

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



1577th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 3 October 1967,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued)

Speech by Mr. Karjalainen (Finland)	1
Speech by Mr. Winiewicz (Poland)	3
Speech by Mr. Çağlayanlı (Turkey)	8
Statement by the representative of Israel	13
Statement by the representative of Iraq	16

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. KARJALAINEN (Finland): Mr. President, I wish to extend to you the warmest congratulations of my Government and myself on your election to the high office of President of the General Assembly. We welcome your election both on account of your eminent personal qualifications and for its political significance. The fact that for the first time in the history of the United Nations a representative of a socialist country of Eastern Europe now presides over the General Assembly, and the general approval that this choice has received, are encouraging signs of the continued improvement of the situation in Europe, where a relaxation of tensions has created conditions favourable for ever-growing co-operation among States representing different political, social and economic systems. Finland has consistently worked, and will continue to work, for the development of such co-operation, and we acknowledge the important contribution that your country and you yourself have made to that end.

2. The primary task of the United Nations is the maintenance of international peace and security. It is natural, therefore, that this should be the central theme of our annual general debate. The balance-sheet of the past twelve months is not encouraging. In spite of all the efforts, no essential improvement in the international situation has been achieved. This is due above all to the war in Viet-Nam. And though the Security Council, through its efforts, succeeded in stopping the fighting, the conflict in the Middle East has also caused wide damage to international relations and left us with a number of unsolved problems which create serious international tension.

3. The position of the Government of Finland on the burning issues of the present international situation is based not only on our well-known policy of neutrality, but also on the principles which we wish to apply to relations among States in all circumstances. Every nation must be free to order its own affairs without

outside interference or pressure. Every State has the right to peace and security. All States must respect each other's territorial integrity and political independence. International disputes must be settled by peaceful means through negotiations. The use or threat of force in international relations must be rejected everywhere.

4. Accordingly, we in Finland have watched with growing concern the continued increase of the use of force and violence in Viet-Nam, where military operations have been intensified and extended to ever wider areas. Yet, as time goes on, it has become clearer than ever that no solution can be reached by military means and that their use presents a growing threat to world peace. Thus no arguments in our view can justify the continued destruction of Viet-Nam. The trend in Viet-Nam must be reversed in order to create conditions conducive to negotiations between all the parties to the conflict. The Government of Finland supports the proposals of our Secretary-General, U Thant, according to which the bombing of North Viet-Nam should be halted and all military activities reduced, so as to prepare the ground for a negotiated settlement.

5. As some of my Nordic colleagues have already stated in this debate, the Governments of the Nordic countries have directed their attention to the situation which will arise in Viet-Nam when peace finally has been brought to that devastated country. The rebuilding of Viet-Nam will demand immense efforts. A study group has been set up by the Nordic Governments to examine what our countries could do in giving humanitarian assistance. In our view, such a programme of aid must be designed to benefit all the people of Viet-Nam. Naturally, it must be based on the wishes of the Viet-Namese people themselves.

6. In the Middle East too the achievement of a lasting and just peace requires a solution of disputed problems through negotiations in a manner acceptable to all the parties. We all know how difficult it is to reach such solutions. But we also know that the international community in its own interest cannot afford to leave the problems of the Middle East once more to be settled by force of arms. In the brief war of last June, the leading Powers demonstrated by their actions that they regarded the containment and halting of the armed conflict to be in their common interest. They also have the primary responsibility for the pacification of the Middle East situation on a more stable basis, for without their co-operation the elimination of the consequences of the war can hardly be possible. In this sense I cannot refrain from expressing our disappointment at the fact that the Security Council has not even begun consideration of the problems of the Middle East.

7. Our task now is to establish the principles on which a solution of the problems of the Middle East can be based. The debate on this question in the fifth emergency special session last summer, as well as the statements made so far in the general debate of this session, has shown that there is wide agreement among Member States on these principles: on the one hand, that the legality of territorial conquest cannot be recognized, from which it follows that Israel must withdraw its forces from the areas it occupied in June; and, on the other hand, that all the States of the Middle Eastern area must have the right to live in peace and security.

8. The war in Viet-Nam and the Middle Eastern crisis both illustrate the role of this Organization in international life today—its limitations as well as its vital importance in the maintenance of peace and security. In the case of Viet-Nam, the United Nations has been rendered impotent for reasons that are known to all of us. It is unable to function as a "center for harmonizing the actions of nations", because not all the States concerned, first and foremost the biggest Power in Asia, are represented here. The Government of Finland has consistently held the view that the seat of China in the United Nations properly belongs to the representatives of the People's Republic of China. We continue to hold that view. It is indeed tragic that the United Nations has been unable to solve the question of the representation of China in a manner that would take into account the reality of the situation.

