Palestinian Arabs are matters of concern not only to Arabs but also to the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America and to all those who cherish peace and justice. From the very beginning of this tragedy in Palestine, it has become apparent that the Zionist authorities forcibly installed on Arab soil represent the colonialist element whose chief aim is to disrupt, with the assistance of the imperialists, the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the Arab Middle East. Assured of impunity, the Zionist authorities in Israel have continued their criminal acts against the Arab people.

23. To mention only the most recent period, we all recall the shameful act of aggression committed on 27 November 1966 against Jordan. Still more recently, on 7 April of this year, the Israel Zionist authorities ordered a large-scale air attack against Syria.

24. Hence we have good reason to take a resolute stand against the Zionists of Israel.

25. No one, or at least no one in Mauritania, can possibly forget for an instant the distressing and serious problem of the Palestine refugees who have been brutally expelled from their land and condemned to live on international charity in squalid camps.

26. We, as Africans, have no right to remain indifferent, and indeed cannot remain indifferent to what is happening in the Arab Middle East. Let us not forget that the State of Israel might have been set up on the soil of one of our countries. The result would have been exactly the same as what we see going on today on the Arab soil of Palestine.

27. Nor can we forget the South African and Rhodesian cancer. Scarcely ten days ago, on 13 June [1524th meeting], the President brought to an end the work of the session devoted to the dramatic problem of South West Africa. The South African representative plainly indicated that his Government, although a Member of our Organization, did not feel bound by the decisions adopted by an overwhelming majority of Member States. What we wish to emphasize by recalling that fact is obvious. Neither the arrogance of the exponents of apartheid in Pretoria and of the white racist minority led by Ian Smith, nor the complete contempt for the Organization's decisions displayed by Pretoria and Salisbury, nor again the cold-blooded manner in which the sacred rights and the dignity of our brothers in that part of southern Africa are being violated would be possible were it not for the effective support of those who are today accomplices and the brains of the aggression carried out by the Israel Zionists against the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan.

28. When in the near future Ian Smith or the exponents of the vile doctrine of apartheid in Pretoria, enjoying the same support as Israel has just availed itself of, decide to attack the true sons of Africa, hemming them in still further and eliminating them completely in order to create super-powerful white States, the precedent which will have been laid down will provide them with a guarantee and a starting point. When that happens, those who are silent today will have to remain silent. And the imperialists will triumph once again.

29. Let me repeat that what is happening today in the Middle East is not only "the business of the Arabs". It is the business of all those peoples who wish to preserve their nation's dignity, territorial integrity and freedom.

30. Let those who do not challenge Israel's existence also weigh in the scales the fate of more than a million and a half Palestinians who are without shelter or homeland.

31. During the past few weeks we have witnessed a sustained campaign on the part of the entire Press of the United States of America and most of the Western countries which is designed to distort the facts. Israel is presented as a peaceful State which is forced to defend itself against neighbouring countries determined to make war on it. Those who are behind this odious campaign describe the Secretary-General's

decision to withdraw the troops of the United Nations Emergency Force as "hasty, inopportune and even irresponsible". We should like to say once again that the decision taken by the Secretary-General in response to that request is entirely in keeping with the fundamental principles of the Charter. The irrefutable arguments which the Secretary-General presented in his report of 26 May 1967<sup>1/</sup> demonstrate the spirit of complete impartiality and respect for the principles of the Charter of our Organization which guided him in his decision. We should stress, moreover, that throughout this crisis the United Arab Republic has confined itself to measures which do not in any way exceed the authority of a State acting within strictly territorial limits and having the legitimate desire to guarantee its territorial integrity and to ensure the security of its nationals. Furthermore, the Government of the United Arab Republic informed the Security Council and the General Assembly that it "would not initiate offensive action against Israel".<sup>2/</sup> But that assurance did not prevent the Tel Aviv authorities from unleashing aggression against the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan. That aggression was only possible because of the active complicity and material assistance of the colonialist Powers working in close collaboration with the Israel Zionist authorities. The Mauritanian people have always believed that the Zionist State of Israel is a passive instrument in the hands of the oppressing forces of the imperialist nations. Situated in the heart of the Arab Middle East, Israel represents a permanent threat to international peace and security. The Zionist State of Israel plays in the Arab Middle East the part played by the white minority in Rhodesia and by those who support apartheid in South Africa.

32. The fact that the Zionist State of Israel is supported and encouraged by those same people who provide aid and assistance to the puppet clique of Chiang Kai-shek, the white minority in Rhodesia, the authorities in Pretoria, and the Portuguese fascist régime in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea, does not and must not escape the notice of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Unity of action and the maintenance of active solidarity are necessary for the success of the struggle which the peoples of the Third World are waging against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

33. Throughout the long meetings held over the last few days, the Security Council has been immobilized by the delaying tactics of the protectors of the Israel Zionists. As we see it, such shameless manoeuvres on the part of those Powers are designed to bring home to the Arabs the idea that "if you want peace, you must consent to your navigable territorial waters being changed into international maritime waterways; if you want peace, do not prevent in any way the arrogant expansionism of our Zionist protégés and, above all, do not bring up the question of the Palestine refugees; do not do anything to upset the plans of aggression directed against you. That is the price you must pay for peace."

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7906.

<sup>2/</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 9.

34. That is what the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom meant when, in several statements made before the Security Council, he reiterated:

"It is the view of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom that the Strait of Tiran must be regarded as an international waterway through which the vessels of all nations have a right of passage."

35. This was also what the permanent representative of the United States meant when he said in the Security Council:

"... conditions in the area have taken a still more menacing turn because of a threat to customary international rights which have been exercised for many years in the Gulf of Aqaba."<sup>3/</sup>

36. Such an attitude on the part of the United Kingdom and the United States of America is hardly surprising. It is obvious that this kind of peace is unacceptable in the Middle East as it would be in any other part of the world.

37. But what is even more disturbing is that the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, strongly supported by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, has used every means at his disposal to prevent the Security Council from doing its duty and condemning the Zionist aggression. Such action is in flagrant contradiction to the most sacred principles of our Organization's Charter.

38. What the Security Council has been unable to do, it is the duty of the General Assembly to accomplish.

39. What the peoples of the world expect from our Organization is a strong and clear condemnation of the aggression committed against the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan.

40. Furthermore, the General Assembly must, in the name of the fundamental principles of the Charter, demand the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops from the region they are occupying in the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan, and their return behind the armistice lines. Hence the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania firmly upholds the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.519], the adoption of which is necessary in the interests of peace and respect for the principles of the Charter.

41. The Israel troops have already done much harm and caused much suffering and considerable destruction. My delegation wishes to emphasize that such actions, which have shocked the moral conscience of the world, flagrantly contradict the sacred principles of the United Nations Charter.

42. The fait accompli resulting from the aggression of June is a most dangerous precedent for all the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The responsible authorities of those countries should reflect upon the fate which might be in store for them if such practices do not call forth the categorical and indignant condemnation of an overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations.

<sup>3/</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Year, 1342nd meeting.