9. Only as a truly universal Organization can the United Nations effectively fulfil its primary function as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security. Experience has shown that instability often occurs in areas where governments are not part of the system of international relations created by the United Nations. The Secretary-General in the Introduction to his Annual Report [A/6701/Add.1] has once again expressed his strong feeling that all countries, even those which for one reason or another have not yet become Member States, should be enabled to follow the work of the Organization more closely by maintaining observers at the Headquarters of the United Nations. As I stated last year in the general debate [1423rd meeting], my Government shares the views of the Secretary-General.

10. Our conviction that we should strive to make this Organization universal has been strengthened by the experiences of the Middle Eastern crisis. While the war has caused damage to the normal fabric of relations between States, the United Nations offers all the parties a forum for discussion and contact. The events in the Middle East have also demonstrated once again that the United Nations has become indispensable to the international community as an instrument for keeping the peace. In spite of all the setbacks that we have experienced in the field of peace-keeping and the disagreements that prevail on the principles involved, the United Nations last June was able to act speedily and effectively when its services were needed for the supervision of the cease-fire agreements. In this situation neutral countries, whose objectivity is accepted by all the parties to the dispute, have once again been called upon to provide personnel for United Nations operations.

11. Finland was among the Member States which, at the request of the Secretary-General, have sent observers to the Middle East. Finland's active and extensive participation in United Nations peace-keeping activities prompts me to lend our support to the suggestion of the Secretary-General that an effort be made to improve the practical capabilities of the United Nations to undertake necessary action in crisis situations. We on our part, together with the other Nordic countries, have already set up standby forces and regular training courses for United Nations service.

12. Although the Middle East crisis understandably has received high priority in this debate, we must continue to give undiminished attention to the problems of southern Africa. United Nations efforts to solve these problems must also be regarded as part of the maintenance of peace and security in the world, for if no progress can be achieved by peaceful international co-operation, the danger of a violent racial conflict will continue to grow. No country, however far from the scene, can afford to ignore that danger. The United Nations, by virtue of resolutions adopted by overwhelming majorities, has in fact set itself far-reaching goals with regard to southern Africa—majority rule in Rhodesia, self-determination and independence for South West Africa, and an end to the policy of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa. How shall we be able to achieve these goals? It must be admitted that what has been done so far has not brought concrete results. Economic sanctions have not yet at least visibly shaken the illegal régime in Rhodesia. The Republic of South Africa continues to practise apartheid. South West Africa remains in the hands of South Africa in defiance of the will of the United Nations. But we must continue our efforts to work towards our goals by peaceful means. And we should not minimize the importance of the fact that today world opinion understands, more widely and clearly than ever before, the threat to international relations inherent in the situation in southern Africa and condemns more vigorously than before racial discrimination in all its forms.

13. In the field of disarmament and arms control, this year has seen some encouraging achievements: the conclusion of the Treaty on the peaceful use of outer space [resolution 2222 (XXI)] and the creation of the Latin-American nuclear-free zone, the first of its kind in the whole world, by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

14. The negotiations in Geneva on the non-proliferation treaty have made substantial progress. There seems to be a reasonably good chance that a complete draft text of a treaty with an adequate article on safeguards may yet be ready in time for consideration by the General Assembly. The Finnish Government sincerely hopes that this Assembly will be able to take positive and definite action on it. The dangers inherent in any further spread of nuclear weapons are frightening. Furthermore, the treaty should be seen in the wider context of its impact on international relations in general. Its effect in reducing tensions and increasing confidence between the great Powers would be an essential prerequisite for any significant future progress in disarmament.

15. The non-proliferation treaty cannot be an end in itself. It should be a step in a continuing process of disarmament and arms control measures, especially in the field of nuclear arms. In this context the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty continues to have the highest priority. All efforts to facilitate its conclusion should therefore be pursued.

16. Recently, new developments in nuclear weapons techniques, mainly connected with the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems, have given rise to widespread concern about their possible effects on disarmament and arms control efforts. We can only hope that the Powers principally concerned will make every effort to avert the possibility of these developments leading to a new and dangerous intensification of the nuclear arms race.

17. The problems of economic development are often obscured by acute and dramatic political conflicts and crises which attract our urgent attention. Yet it is today generally recognized that these economic problems, too, have a vital relevance also for world peace.

18. In less than four months the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) will convene in New Delhi. The preparations for the Conference have established beyond any doubt that the gap between the industrialized countries and the developing countries, instead of diminishing, continues to grow. The time has indeed come for all of us to join our efforts in what the Secretary-General of UNCTAD has so appropriately described as the creation of a new global strategy for development. My Government will pursue its preparations for the New Delhi conference in this spirit.

19. The central role played by the United Nations in designing such a strategy for combating world want has been further emphasized in recent times. I have in mind, among other things, the creation of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, which has now commenced its operative activities. I am sure that it will be a valuable instrument for development in diversifying the economies of developing countries. Industrialization is widely recognized as a key sector in improving standards of living. It is, however, only one of the key sectors. Recent developments in the world food situation call for much greater and much better concerted action. Even if we succeed in boosting food production it is unlikely that this alone will be enough in the not too distant future at the given rate of population increase. My Government has noted with gratification that this Organization is prepared to pay increased attention to the grave problems of the population increase. As long as the excessive growth of the world population cancels out the achievements in food production and other vital sectors of the economies we are trying to row upstream, making little progress in spite of great efforts.

20. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): Comrade President, we have already had the occasion to congratulate you from this rostrum on your election, but I also wanted personally to say on my behalf, and on behalf of all my other colleagues in the delegation, that it gives us great pleasure to see in the Chair so distinguished a representative of a friendly country, socialist Romania. I should like at the same time to congratulate all the

elected officials of the present session of the General Assembly, the Vice-Presidents and the Chairman of the Committees.

21. May I also be permitted to express our appreciation and gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Pazhwak, who so ably and tirelessly guided our work during a very busy and difficult year. His great experience as an old hand with United Nations problems assisted all of us. We do sincerely thank him and we are grateful to Afghanistan for having given us such a President of the General Assembly.

22. The United Nations is now facing the duty of pronouncing itself on the two current concepts as to how international relations are further to be shaped. A definite choice has to be made as to what should constitute the basis for the relations between States and nations: the affirmation of force and violence, or international co-operation based on respect for the right of peoples to independence, sovereignty and peaceful development. The one cannot be reconciled with the other.

23. The choice is not a matter of mere theory. It results from realities. It is seemingly, but only seemingly, simple. It is made difficult by the fact that, through demagoguery and falsehood, basic notions and principles are being deprived of their true meaning.

24. Slogans of justice and respect for law are only too often invoked to cover actions which glaringly contradict their true essence. A desire for peace and negotiations is being declared by those who, at the same time, indiscriminately use bombs, annex foreign territories by the use of force and escalate the arms race. Under slogans of equality, hate is being instilled against peoples struggling for their independence. Freedom is preached with napalm used as an argument. Let us consider the present international situation as against these general remarks.

25. We of Poland know Viet-Nam not from photographs taken by attacking bombers and not from the outside of the strategic hamlets established by American bayonets in the South. We know the people of Viet-Nam from their day to day life and struggle. We do admire their courage and patriotism, their determination and self-sacrifice in opposing a powerful aggressor, and their unshaken faith in victory. We fully understand and entirely support their aspirations.

26. We have listened here to an "appeal" of the representative of the United States for a solution of the problem of Viet-Nam on the basis of the Geneva Agreements. But, were it not precisely for the United States and its attitude towards those international Agreements, the problem of Viet-Nam would have been solved long ago, in 1956, through free elections provided for by those Agreements. The undeniable historical fact is that it was the United States which then prevented the holding of the elections.

27. American intervention began to undermine and violate the Geneva Agreements. It began with the so-called military advisers in South Viet-Nam; it went on, meddling with internal affairs, imposing changes of governments, eliminating from governments people who advocated rapprochement with the North; it acquired new dimensions of lawlessness and violence when an undeclared war against

7. Our task now is to establish the principles on which a solution of the problems of the Middle East can be based. The debate on this question in the fifth emergency special session last summer, as well as the statements made so far in the general debate of this session, has shown that there is wide agreement among Member States on these principles: on the one hand, that the legality of territorial conquest cannot be recognized, from which it follows that Israel must withdraw its forces from the areas it occupied in June; and, on the other hand, that all the States of the Middle Eastern area must have the right to live in peace and security.

8. The war in Viet-Nam and the Middle Eastern crisis both illustrate the role of this Organization in international life today—its limitations as well as its vital importance in the maintenance of peace and security. In the case of Viet-Nam, the United Nations has been rendered impotent for reasons that are known to all of us. It is unable to function as a "center for harmonizing the actions of nations", because not all the States concerned, first and foremost the biggest Power in Asia, are represented here. The Government of Finland has consistently held the view that the seat of China in the United Nations properly belongs to the representatives of the People's Republic of China. We continue to hold that view. It is indeed tragic that the United Nations has been unable to solve the question of the representation of China in a manner that would take into account the reality of the situation.

9. Only as a truly universal Organization can the United Nations effectively fulfil its primary function as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security. Experience has shown that instability often occurs in areas where governments are not part of the system of international relations created by the United Nations. The Secretary-General in the Introduction to his Annual Report [A/6701/Add.1] has once again expressed his strong feeling that all countries, even those which for one reason or another have not yet become Member States, should be enabled to follow the work of the Organization more closely by maintaining observers at the Headquarters of the United Nations. As I stated last year in the general debate [1423rd meeting], my Government shares the views of the Secretary-General.