43. Our Organization must shoulder its responsibilities in order to prevent the disastrous consequences to the whole world which might result from the present situation in the Arab Middle East.

44. In the occupied territories, the Israel troops loot the houses, destroy the schools and hospitals and indulge in all kinds of lawless acts. Their conduct is strangely reminiscent of that of the soldiers of Hitler in the countries occupied by the Nazis during the Second World War.

45. The Israel troops must therefore be withdrawn immediately from all the Arab regions which they illegally occupied as a result of deliberate and treacherous aggression.

46. From recent statements made by Israel's protectors and by the Zionist authorities themselves, it is easy to see that the imperialist Powers intend to force the Arabs to beg on their bended knees for a negotiated peace with the Zionists, the arrogant perpetrators of this cowardly aggression against the Arab people.

47. But the Third World would not accept such an action—or at least we hope it would not.

48. The Israel troops have already caused a great deal of suffering and destruction. Their immediate and unconditional withdrawal behind the armistice lines, and the unequivocal condemnation of Israel's aggression are the minimum measures which the General Assembly is bound to take without delay. We must become aware of these serious violations of the fundamental principles of the Charter and do something about them promptly. Any other attitude would do irreparable harm to the moral authority of our Organization and might even rob it of all meaning and all prestige.

49. Mr. HARMEL (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium) (translated from French): Despite certain legal considerations, Belgium associated itself with the request for the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly. Indeed, it was convinced of the seriousness of the present crisis, and considers the situation to be a very serious one for our Organization. The United Nations must now show whether or not it has the ability and the will to assume its responsibilities with regard to peace.

50. Belgium firmly believes in the principles of the Charter signed at San Francisco and in the purposes of our Organization which are stated therein: "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security," and to institute methods "to insure ... that armed force shall not be used".

51. We are convinced now more than ever that only a multilateral institution such as ours can create the conditions for peace if each State complies with our promise by refraining from dictating the law or exercising justice on a unilateral basis.

52. What is involved is very serious: it is not merely a question of war or peace in the Middle East; above and beyond that, the prospects for international co-operation have once again been placed in jeopardy.

An objective examination of the situation reveals only too clearly that our Organization is in a position to act. It is for us to decide whether it should do so.

53. Ever since the creation of the United Nations, States have been concerned with the situation in the Middle East. When the resolution relating to the fate of Palestine was adopted in 1947, I find that the Belgian representative expressed the following view:

"We shall vote for the majority solution only because we are convinced that the permanent members of the Security Council who have recommended its adoption, have weighed the consequences and that they will not only carry out the measures which the Security Council may be called upon to take to ensure the maintenance of peace, but that they will permit or facilitate the necessary decisions." [125th meeting.]

It is in this spirit that we have endorsed and encouraged each action the United Nations has taken in that part of the world.

54. Since then, throughout nineteen turbulent years we have taken part in the armistice commissions and made financial contributions, as far as our means would allow, to the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. However, the joint efforts of so many nations did not lead to a world-wide settlement, and we knew that any action which might alter the unstable equilibrium prevailing for better or worse in that region could at any moment rekindle hostilities. That is why the recent frontier incidents, the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, the changes in the situation along the Gulf of Aqaba, the virulent political declarations and the movements of troops created such a paroxysm of tension. We all still hoped, however, that the conflict could be avoided and all of us, as far as we were able, recommended moderation to the parties concerned. Unfortunately, on the morning of 5 June, hostilities broke out and from that moment we were certain that our Organization could not allow the conflict to develop without acting. We, no doubt like many others, sent a message to the members of the Security Council, and more particularly to its permanent members, expressing the hope that they would order a cease-fire. An armistice was essential, we wrote, as long as the fighting remained inconclusive, since later on it would assume even more serious proportions. Eventually the cease-fire came about on 10 June. But as we had feared five days earlier, the situation had undergone tremendous upheavals in a very short space of time.

55. How are we to judge the situation now? In our view, the cease-fire means simply that the Security Council on the one hand and the belligerents on the other have agreed to search for a peaceful solution instead of fighting. Thus the cessation of hostilities was merely a half measure, preliminary to pacification and only one step towards the restoration of peace. Yesterday morning [1529th meeting], Mr. Brown quite rightly pointed out that the cease-fire operations must be reinforced, and he suggested measures for this which I would strongly support. Such measures would make it possible to conduct a constructive search for an over-all peaceful settlement; but in order to accom-

plish that, we believe that two pitfalls must be avoided.

56. The first would be for one of the parties to take unilateral action during the cease-fire. In fact, no political or juridical inferences should be made from the territorial changes resulting from the fighting. We would regret any action designed to confirm the new situation on the political or juridical level, beyond the context of a freely negotiated over-all settlement.

57. The second pitfall would be for this session to begin to apportion the blame for the crisis. We feel very strongly that such an attempt would be both pointless and harmful. Its only result would be if we are objective, to make us criticize ourselves.

58. In 1948, following the deliberations of the United Nations on the Israel situation, the majority of Members of our Organization, and above all the largest of them, recognized Israel just as they recognized the other independent States of the Middle East.

59. Three times since that recognition, our Organization has had to intervene to stop fighting between Israel and its neighbours. But it has not succeeded in finding a solution to their problems or in establishing the conditions for their coexistence. For nineteen years, for better or worse, we have carried the burden of a problem which arose out of our own deliberations.

60. What, therefore, is the use of retracing our steps and engaging in polemics or diplomatic quibbling?

61. In our search for a solution, let us also avoid complicating the current situation still further by injecting into it the venom of the cold war. It would be entirely wrong to transport the European confrontation between the communist States and the non-communist States to another part of the world. It would be a pity to add in this way an element of confusion and complicate the task of those who will subsequently have to arrange negotiations and conciliations. Hence we are convinced that we must purge our debates of ideological, religious or racial anathemas, which we, for our part, will make every effort to do.

62. Consequently, what result should we or can we now expect from the deliberations of our Assembly? We are firmly convinced that, within the limits of this mission, our meeting will show some results provided that Member States agree to perform two tasks which we consider to be urgent.

63. The first is to discover a common desire for conciliation—something which we believe the vast majority of our countries possess—and on that basis to appeal to the belligerent countries and the Security Council to seek and to establish the lasting settlement for which we have been looking so long.

64. It was in that spirit that the Belgian delegation listened with hope to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics when he said here:

"Much depends on the efforts of the big Powers. It would be well if their delegations, too, could find a common language in order to reach a decision in

harmony with the interests of peace in the Middle East and the interests of universal peace." [1526th meeting, para. 81.]

65. It was with an equal hope that we took note of the appeal addressed by President Johnson on Monday, 19 June when he said:

"This is a time not for malice, but magnanimity; not for propaganda but for patience; not for vituperation, but for vision."

66. Can these two statements, which preceded the many others we have heard and were made at the very time when our Assembly was beginning its work, give us reason to believe that our Assembly will find its way through the clash of interests, passions and ideas towards that core of harmony which it needs in order to settle the immense problem that has been undermining it for nearly two decades? That is our hope.

67. The second urgent task, which the Belgian Government has asked me to stress particularly, is to call for immediate measures of assistance for the new refugees and the victims of the fighting.

68. For nearly twenty years, our Organization has been confronted with the tragic fate of the Palestine refugees. We are well aware that this fate, which is one of the scourges of the war, contains within it the seeds of a new conflict if it is not rapidly brought to an end. It is for this reason that our Organization resolved from the very start to seek lasting solutions to the problem of the Palestine refugees, solutions which have as their principal objective the reintegration of the displaced persons in economic life.

69. For many reasons of which we are all aware, the United Nations, in spite of all its efforts, has been unable to guarantee to the Palestine refugees conditions of stability and well-being which would have spared them the misery of their camps. We are deeply disappointed about this and we shall speak of it again during the next session of the General Assembly.

70. Unfortunately, the recent fighting has further aggravated the situation. Not only has UNRWA suffered material losses, but new communities of people have been forced to abandon their homes.

71. Of course, the chief goal of this Assembly is the formulation of principles which will bring about peace and stability in the Middle East; but we believe that a concurrent examination of the possibility of urgent humanitarian action will also accord with our general objectives. We support the appeals made by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and by the Security Council resolution of 14 June [237 (1967)], as well as the action of the specialized agencies. My Government hopes that as soon as possible the General Assembly will also grant the Commissioner-General of UNRWA the necessary powers to overcome, in the immediate future, the new difficulties created by the fighting and, I would emphasize, to help to bring about the repatriation of the displaced persons. We would also appeal to Governments and charitable organizations to supply UNRWA and the other rescue organizations with the necessary means which they have not yet at their disposal. Consultations are taking place

at the moment; we give them our full support. I hope that they will lead rapidly to a successful conclusion, quite apart from any considerations of a political nature, and that we shall soon see the adoption of appropriate measures, for example, in a special resolution. Several Governments have already met the situation by decreeing emergency measures. The Belgian Government, for its part, has decided to make transport planes and helicopters available to the United Nations for the entire time necessary to carry out these humanitarian operations. The planes will be arriving at Amman today carrying the emergency aid which has been offered by Belgium.

72. A unanimous appeal on the part of our Assembly would most certainly lead to further international efforts and would demonstrate that man's well-being and dignity are still essential objectives of us all.

73. Permit me now to say how Belgium views the dilemma facing this Assembly. Long experience indicates that we have two alternatives.

74. One of these is gloomy: if we do not seriously seek and, as a result, achieve, a peaceful over-all settlement, the Near East will remain subject to the laws of force and insecurity. The arms race for conventional weapons will be resumed to the detriment of that region's development; we will then find it difficult to prevent one or the other of those countries from trying to obtain possession of an atomic weapon. Territorial conquest and reconquest will remain the strategic and political objectives on all sides; fighting will then begin again as soon as possible and who knows whether this time the entire world may not be dragged into the disaster.

75. The other alternative is that of complete settlement in accordance with the principles of Article 2 of the Charter: the sovereign equality of all Members, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the renunciation of the threat or use of force.

76. These principles, which the President of the Italian Council of Ministers defined so clearly yesterday [1530th meeting], form the basis of any equitable and definitive solution. Thus, without giving a time priority to any of the measures that I shall once more enumerate, the States involved will desist from their belligerence; Israel will abandon any expansionist aims and hence any military occupation; it will be recognized as having the status of a sovereign State without any reservation; and innocent passage through maritime water ways will be respected in accordance with international conventions.

77. In the same spirit, a realistic and lasting solution will at last be found to the tragic problem of the refugees; international guarantees will be provided with respect to all the Holy Places of all the various religions.

78. Finally, is there any reason why we should not guarantee peace in the Middle East by establishing a regional security agreement, in accordance with Article 52 of the Charter? This would help in particular to limit the arms race in that region.

79. Hence two courses are open to us: one is in accordance with the Charter, the other is not.

80. And we believe that the nations have no choice. Our Assembly must guide negotiations only towards those decisions which are in accordance with the Charter. Though we know that nothing can be definitive without the agreement of the parties concerned, our Assembly can indicate in a resolution the direction in which we should go.

81. It can also remind the great Powers and those who have the dangerous honour of sitting temporarily on the Security Council that they are vested with the undisputed authority to help those whose conflict they have interrupted. They will be usurping no one's power by arranging negotiations, offering the use of their good offices, or suggesting any mediation that may prove possible.

82. In conclusion, we feel the need to stress the particular confidence which the Charter places in the countries that are Permanent Members of the Security Council. Therefore, on behalf of my country, I would tell them that we, as one of the peoples of the United Nations, recognized in San Francisco that they have a special role to play in the maintenance of peace. We recognized their power and their authority. Why should we not emphasize their responsibility today? They have not exhausted the possibilities for action open to them; in fact, those possibilities have barely been broached. We shall be disappointed if they do not act and they must know that we have confidence in them now, just as we did in San Francisco.

83. We hope that during the present session a recommendation will be adopted which will encourage the parties involved to move along the only path required of them by their obligations under the Charter, a course which will strengthen the actions of the Security Council and of its permanent members, and which will indicate the broad lines of the peaceful settlement desired by all States.

84. On the other hand, our Assembly could precipitate a more acute phase in this crisis. But it will not do so; it will find in itself and in the principles which unite us sufficient wisdom and strength to establish peace in the Middle East.

85. Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (Minister for Foreign Affairs of France) (translated from French): It is in grave, and even in dramatic circumstances that the United Nations General Assembly has met for this emergency special session, on the initiative, of course, of one of its Members, but with the agreement of the great majority, if not of practically all of them. This is a natural reflex at a time when a war has just, if not ended, at least stopped, and when the Middle East in particular and the whole world in general are facing a crisis which is serious enough in itself, but which threatens to rebound at any moment and may, unless the situation is radically changed, be dangerously prolonged for years to come.

86. I have said that it is a natural reflex. A war of any kind is a shock and an ordeal for the entire international community which directly feels its repercussions, and feels them all the more because it senses and knows that another deplorable conflict has been raging elsewhere for a long time and that what has just happened in the Middle East has a direct psycho-

logical and political connexion with the worsening situation in South East Asia.

87. Hence it is only natural that the Assembly should wish to discuss it and to express its feelings, or rather its emotions, that anyone who wishes to do so should give his opinion and that in the end, failing any conclusions, some trends should at least emerge, as far as that is possible. Such, in the view of the French delegation, is the role which seems to fall to the General Assembly under the terms of its Charter. For it is evident that international opinion as it will now be expressed, even if its reactions are diverse, will play an important part in guiding necessary actions in the future.

88. The legal terms under which the Assembly is meeting are, in the last analysis, of little significance. What is important is that it should be able to discuss the situation. We are not asking it to take decisions; in any case, that is not its task. If any action is called for on the part of the United Nations, we know very well that it is for the Security Council to initiate it. The Security Council has already discussed the problem and voted on it during the last few weeks. I have no doubt that in the near future it will have plenty of opportunities to do so again.