10. Our conviction that we should strive to make this Organization universal has been strengthened by the experiences of the Middle Eastern crisis. While the war has caused damage to the normal fabric of relations between States, the United Nations offers all the parties a forum for discussion and contact. The events in the Middle East have also demonstrated once again that the United Nations has become indispensable to the international community as an instrument for keeping the peace. In spite of all the setbacks that we have experienced in the field of peace-keeping and the disagreements that prevail on the principles involved, the United Nations last June was able to act speedily and effectively when its services were needed for the supervision of the cease-fire agreements. In this situation neutral countries, whose objectivity is accepted by all the parties to the dispute, have once again been called upon to provide personnel for United Nations operations.

11. Finland was among the Member States which, at the request of the Secretary-General, have sent observers to the Middle East. Finland's active and extensive participation in United Nations peace-keeping activities prompts me to lend our support to the suggestion of the Secretary-General that an effort be made to improve the practical capabilities of the United Nations to undertake necessary action in crisis situations. We on our part, together with the other Nordic countries, have already set up standby forces and regular training courses for United Nations service.

12. Although the Middle East crisis understandably has received high priority in this debate, we must continue to give undiminished attention to the problems of southern Africa. United Nations efforts to solve these problems must also be regarded as part of the maintenance of peace and security in the world, for if no progress can be achieved by peaceful international co-operation, the danger of a violent racial conflict will continue to grow. No country, however far from the scene, can afford to ignore that danger. The United Nations, by virtue of resolutions adopted by overwhelming majorities, has in fact set itself far-reaching goals with regard to southern Africa—majority rule in Rhodesia, self-determination and independence for South West Africa, and an end to the policy of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa. How shall we be able to achieve these goals? It must be admitted that what has been done so far has not brought concrete results. Economic sanctions have not yet at least visibly shaken the illegal régime in Rhodesia. The Republic of South Africa continues to practise apartheid. South West Africa remains in the hands of South Africa in defiance of the will of the United Nations. But we must continue our efforts to work towards our goals by peaceful means. And we should not minimize the importance of the fact that today world opinion understands, more widely and clearly than ever before, the threat to international relations inherent in the situation in southern Africa and condemns more vigorously than before racial discrimination in all its forms.

13. In the field of disarmament and arms control, this year has seen some encouraging achievements: the conclusion of the Treaty on the peaceful use of outer space [resolution 2222 (XXI)] and the creation of the Latin-American nuclear-free zone, the first of its kind in the whole world, by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

14. The negotiations in Geneva on the non-proliferation treaty have made substantial progress. There seems to be a reasonably good chance that a complete draft text of a treaty with an adequate article on safeguards may yet be ready in time for consideration by the General Assembly. The Finnish Government sincerely hopes that this Assembly will be able to take positive and definite action on it. The dangers inherent in any further spread of nuclear weapons are frightening. Furthermore, the treaty should be seen in the wider context of its impact on international relations in general. Its effect in reducing tensions and increasing confidence between the great Powers would be an essential prerequisite for any significant future progress in disarmament.