89. One need hardly be a pessimist to see that the situation resulting from the events listed on our agenda is gloomy and fraught with danger. This is so in the Middle East itself, and so too when one considers the world-wide implications of the crisis and especially the relations between the major Powers.

90. The situation on the spot is, alas, far removed from what it was at the time, scarcely two weeks ago, when the only question was the freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba. What at the time gave rise to so much excitement, so much controversy and even so much passion, seems now to be, if not secondary in importance, at least completely outdistanced by events. The war has thrown open the door to all the demons. How could it have been otherwise?

91. First of all, from the human standpoint, it has given rise to intolerable sorrow and suffering. It has brought back into the foreground the problem of the refugees, both the new refugees—and there are many of them—and the former refugees from Palestine whose very status, precarious as it has been over the past eighteen years, is once again in jeopardy, while a second exodus means new trials for many of them. This is a problem which imposes new obligations, not only on the Government which bears the immediate responsibility as a result of the fighting, but on the international community as a whole. The Security Council has not failed to consider the problem. But this is only the first step and should be followed by effective measures.

92. Then, from the political standpoint, the situation is probably even graver. All the questions are suddenly raised simultaneously. All the opposing forces reappear in their harshest light. All the impossibilities become more apparent than perhaps ever before. In short, the war has settled nothing and has made everything more difficult. And yet the basic facts remain the same. The problem is still that Jews and Moslems in the East should be able to live side by

side in peace, tolerance and mutual respect. This is manifestly their interest if not their duty. It is also the interest of all other nations.

93. It has become a cliché to say that peace is indivisible. We have direct experience of this in the crisis with which we are now concerned. When the fighting broke out, and especially when it turned into a trial of strength, who among us did not feel that the peace of the world itself might be at stake, especially since this is a region which, from time immemorial, has been the chosen land for foreign intervention and the conflicts of Powers, whatever form those Powers may have taken throughout a history of several thousand years? From time immemorial this region has been one of the most sensitive in the world, if only for the reason that it lies at the confines of three continents and because it was the cradle of civilization and of the religions of half of mankind.

94. In our own time, it has inevitably become a confrontation ground for those who, because of all the means at their disposal—but primarily military means—encounter one another on every side in the same way. The danger is all the more apparent in that the Viet-Nam war, to which I have already referred, can only help to extend this troubled state of affairs, not just locally but over a wide area, and will even affect the psychological and political process which has led to the present crisis, above all because it involves and renders more acute—one might say almost automatically—the confrontation of two very powerful States.

95. In all objectivity we must say that the temptations of escalation have been resisted. This was most certainly wise. Moreover, a general war—or any other war for that matter—would solve no problems, assuming that there would be any problems left to solve. But such action only served to ward off the most pressing danger, for the fact remains that subsequently, as had been the case before, the differences between certain great Powers became more pronounced than ever, and they remain an essential element in the situation.

96. Ever since the crisis began in circumstances, which it is no longer necessary to recall, France, for its part, found in these opposing forces a further reason for continuing to advocate moderation and for trying to convince the opposing sides of the need for it. Up until 5 June last, when the issue was still the passage through the Strait of Tiran—a question which has never been the subject of anything more than a *de facto* settlement imposed by one of the adversaries on the other—France constantly reiterated that it was necessary to arrive at a negotiated settlement, even if it was only a *modus vivendi*, failing a convention in good and due form. France thought, and it still thinks, that such a discussion need not have been impossible, with the help, of course, of the international community. Perhaps than the four permanent members of the Security Council, working in harmony, would have been able to play a useful role. But events did not take that course. We have nevertheless persisted in saying, to both parties, that to resort to arms would be the worst thing that could happen, and so that



there should be no misunderstanding, the French Government publicly and solemnly stated on 2 June:

"France has not entered into a commitment of any kind or on any subject with either of the States involved. For her own part, she considers that each of these States has the right to exist, but that the opening of hostilities would be the worst possible outcome. Consequently, the first State to take up arms, wherever it might be, would not have its approval, still less its support."

97. We added that it was a case of finding a solution to the root of the existing problems, and this included not only that of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba but also the situation of the Palestine refugees and the situation existing between the neighbouring States concerned. Such was the task with which we were confronted if the prevailing situation of expectancy was to be maintained and a *de facto* détente was to result.

98. This appeal to reason went unheard. Since then we find ourselves in a situation that has changed radically. It is this situation which we must now face.

99. First, from the international viewpoint—and this should be the primary concern of the United Nations—the differences are more pronounced than ever. Three great Powers have no relations at all with one or other of the parties—the Soviet Union with Israel, and the United States of America and Great Britain with many of the Arab countries, beginning with those which are most directly involved. This only serves to emphasize the world-wide nature of the crisis.

100. On the other hand, from the regional viewpoint, all the elements are now present for an indefinitely prolonged struggle. As a result of its military victories, Israel now occupies territories belonging to the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which in themselves are considerable, especially in relation to the size of Israel's own territory, and which have an Arab population which, including as it does the Palestine refugees, is quite substantial in comparison with Israel's own population. It seems obvious that such a situation which is the result of a cease-fire painfully achieved after unanimous and repeated appeals by the Security Council must, if it is allowed to continue, give rise to incessant and dangerous incidents.

101. The Israel Government, basing itself on the present military situation, and deliberately putting aside for the future any further intervention on the part of the United Nations or a third Power, has announced that it intends to discuss peace terms with each of the Arab countries individually. It has not, however, defined these terms, even though they seem to go far beyond freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba. How can it be expected that these Arab countries, which for twenty years have refused to negotiate with Israel—however great the shock they suffered or possibly even because of that shock—would be any more ready to negotiate today than they were yesterday? It has, I dare say, never been more difficult to envisage even the minimum of dialogue. This is the first and tragic observation we are forced to make.

102. In other words, this is a precarious and perilous situation from which, at the moment, there seems to be no way out. However, the duty, the interest and the mission of all of us is to prevent it from continuing in its present form, for peace might not long endure. If it were endangered a second time that would undoubtedly prove a worse and possibly more widespread disaster than before and nothing further would have been settled. We can, indeed, state in principle that war is no solution; this I have said several times but I repeat it again because I believe that it is vital. The belief that the use of force is not the way to settle a conflict is not only France's traditional attitude but it is also the fundamental principle of the Charter of our Organization. This is still more true in the case of the present conflict.

103. The Arabs and the Israelis are to some extent fated to live side by side in the Middle East. They must live together. They have, indeed, done so for untold centuries even if conditions in the past were very different. That is why we cannot impose a solution to the detriment of either of them, since such a solution would inevitably be called into question at the first favourable opportunity. In other words, some understanding must be finally reached.

104. The position of the French Government, from the moment the military operations ended, has been prompted by these feelings and this viewpoint. It goes without saying, as we said at that time, that no fait accompli on the spot regarding territorial limits and the status of the citizens of the States concerned can be accepted as permanent. Only a freely-negotiated settlement, accepted by all parties involved and recognized by the international community, can eventually solve the problems as a whole.

105. Obviously, we are far from achieving this and the French delegation knows that as well as anyone. But it is precisely because the situation is serious that the General Assembly is discussing it. When everyone has spoken in turn, whatever may be the conclusions which are finally reached, it will emerge beyond all doubt that there is no other way than the one we are pointing out.

106. Hence, it will be for the international community itself to take the first step and to make first the effort in a spirit of justice and a desire for peace. Within that community, it will be up to those whose special responsibility for the maintenance of security is recognized by the Charter to play the part which has been allotted to them. We know, moreover, that nothing will be done without those Powers, nor, with all the more reason, against them or against one of them.

107. It is certainly not in the interest of any of the countries in that region to become pawns in the game of the great Powers to be used by them for their own political ends. But neither is it in the interest of the great Powers themselves, if, as I believe, they sincerely desire peace, to encourage local rivalries and even to make use of the divisions which exist between the various sides, while leaving unsolved the problems over which they are opposing one another. It is in this spirit, as a united and constructive effort, in other words, that the French delegation reviews possible courses of action. Every precaution

should, of course, be taken, for the intention is to help and not to force the hand of countries that are independent and that intend to remain so.

108. But here again, we should like to point out that the world context is essential. So long as the war continues in Viet-Nam, there will be no prospect of peace in the Middle East. But entirely new prospects would immediately open up should the war come to an end on the terms which France has frequently reiterated, terms which would imply a bold and fruitful decision on the part of a great State.

109. With that in mind and in the atmosphere of harmony which must be re-established, France for its part will always be ready to work for peace. France feels that it can claim to be entirely impartial and that its sole objective, in the Middle East as elsewhere, is peace and nothing more. I should like to say first to the Israelis that France has never known racism and that this is even more true today than it has ever been. It maintains time-honoured relations with the Arabs based, as far as it is concerned, on respect for their dignity and on the knowledge that their primary need is to affirm their national identity and their economic and human development. It is enough to say that my country's sole ambition is to see this crisis, which is threatening to persist and to expand, come to an end in such a way that peace in the Middle East and throughout the world will never again be endangered. Since the fighting has only just come to an end, it is not possible as yet to appreciate the magnitude of the damage. We are well aware that months, years, even many years will go by before that damage is repaired, let alone forgotten. Let us, however, continue to hope and let us each strive to play our part so that one day—no doubt a long way off as yet, but one day nevertheless—the Jews and Moslems now so cruelly pitted against one another in the Middle East may finally cease to be enemies.

110. Mr. PIRZADA (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan): The situation which the General Assembly, in this emergency special session, has met to consider is one of the most fateful in the contemporary history of mankind. It is as charged with tragedy as it is heavy with portent.

*Mr. Csatorday (Hungary), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

111. The witnesses to the tragedy are the thousands of dead in Jordan, Syria and Sinai. They are also the hundreds of thousands more who have been rendered homeless—many of them for the second time. The death of some and the loss of their homes by others has diminished us all. But, indeed, there is another victim in this tragedy. It is not so much the Arab nation—which will, I am confident, regain its territorial integrity—as it is the fabric of peace which this Organization was meant to build, to guard and to preserve. The victim is the Charter of the United Nations whose principles have been reduced to tatters.

112. I submit, there will be no solution of this crisis until these principles are revived and reasserted by the international community. Let us look briefly at what has happened to these principles, both in the

clash of arms in the Middle East and in the din of debate in the Security Council.

113. A basic principle of the Charter requires that force shall not be used against the territorial integrity of Member States except in self-defence against armed attack. Is there any doubt that Israel fired the first shot? The very fact that the Arab countries were caught unaware and actually sustained grievous losses during the first hours of the war when, as Israel itself claims, it wiped out their Air Force, shows who took the initiative. The matter has been so widely reported in the world Press that any questioning of it betrays a total indifference to facts.

114. The evidence is corroborated by the crucial fact that the President of the United Arab Republic had given assurance to the Governments of both the United States and the Soviet Union that his forces would not strike first against Israel, and no corresponding assurance was either given by or obtained from Israel during the critical two weeks before the war. Even those who have been clearly hostile to the President of the United Arab Republic did not, and could not, assert that he gave the assurance and then dishonoured it.

115. It is therefore clear beyond any possibility of doubt that Israel resorted to force and invaded the territories of three Member States. Was this aggression? Any reasonable doubt about the answer to this question can only arise from an impression that perhaps Israel had some justification for taking unilateral action by force.

116. Let us examine this. According to Article 51 of the Charter, the only justification for the exercise of the right of self-defence is the occurrence of armed attack. Even in that contingency, the matter is to be reported to the Security Council and the exercise of the right terminates when the Council has taken measures necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

117. The conclusion is therefore inescapable that Israel resorted to force and acted contrary to the Charter. Those who might be unwilling to call it "aggression" and condemn it as such can be influenced only by the thought that the so-called blockade of the Strait of Tiran was perhaps a mitigating circumstance. Mr. Eban, in his statement on 19 June before this Assembly, almost made this act the initial point of war. He stated:

"From the moment the blockade was imposed, active hostilities had commenced and Israel owed Egypt nothing of her Charter rights." [1526th meeting, para. 133.]

118. I would beg representatives not to be overwhelmed by propaganda, but to look facts squarely in the face.

119. First, even when Israel was denied by the United Arab Republic the right of passage through and in the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel's navigation remained unrestricted on its Mediterranean coast. It is admitted that navigation through the Strait of Tiran accounted for no more than 5 to 10 per cent of Israel's trade.

120. Second, the action of the United Arab Republic did not create an entirely new situation; it merely restored the status quo ante and sought to liquidate a consequence of Israel's aggression in 1956. Israel had enjoyed no right of passage through the Strait of Tiran before 1956, and this situation had not aroused opposition on the part of most maritime Powers.

121. Third, the assertion of Israel's right could be based only on its possession of the Port of Elath. But this port was nothing but the Arab port of Umm Reshresh, which Israel occupied by the use of force in violation of the Armistice Agreement of 1949. No legal right could be asserted on the basis of an illegal act.

122. Fourth, the action taken by the United Arab Republic was by no means an unprovoked act and did not amount to a sudden stoppage of innocent passage. In the words of paragraph 4 of article 14 of the 1958 Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, "passage is innocent so long as it is not prejudicial to the peace, good order or security of the coastal State".<sup>4/</sup> In April 1967, Israel carried out a major raid on Syria and threatened raids of still greater size. Certainly, international law did not require the United Arab Republic to continue to allow Israel to bring in through Arab territorial waters oil and other strategic supplies which could be used to conduct further military raids.

123. Fifth, the United Arab Republic was not the first party to assert a belligerent right. The records of the Security Council show that over the years Israel has continually launched what it calls "reprisal" raids, and that the Council has consistently dismissed this right of reprisal and retaliation. I shall refer later to this record. At the moment, the point is that, whether based on belligerency or not, the closing of a strait to strategic cargo for Israel was a far more peaceable act than the military actions which Israel has launched from time to time.