15. The non-proliferation treaty cannot be an end in itself. It should be a step in a continuing process of disarmament and arms control measures, especially in the field of nuclear arms. In this context the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty continues to have the highest priority. All efforts to facilitate its conclusion should therefore be pursued.
16. Recently, new developments in nuclear weapons techniques, mainly connected with the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems, have given rise to widespread concern about their possible effects on disarmament and arms control efforts. We can only hope that the Powers principally concerned will make every effort to avert the possibility of these developments leading to a new and dangerous intensification of the nuclear arms race.
17. The problems of economic development are often obscured by acute and dramatic political conflicts and crises which attract our urgent attention. Yet it is today generally recognized that these economic problems, too, have a vital relevance also for world peace.
18. In less than four months the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) will convene in New Delhi. The preparations for the Conference have established beyond any doubt that the gap between the industrialized countries and the developing countries, instead of diminishing, continues to grow. The time has indeed come for all of us to join our efforts in what the Secretary-General of UNCTAD has so appropriately described as the creation of a new global strategy for development. My Government will pursue its preparations for the New Delhi conference in this spirit.
19. The central role played by the United Nations in designing such a strategy for combating world want has been further emphasized in recent times. I have in mind, among other things, the creation of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, which has now commenced its operative activities. I am sure that it will be a valuable instrument for development in diversifying the economies of developing countries. Industrialization is widely recognized as a key sector in improving standards of living. It is, however, only one of the key sectors. Recent developments in the world food situation call for much greater and much better concerted action. Even if we succeed in boosting food production it is unlikely that this alone will be enough in the not too distant future at the given rate of population increase. My Government has noted with gratification that this Organization is prepared to pay increased attention to the grave problems of the population increase. As long as the excessive growth of the world population cancels out the achievements in food production and other vital sectors of the economies we are trying to row upstream, making little progress in spite of great efforts.
20. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): Comrade President, we have already had the occasion to congratulate you from this rostrum on your election, but I also wanted personally to say on my behalf, and on behalf of all my other colleagues in the delegation, that it gives us great pleasure to see in the Chair so distinguished a representative of a friendly country, socialist Romania. I should like at the same time to congratulate all the elected officials of the present session of the General Assembly, the Vice-Presidents and the Chairman of the Committees.
21. May I also be permitted to express our appreciation and gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Pazhwak, who so ably and tirelessly guided our work during a very busy and difficult year. His great experience as an old hand with United Nations problems assisted all of us. We do sincerely thank him and we are grateful to Afghanistan for having given us such a President of the General Assembly.
22. The United Nations is now facing the duty of pronouncing itself on the two current concepts as to how international relations are further to be shaped. A definite choice has to be made as to what should constitute the basis for the relations between States and nations: the affirmation of force and violence, or international co-operation based on respect for the right of peoples to independence, sovereignty and peaceful development. The one cannot be reconciled with the other.
23. The choice is not a matter of mere theory. It results from realities. It is seemingly, but only seemingly, simple. It is made difficult by the fact that, through demagoguery and falsehood, basic notions and principles are being deprived of their true meaning.
24. Slogans of justice and respect for law are only too often invoked to cover actions which glaringly contradict their true essence. A desire for peace and negotiations is being declared by those who, at the same time, indiscriminately use bombs, annex foreign territories by the use of force and escalate the arms race. Under slogans of equality, hate is being instilled against peoples struggling for their independence. Freedom is preached with napalm used as an argument. Let us consider the present international situation as against these general remarks.
25. We of Poland know Viet-Nam not from photographs taken by attacking bombers and not from the outside of the strategic hamlets established by American bayonets in the South. We know the people of Viet-Nam from their day to day life and struggle. We do admire their courage and patriotism, their determination and self-sacrifice in opposing a powerful aggressor, and their unshaken faith in victory. We fully understand and entirely support their aspirations.
26. We have listened here to an "appeal" of the representative of the United States for a solution of the problem of Viet-Nam on the basis of the Geneva Agreements. But, were it not precisely for the United States and its attitude towards those international Agreements, the problem of Viet-Nam would have been solved long ago, in 1956, through free elections provided for by those Agreements. The undeniable historical fact is that it was the United States which then prevented the holding of the elections.
27. American intervention began to undermine and violate the Geneva Agreements. It began with the so-called military advisers in South Viet-Nam; it went on, meddling with internal affairs, imposing changes of governments, eliminating from governments people who advocated rapprochement with the North; it acquired new dimensions of lawlessness and violence when an undeclared war against

the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam was unleashed. This very intervention constantly threatens Cambodia and Laos. It has drawn into its orbid new States whose Governments are eager to serve the United States. May I say that a bare few miles of land, sea and air space separate it from exploding into further incalculable dangers.

28. It was American aggression that paralysed the activities of the International Commission on Supervision and Control, established to supervise the implementation of the Geneva Agreements following the withdrawal of French colonial troops from Indo-China. Today the Commission is not able to deal with the armed intervention of the United States forces in Viet-Nam. At the same time attempts are being made to use the Commission against the victims of the American aggression: the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Front for Liberation.

29. My country is a member of that Commission and cannot accept that its activities be thus distorted. In spite of the fact that as a result of the American intervention the Commission is at present unable to discharge its functions properly, our representatives on the Commission remain at their posts. That is so because we believe that one day the Commission will be able to fulfil the role, indeed the useful role, that was assigned to it by the Geneva Agreements. And we do deeply trust that one day the Vietnamese people will be able to decide its own destiny on the basis of the Geneva Agreements. That, however, cannot happen in present conditions.

30. Let no one here attempt to put behind the defendants' bench the victims of aggression—the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam or the National Front for Liberation—even if he has at his disposal all the American information media. It was the United States that started it all, under circumstances which the eminent American jurist Quincy Wright characterized as follows. Permit me carefully to quote a pertinent passage.

"There is no evidence of any action by North Viet-Nam which could be regarded as an armed attack upon the South prior to 1958, after Ho Chi Minh had engaged in four years of fruitless effort to carry out the resolutions of the Geneva Conference. In these circumstances Ho Chi Minh's action in support of the Viet-Cong did not constitute aggression or armed attack in international relations but civil strife within the domestic jurisdiction of Viet-Nam, similar to the action of the North against the South in the American Civil War. Whether called 'intervention', 'reprisals' or 'collective defense', the United States response by bombings in North Viet-Nam, which began in February, 1965, violated international law, the United Nations Charter, and the Geneva Agreement, if the latter were in effect."^{1/}

31. Thus the world awaits the necessary moves to be made by the United States—first of all, the undertaking to end unconditionally all hostile acts against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. And we do not mean empty declarations, multiplying missions and soundings, dramatized for reasons of political ex-

pediency—sometimes of internal political expediency—whose actual purpose seems to be to explore the possibilities for further escalation rather than for meaningful negotiations. We of Poland have had some bitter experience in that connexion. Indeed, it has been known to the United States well enough, and for a long time, that the road to political solutions can be opened only through the unconditional ending of all hostilities against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

32. It is not for the victim of an attack to take the first conciliatory step, and it is not for the one who attacks to present conditions. As for the friends of the Viet-Nameese people, nobody should expect that they would undertake to persuade the Viet-Nameese leaders to accept any demands under the threat of bombs. Moreover, one cannot bomb a nation into submission, which still seems to remain the American illusion, tragic as it is.

33. We cannot refrain from emphasizing that complete disregard for international agreements—in this case the Geneva Agreements—and trampling upon the rights of a small nation by one of the world Powers have a detrimental, destructive influence on international relations as a whole. And the world feels it.

34. It was the Foreign Minister of Bulgaria who so rightly said here yesterday that "the aggression of the United States against the Viet-Nameese people casts its shadow on the international situation and poisons relations between States". [1575th meeting, para. 82.] That applies equally to Asia, Africa or Europe, as a matter of fact.

35. At the same time, it reduces to nothing the moral foundation of international order; it accustoms people to methods that ought to be firmly renounced. It is also bound to deprave the minds of individual human beings. Secretary-General U Thant refers to this in the introduction to his annual report with well-founded concern which everyone cannot but share. I quote his wise words:

"When violence is highlighted and even glamourized by mass media, thus instilling in society, and particularly in the young, an appetite for solving problems by force, the turbulences of today are dangerously fanned and the seeds of larger and deeper troubles at national and international levels are sown for the future." [A/6701/Add.1, para. 151.]

36. Permit me to turn now to the Middle East. Our attitude towards Israel's aggression against its Arab neighbours was expounded from this very rostrum by the Prime Minister of my country three months ago. The developments that have since taken place add strength to our basic attitude. The statement made last Friday [1573rd meeting] by Mr. Riad, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, very precise in its detailed presentation of historical facts, was the most authoritative document on the true course of events. There is not much I can add, except to draw some additional conclusions.

37. The very same forces without whose encouragement and support Israel would not have dared to start its military adventure prevented the United Nations

^{1/} "Legal Aspects of the Viet-Nam Situation," by Quincy Wright (*American Journal of International Law*, vol. 60, October 1960, p. 767).

from taking unequivocal, formal decisions. That is our first conclusion emerging from the fifth emergency special session.

38. The second conclusion is that, at least on one matter, the emergency special session showed an overwhelming majority. Most delegations were firm in stating that Israel has to withdraw to the positions held before 5 June, and that aggrandizement of national territory through armed aggression cannot be condoned: it simply is not national territory. The same attitude has been expressed by the majority of the speakers who have preceded me in this debate—if I may be permitted to sum up the statements that have been made up to now from this rostrum in the general debate.

39. A third conclusion is to be underlined, emerging not only from the debates of the special session but from the attending circumstances as well: the Government of Israel clearly refuses to respect the decisions of the United Nations. It does so even in the case of such unchallenged and unanimous or almost unanimous resolutions as those on Jerusalem, on the humanitarian treatment of prisoners of war and of the civilian population, and on the right of Arab refugees freely to return to their homes. And now Israel begins to colonize the lands grabbed from its Arab neighbours.

40. Hence the fourth conclusion: the lack of a sufficiently firm reaction against any aggressive war and of a speedy elimination of its consequences serves only to encourage those Governments and quarters which, in pursuance of their own narrow goals, are pushing the world into new crises. For acts of aggression, wherever perpetrated, always create a climate that encourages retrograde forces, suppression of the rights of nations and of human rights, and defiance of the United Nations.

41. We cannot and should not forget that Israel is a creation of the United Nations. That State would not exist were it not for the decisions of the United Nations. Today the Government of Israel is opposing our Organization. It even attempts to exclude it from the solving of the controversial problems of the Middle East by demanding direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. Can the United Nations remain passive and helpless?

42. Poland has always expressed itself in favour of the existence of the State of Israel. However, we shall consistently oppose any expansionist policy of Israel. We shall not desist from our efforts to seek through the United Nations a solution to the Middle East crisis that would deny premium to the aggressor, liquidate as promptly as possible the consequences of the June aggression, and ensure the sovereign right to free and secure national development for the countries of that region: first of all, security for the Arab countries, since they were the victims of aggression last June as they were in 1956.

43. Let us say firmly that the authority of the United Nations, already put to the test as it is by the conspiracy of reactionary forces in the southern part of Africa, is at stake. The Republic of South Africa and the illegal white minority régime in Rhodesia, hand in hand with Portuguese colonial authorities, flout the unanimous attitude of the rest of the world, flout all

formal decisions of the United Nations, and ignore universal condemnation.