124. It is this situation that was presented to the world by Israel as furnishing a casus belli. If, under the influence of rhetoric, we endorse this evaluation of the situation that prevailed in the Middle East prior to the outbreak of hostilities on 5 June, we turn our backs on all the principles that the Charter obliges us to maintain and uphold. Nothing is more repugnant to the Charter than this concept of casus belli. What is this concept except a reversion to international anarchy? If each nation has a right by itself to determine what constitutes a cause justifying war, then nothing is left of that international order predicated in the Charter. Then, all its principles and procedures can be consigned to oblivion.

125. I do submit that we here in the United Nations cannot afford to consign to oblivion the principles of the Charter. Israel launched a unilateral armed action on the territories of three Member States without any justification in the Charter. This is a game which more than one can play. If one Member State feels justified in doing it today, another will do it tomorrow. The great Powers, armed with their

might, may not fear this prospect, but we, the others not so privileged, can only shudder.

126. On behalf of the Government of Pakistan, I would therefore urge the Assembly to take note of and to condemn Israel's aggression. The pronouncement of the Assembly should be as clear as the aggression was naked.

127. It is important that, in pronouncing itself on this aggression, the Assembly should remain mindful of its background also. Mr. Eban employed his ingenuity, both of words and of arguments, in an attempt to exculpate the offender and, indeed, to prove the innocent guilty. He quoted extracts from statements of Arab leaders which, according to him, were inflammatory and constituted a threat to Israel's existence. But we in this Assembly have to look at these things in their proper perspective and context. When a people has been subjected to encroachment of the scale and magnitude which is exemplified in the establishment of Israel, and when all avenues for the redress of their grievances are barred, what will be their natural response? It is bound to be one of vehement language. To try to convince this Assembly, therefore, that such statements materially affected the situation in the Middle East is nothing but to presume ignorance on our part and to try to capitalize on it. An objective account of the situation is given in the Secretary-General's report.

"Intemperate and bellicose utterances, by other officials and non-officials, eagerly reported by the Press and radio, are unfortunately more or less routine on both sides of the lines in the Near East. In recent weeks, however, reports emanating from Israel have attributed to some high officials in that State statements so threatening as to be particularly inflammatory in the sense that they could only heighten emotions and thereby increase tensions on the other side of the lines."<sup>5/</sup>

128. I might recall here the reports of Israel's threats against Syria which were published in the world Press. I quote from a report published in The New York Times of 13 May:

"... Israeli leaders have decided that the use of force against Syria may be the only way to curtail increasing terrorism.

"Any such Israeli reaction to continued infiltration probably would be of considerable strength but of short duration and limited in area.

"...

"An Israeli source has remarked that Israel must make her position clear to the Syrians and the only way to do so is with force."

129. This, incidentally, disposes of the repeated denial by the Israeli authorities of the reports that they were preparing to attack Syria in the middle of May.

130. Deeds always speak louder than words. It is the practice of the Israeli leaders to present to the world the image of a small, helpless, peace-loving people

<sup>4/</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>5/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7896, para. 8.

surrounded by bellicose and predatory neighbours. But how does this image stand when placed in juxtaposition with reality? The reality is that Israel was born in violence, nurtured on terror and enlarged by aggression, and that it remains, as Mr. Eban's statement demonstrated, an unrepentant aggressor.

131. Alone among the Member States of the United Nations, Israel has been rebuked or censured by the Security Council at least as many as seven times. It is not necessary for me to recount the record here. Of one incident, I have a vivid personal memory. It was in November of last year, the very day of the arrival in Jordan of President Ayub Khan on a state visit, that Israel chose to carry out its brutal raid on the village of Es-Samu and kill its inhabitants.

132. If there are any who think that the continual resort to violence by Israel may be based on accidents, they should ponder the truth stated by an impartial United States observer, Commander E. H. Hutchison, who was the head of the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission. In his book Violent Truce he states:

"That Israel was following a government policy of reprisal and intimidation against the Arabs was a guarded secret until early in 1954. Up until then, each incident was attributed to an angry and uncontrollable citizenry. However, those who investigated the Israeli raids recognized the hand of Israeli security forces in most instances. In announcing and attempting to defend Israel's policy of reprisal, Moshe Brilliant, in the March 1955 issue of Harper's magazine, lifted the veil of secrecy from many past incidents and, in a way, painted a rather dismal picture of what may be expected in future Israel-Arab relations.

"Those bloody 'border incidents' are seldom accidental ... They are retaliation, part of a deliberate plan to force the Arabs to the peace table. Some call it 'realistic', others 'cynical'—but it promises to be effective!"<sup>6/</sup>

133. Commander Hutchison adds:

"It is difficult to understand a nation in today's world settling, even covertly, on such a plan."<sup>7/</sup>

134. As Israel has had a cumulative record of military actions, it is elementary justice that the rebukes and censures administered by the Security Council, which have had no effect on it, should now culminate in action sufficient to have a real deterrent effect. We hope that the United Nations has the moral resources to initiate such action itself, and not leave it to the inevitable nemesis of time.

135. Before I come to another basic principle of the Charter, I should like to refer to an important matter. The Secretary-General decided on 18 May to accede to the request of the Government of the United Arab Republic, made in the exercise of sovereign rights, for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force. There has been some criticism of the Secretary-General's action. Many speakers before me have noted Israel's refusal to accept the

deployment of the Force on its side of the border, following the suggestion of the Minister of External Affairs of Canada, which the Secretary-General put to Israel. A few days ago a memorandum purporting to have been left by the late Dag Hammarskjöld was published in an attempt to prove that U Thant acted contrary to the understanding reached between the Secretary-General and President Nasser in 1957 on the conditions to be complied with if the question came to withdrawal of the Emergency Force. The Secretary-General has given a clear and convincing reply. We regret and deplore attacks on the Secretary-General. They can only weaken the United Nations. Pakistan reposes the fullest confidence in his judgement, impartiality and integrity.

136. I now come to another basic principle of the Charter. This involves the obligation of the United Nations to suppress—I repeat "to suppress"—acts of aggression. Let us see how this obligation has been honoured so far.

137. The suppression of aggression can have only two meanings. It can mean either the employment by the United Nations of force superior to that of the aggressor, with the result that the aggression is punished and restrained, or, if such force is not available, the taking of measures which would remove or liquidate the consequences of the aggression. The first kind of action is envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter; the second is the type which the United Nations has taken so far in other situations resulting from the use of armed force.

138. What action has the Security Council taken so far in the present crisis? It takes satisfaction from having brought about a cease-fire. But that resolution was passed at a time when Israel had already accomplished most of its objectives. The Security Council failed to determine the act of aggression when the act was unmistakable. Added to this was the even graver failure to call upon Israel to withdraw its forces immediately behind the demarcation lines laid down in the Armistice Agreements.

139. It is not my intention to dwell upon the causes or motivations of this failure. But to all those who are concerned with maintaining the principles of the Charter, it cannot but be cause for dismay that the Security Council has departed from precedents, and has allowed Israel to gain an advantage and to keep its forces in the territories of Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic.

140. We in Pakistan are quite familiar with the precedents which are relevant in this context. The Security Council brought about a cease-fire in two instances of fighting between India and Pakistan in 1949 and in 1965. In both cases, the call for a cease-fire was accompanied by a call for the withdrawal of the forces of the combatants. This was not fortuitous. It is basic to the law of the Charter that a threat or breach of international peace cannot be removed or averted unless the combatant forces are withdrawn to their original positions. It is also elementary justice. In the present situation, to allow the troops of the invader to remain on the soil of the victim would be to permit the aggression to continue.

<sup>6/</sup> Commander E. H. Hutchison, Violent Truce (New York, The Devin-Adair Company, 1956), p. 116.

<sup>7/</sup> Ibid.



141. I submit that the Security Council cannot escape this clear implication of its failure to insist on the immediate withdrawal of Israel's troops from the territories of Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. Nothing is more urgent now than that this failure be repaired and the honour of the United Nations redeemed.

142. It was rightly observed by some members of the Security Council that the Council's resolution calling for a cease-fire was unsound because it did not demand the withdrawal of forces simultaneously. The truth of this observation was demonstrated by the events which took place after the Council adopted its resolution. The representatives of Israel felt free to make statements about the actuality of the cease-fire which were contrary to facts. References have already been made to these untrue and misleading statements.

143. Israel disregarded the cease-fire until its objectives and designs had been accomplished. It is hard to believe that this could have happened if the Security Council had taken the straightforward course of condemning the aggressor and asking him to withdraw his troops.

144. What has been the effect of the Council's failure in this respect?

145. One effect is readily apparent. Prior to launching the aggression and even on the day the fighting began, Moshe Dayan had declared that Israel had "no aim of territorial conquest". Two days later, the same person stated that Israel would never depart from the Old City of Jordanian Jerusalem. Mr. Levi Eshkol first said that the sole aim of Israel's unilateral action would be to destroy an encircling blockade, but on 12 June he declared that Israel would not retreat within its prewar frontiers. We are deeply anguished that Israel, having seized the Holy City of Jerusalem in the course of its aggression, makes no secret of its intentions to annex it. It calls annexation 'unification'. It is at Israel's design to present the world and this Assembly with a fait accompli that the Government of Pakistan felt compelled to protest in our letter of 16 June to the Secretary-General [A/6722].

146. I put the question to this Assembly: if Israel is entitled to present a fait accompli, what principle of restraint on State action, what rule of international conduct disentitles any other State from doing so? If Israel can invade and keep Jerusalem, why should not every other State invade and keep whatever territory it may covet? Has Israel gained, by the use of force, a superior title to defy this Organization?

147. If so, then should we not all assume a similar title, denounce the obligations under the Charter, repudiate all its procedures, and let force be the arbiter of international disputes? It is this crucial question which this Assembly is called upon to answer.

148. I recall here the words spoken by an American statesman in this Assembly hall. The late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, said on 1 November 1956:

"If, however, we were to agree that the existence in the world of injustices which this Organization has so far been unable to cure means that the principle of the renunciation of force should no longer

be respected, that whenever a nation feels that it has been subjected to injustice it should have the right to resort to force in an attempt to correct that injustice, then I fear that we should be tearing this Charter into shreds, that the world would again be a world of anarchy, that the great hopes placed in this Organization and in our Charter would vanish, and that we should again be where we were at the start of the Second World War ..." [561st meeting, para. 140].

149. These words were spoken by Mr. Dulles at a time, when as now, the United Arab Republic had suffered an Israeli aggression. I would commend them to all the statesmen here assembled.

150. I would also refer here to the statements of four successive Presidents of the United States committing their Government to help in maintaining the political independence and territorial integrity of all States in the Middle East. The continued presence of the Israeli forces on the soil of Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic, I submit, directly militates against this guarantee because, even if temporary, it is a violation of the political independence and territorial integrity of these three Arab States. The Assembly can derive no consolation from the thought that, eventually, the Israeli forces will be withdrawn. Any postponement, even for a single day, of such withdrawal is a denial of the sovereignty of the Arab States. It is anathema in terms of the Charter of the United Nations. Nothing could be termed more unjust than a plan to use the continuance of Israeli forces on Arab territory as a means of putting pressure on the Arab States in the oft-misused name of peace. Nothing, indeed, would be a more disastrous course for this Organization to take.

151. I said that every principle of peace has been torn to shreds in the Middle East. How the principles of respect for the right of self-determination and of peaceful and just settlement of disputes have been violated, is a long, dismal chapter in the history of the United Nations, which relates to the genesis of the Arab-Israel conflict. Since I cannot recount the whole story on the present occasion, I shall content myself with a reference to some incontrovertible facts.

152. Palestine was a mandated territory up to 1948. There were other Non-Self-Governing Territories where the mandate was terminated or independence granted during the lifetime of this Organization. In each case, the Government of the territory was established on the basis of the wishes of the people. The Assembly is aware of the emergence into independence of British and French Togolands, British and French Cameroons and Rwanda-Urundi which have become respected Members of this Organization. I am sure it is also mindful of its own recommendations in the case of the former mandated territory of South West Africa. Palestine is the only former mandated territory where this principle of self-determination was totally disregarded. What has been the result? Three wars in two decades and endless human suffering.

153. This is the root of the present crisis. The partition resolution of 29 November 1947 [resolution 181 (II)], which was adopted, thanks to the employ-

ment of extraordinary means, by the vote of only thirty-three Members of this Organization, caused the uprooting of a people from its land and the foisting of an alien population on it. However, even this resolution provided for a Jewish State only in portions of Palestine, which would come into being simultaneously with an Arab State and an international area around Jerusalem. Resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949, admitting Israel to membership in the United Nations was adopted on the understanding that it would honour its obligations under the Assembly's resolutions on its frontiers and the repatriation of refugees.

154. Furthermore, the partition resolution made it a condition of the emergence of the Jewish State that the fundamental rights and liberties of its Arab inhabitants must be fully respected. But Israel disregarded that basic condition. It seized considerably more territory than was assigned to it, prevented the establishment of the Arab State by occupying half of its territory and splitting it into separate pockets, occupied the greater part of Jerusalem, expelled one million Arabs from their homes and confiscated their property. Thus the State of Israel which was established on 15 May 1948 is not the Jewish State envisaged in the United Nations resolution.

155. In view of this background, it is natural that Israel should try to mislead world opinion by invoking what it calls Israel's right to live. Right to live as what, may we ask? As an aggressive State, perpetually resorting to violence and bent on expansion?

156. Having deprived another people of their homeland, has Israel the right to resort to repeated armed aggression in its search for expansion, stage by stage? One must concede the virtue of frankness to the creators of Israel's design. Mr. David Ben-Gurion left the world in no doubt when he said:

"To maintain the status quo will not do. We have set up a dynamic State, bent upon ... expansion."<sup>8/</sup>

157. When Israel has appropriated territory which was not assigned to it by the United Nations, when it has waged three wars, when it has outraged the most cherished aspirations of the followers of two great world religions—Christianity and Islam—by seizing Jerusalem, what does this right to existence of Israel mean except the right to turn back the whole movement of this century towards the self-determination of the peoples of Asia and Africa, the end of colonial rule and the maintenance of the norms of the Charter? Are we expected to recognize this right?