44. There too, the forces without whose support neither apartheid nor the last bulwarks of colonialism could survive should be strongly exposed; the very same forces but for which there would be no blood bath in Viet-Nam and no Israeli extremism. It was not by chance that, with regard to the problem of Viet-Nam, the statements made here by Mr. Goldberg [1562nd meeting] and Mr. Eban [1566th meeting] revealed an identical approach.

45. It is true that in Europe we note certain encouraging positive developments: increased contacts and the easing of barriers that had divided our continent. No country could feel more sincere satisfaction with this trend than Poland. Security and international co-operation in Europe are indispensable conditions for the further successful development of my country. I think that we are not alone in this respect. For many years we have been trying to contribute actively to the creation of such conditions. We do it by expanding our bilateral relations, so successfully developed with almost all European countries. On the part of all who hold dear the peaceful development of Europe we meet with understanding and joint efforts, which we highly appreciate.

46. In another sphere, our efforts have led us to advance the well-known Polish initiatives on détente and disarmament in Europe. We are, of course, concerned with the whole of Europe and not merely with some parts of it, as was the case with the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. George Brown, who in his statement here tried incorrectly to identify the Common Market area with the whole continent. We do not accept such pars pro toto. Europe is a much wider concept than its fragment west of the Elbe. I do hope that the British Foreign Office will grasp this one day. However, in Europe too, forces are at work that obstruct and attempt to scuttle such efforts towards the easing of tension, for the creation of better conditions of security. While a new approach and a spirit of understanding are being advertised, in practice claims that constitute an insurmountable obstacle on the road to true normalization are not abandoned.

47. What is the essence of the problem of normalization in Europe? In our opinion, it consists in the acceptance, as a point of departure, of the status quo resulting from the dearly bought victory of the great anti-fascist coalition in the Second World War. It consists further in the renunciation of the use of force and in undertaking not to interfere with the internal affairs of other States; and it consists in building security based on the existing real situation. Only with the creation of conditions in which European nations will have a feeling of real security, and not merely of its appearance, shall we be able to proceed with the solution of the outstanding political problems. Required are not only conditions of security; there is also a need for patience, time, realism, good sense and, finally, the chasing away of the demons of the past, if I may recall here the words of the Foreign Minister of France [1571st meeting].

48. These basic premises seem to be recognized by the overwhelming majority of the countries and

Governments of Europe; I hope that we are not over-optimistic. They are, however, undermined and ignored by the West German Government. This is why the declarations from Bonn—so far, in our opinion, unsubstantiated—still meet with a more than sceptical reaction in Poland. Can one wonder when, at the same time, extremist revanchist forces are acquiring more influence west of the Elbe—and particularly at a time when we see that in another NATO country a retrograde military junta has taken over?

49. The Polish Government and the Polish people fully appreciate the importance—more, the indispensability—of normal, good, extensive relations between the Polish and the German peoples. And, what is even more important, we have given in this respect clear proof not only of our desire, but also of our determination, by establishing close neighbourly relations and broad co-operation with one of the two existing German States, our neighbour, the German Democratic Republic. We contend that this is a very important and valuable contribution on the part of our two States, the Polish People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic, to the consolidation of peace.

50. Poland is also prepared to establish normal relations with the German Federal Republic once its policy is based on new, realistic foundations. We have repeatedly formulated what premises we deem indispensable in that connexion. First of all: the recognition of the existence of two German States, the renunciation by the German Federal Republic of territorial claims, and the renunciation by it of aspirations to exercise control over nuclear weapons.

51. The existence of a peaceful, democratic, sovereign German State between the Elbe and the Oder, is a fact. It is also a fact that the established western frontier of Poland is final and cannot be changed. It is a fact, too, that after the well-known historical experiences of the past the creation of a nuclear arsenal under the control of West German militarism cannot be tolerated.

52. The ignoring of realities, just as any other unrealistic premise of policy, can breed only harm. Our demand that the German Federal Republic recognize the realities which now exist in Europe is an appeal to good sense. Against the dynamic and constructive policy of Poland, the German Federal Republic sets its own policy of immobility. The western part of Germany has been pushed into that immobility by a combination of American anti-communism and the revanchist tendencies of the heirs of German imperialism, as our leader, Mr. Gomulka, once put it.

53. All Polish initiatives—which, I hope, are known to a large degree here in this Hall—concerning European security originated from the conviction that one should begin, first of all, by halting the armaments race and then by gradually reducing the huge pile of weapons and military effectives accumulated in the heart of Europe during the years of the cold war.

54. It was not by chance that in the well-known Rapacki and Gomulka plans attention was principally directed towards the freezing and gradual reducing of the nuclear war potential. Indeed, it is the atomic war that threatens mankind with the greatest dangers

and losses, beyond the limits of the average man's imagination; just as imagination seems to fall American statesmen, unable to visualize a world not armed to the teeth. Well, it is hard, indeed, to imagine the Pentagon turned into a museum.