158. Mr. Eban has spoken defiantly of Israel's determination not to relinquish occupied territory. He said that the clock must move forward, not backward for Israel. The implication is clear. It must move backwards for the Arabs—but this cannot be countenanced.

159. As regards the suggestion that Israel and the Arab countries should negotiate a peace bilaterally, the reality is that Israel's aggression has inflicted the deepest physical and psychological wounds. How can it be expected that, after such a traumatic shock, the two sides will begin to negotiate the terms of a just

and lasting peace, unless withdrawals of Israeli forces are first carried out.

160. Another suggestion, which is of the same pattern, is that we should take advantage of this Assembly session and examine all outstanding issues in the Middle East. Pakistan, for one, is anxious that no issue should escape examination, but the question is: are we to examine all outstanding issues while the aggressor remains on the victim's soil? What will profit us this examination if, in the meanwhile, we are in actuality permitting the aggressor to capitalize on his gains.

161. We here have only one frame of discussions, and only one basis of action. That is the Charter. Let us apply the provisions of the Charter to the present situation. If we do so, the only course of action for us is to condemn the aggression launched by Israel on 5 June and to demand the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab territories, including the Holy Places, to positions prior to hostilities.

162. This Assembly will agree that a lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be based on the perpetuation of injustice. The wrongs done to the Arabs must be righted. Only thus will conditions be created for a just and durable peace in the region.

163. Mr. TSEDENBAL (Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic) (translated from Russian): This is not the first time that the United Nations has discussed the situation in the Near East. At this time an extremely dangerous situation has developed in that area, where the State of Israel is once again disturbing peace and tranquillity. By initiating direct military operations against the neighbouring Arab States the ruling circles of Israel have committed another act of aggression in violation of the United Nations Charter and in defiance of numerous decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

164. The war, which was prepared and unleashed by the Israel leaders, was by no means a "defensive" war, as the Tel-Aviv authorities would have us believe. It was a deliberate act with far-reaching expansionist aims.

165. Despite the cease-fire obtained by the efforts of peace-loving forces, a tense situation still prevails in the Near East. By its occupation of foreign territories, Israel is, in fact, pursuing its aggression and creating a situation in which a military conflict may again flare up at any moment. Moreover, Israel refuses to withdraw its forces from the temporarily occupied territories and is brazenly demanding to annex these lands.

166. World public opinion is deeply indignant that the Israel invaders are resorting to bestial violence and arbitrary acts against their victims, evicting the Arabs from their native land, and leaving tens of thousands of completely innocent people, including women, children and the aged, without food and shelter. This further aggravates the already serious problem of the refugees. Thus, we are faced here with a direct crime against humanity, a crime forbidden by international law.

167. This flagrant aggression should be condemned as an act of international brigandage. This is required

<sup>8/</sup> David Ben-Gurion, *Rebirth and destiny of Israel* (New York, Philosophical Library, 1954), p. 419.

by the conscience of mankind itself, by the need to relax international tension and to ensure universal security.

168. It is our profound conviction that the only just way to restore peace is the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all the troops of the aggressor from the territories of the Arab States and in the shortest possible time for all the damage caused to the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan as a result of the aggressive military action of Israel. Only on this basis can measures be taken for the further stabilization of the situation in the Middle East.

169. The Mongolian delegation fully supports the draft resolution [A/L.519] submitted by the Soviet Union, which contains not only a resolute condemnation of the aggressor but also provides for the prompt elimination of the consequences of the aggression and the restoration of peace and justice in the area.

170. It is perfectly obvious that certain circles of the imperialist Powers have stood and are standing behind Israel. Without the support and encouragement of those circles, Israel would not have dared to carry out this adventurous aggression in order to realize its predatory designs and to defy the United Nations and world public opinion as a whole. The draft resolution [A/L.520] submitted by the delegation of the United States affords fresh evidence of this. This draft actually openly defends the aggressor, attempts to help him strengthen his hold on the temporarily occupied territories, and seeks to infringe on the inalienable right of the Arab peoples to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their countries.

171. It is not surprising that the temporary seizure by Israel of Arab territories meets with the approval of the South African racists, the West German revanchists and forces akin to them, whose intentions are well known to all peoples, especially the peoples of Africa and Europe.

172. The Israel aggression against Arab states cannot be considered in isolation from events taking place in other parts of the world. It forms part of the policy of the ruling circles of the imperialist Powers, who are trying to deprive peoples of their freedom and national independence and to bring them once again under the colonial yoke. The most vivid expression of this policy is the growing escalation by the United States of the criminal colonial war against the heroic Viet-Nameese people, a war fraught with great danger for the peoples not only of Asia but of the entire world.

173. The forces of world reaction and war are resorting now, and may well resort in the future, to aggressive actions first in one part of the world and then in another to save systems of government and régimes that are hated by the peoples and to strike at patriotic and progressive forces. My delegation is convinced, however, that the designs of the enemies of peace and progress can be thwarted by the united efforts of the peace-loving peoples. One reason for this is that in the last few decades the world has witnessed immense changes which have been reflected

in the membership of the United Nations and in the growth of its activity. As a result of the qualitative changes which have taken place in the United Nations in recent years with the admission of newly independent Afro-Asian States, a new picture has been formed which differs from the one which characterized the early days of this body's existence which I was able to witness here twenty-one years ago.

174. The Member States of the United Nations should make better use of all the possibilities open to them in order to bridle the instigators of aggression before it is too late and to suppress interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, whatever pretext is adduced to justify it.

175. The just and courageous struggle of the Arab peoples against the predatory ambitions of the imperialists and their stooges meets with warm sympathy and support from all peace-loving forces and all those who cherish the cause of freedom and independence.

176. In this hour of trial for the States of the Arab world, the socialist countries, who consistently defend the cause of peace, national independence and social progress, have stood firmly on the side of the Arab peoples. From the first days of the Israel aggression, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, true to the policy of peace and friendship among peoples, has resolutely affirmed its support of the Arab countries that are fighting for a just and righteous cause. This position of ours is unswerving and has been clearly expressed in the official statements of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic.

177. The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Mongolian people have warmly welcomed the proposal made by the Soviet Government to convene an emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly to consider the question of eliminating the consequences of the Israel aggression. This initiative of the Soviet Government has met with a favourable response from the majority of States Members of the United Nations. Such a proposal could come only from a country which not only recognizes but also consistently defends the legitimate rights and interests of small nations and strives to prevent a new world war.

178. The situation that has arisen requires that the United Nations should prove equal to the tasks facing it. It must resolutely side with the Arab States that are the victims of aggression, and take a clear-cut and objective position on the important matter of preventing new and even graver conflicts.

179. Today the peoples of the whole world are looking with hope to those participating in this session. They expect the General Assembly to take effective measures in full accordance with the lofty principles and goals of the United Nations. May I express the hope that the General Assembly will arrive at a just decision on the problem under discussion, which is of vital importance for all peoples.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*