55. Ten years have just passed since the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs announced [697th meeting] from this very rostrum the Polish plan for the de-nuclearization of Central Europe. That idea slowly but effectively worked its way through diplomatic chancelleries, ministerial talks and various social and political discussions as one of the effective methods for starting the process of establishing collective security in Europe. We consider that it has lost nothing of its timeliness. It can be taken up at any moment for implementation—exactly like the Gomulka plan as well—once the understanding of the true interests of European security prevails over the obstructions that still remain. In the meantime my Government will not weaken in its quest for solutions conducive to fostering an increasing co-operation of a Europe unperturbed by fear.

56. I feel that historians will one day in the future seriously ponder over many initiatives of the socialist countries not taken up by the West as other examples of great opportunities lost. For East-West relations have followed—and regrettably still show—a pattern in which it is easier in the West to throw invectives and spread suspicion about the real intentions of the commonwealth of socialist countries than properly to grasp their essence and profound meaning, to understand sincerely that Warsaw, Minsk, Kiev, Berlin, Dresden and other destroyed towns, villages and hamlets, were not rebuilt in order to be once again levelled to the ground, and that we seek in all earnestness constructively to realize the principle of peaceful coexistence of countries with different systems—which is the basic principle of the foreign policy of my country and of all the socialist States.

57. The Polish plan for an atom-free zone gave inspiration to the creation of similar zones on other continents. Notwithstanding the shortcomings that we discover in the process of implementation of those concepts, they constitute a certain step forward in the struggle for general and complete disarmament; and the contribution of statesmen and politicians applying their goodwill to the implementation of those plans—by no means utopian—should be given due appreciation.

58. As far as disarmament is concerned, we are now awaiting the results of the Geneva discussions on an agreed treaty on non-proliferation. The sooner that treaty is signed, the better; the larger the number of States acceding to it, the more advantageous it will be for humanity at large. The risk of an unbridled process of new States coming into possession of nuclear weapons in ever-increasing numbers is alarming enough to impose the need for co-operation by all in the interest of a greater and better sense of security for everyone.

59. We do not consider the treaty to be an end in itself. We do consider it again as only a step forward, but still a substantial step in a series of measures that are supposed to and can bring us closer to the goal of complete nuclear disarmament. We hope that

the next steps will follow also as soon as possible in order not to lose the impetus.

60. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union has presented to our session a draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons [A/6834]. Initiatives in that direction have already been taken by Ethiopia, as we remember.^{2/} In 1961, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a solemn Declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons [resolution 1653 (XVI)]. The draft convention, if accepted and ratified by a considerable number of States, can become a logical step, following the non-proliferation treaty. In the course of the debates in the Political Committee of this Assembly, the Polish delegation will have the opportunity to give broader consideration to this valuable proposal of our Soviet friends. We shall approach with the same attention the other proposition of Minister Gromyko concerning the need for accelerating the work of the United Nations on the definition of aggression [A/6833 and Corr.1].

61. With equal interest we are awaiting the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons, as well as on the influence of nuclear armaments upon the security and economy of individual countries.^{3/} We shall welcome this report with particular satisfaction; it follows the initiative advanced from this very rostrum by Mr. Gomulka in 1960 [874th meeting], and elaborated in the proposals made last year by U Thant.^{4/} Due importance should be attached to this document so that it can be used properly in the interest of the noble cause which it is to serve. The Polish delegation is of the opinion that the paper should be widely popularized. Knowing that this opinion of ours is shared by many other delegations, we declare our readiness to co-operate with them in submitting in due time a corresponding draft resolution.

62. U Thant's report, worked out by competent experts of many countries, undoubtedly will contribute to a fuller understanding of the threat of nuclear war and of the destruction it could bring about. At the same time it will, indeed, throw some light on the economic effects of nuclear armaments which, through rapidly soaring costs, may undermine seriously the economic development of countries entering heedlessly upon this precipitous road. This leads me to a few remarks on the economic problems with which the United Nations is dealing.

63. The process of the institutional formation of what we call the United Nations family seems to have been completed with the establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. The need for the most precise co-ordination of the activities of United Nations agencies and organs now emerges as one of our more important tasks.

64. The question is not only that of avoiding a duplication and overlapping of their work, which occurs

only too frequently at present. There also arises the problem of the best possible use of the growing budgets of international organizations so that their operational efficiency can match the increasing needs within what are, after all, limited financial means.

65. In the Second Committee my colleagues will have an opportunity to present in greater detail our views on some of the other economic problems confronting the session. From this rostrum I wish to say only that the assessment of the world economic development for the current year is far from optimistic. This problem was touched upon by the speaker who preceded me, the Foreign Minister of Finland, and similar observations have already been made by other speakers in this debate. They were made against a background from which our own observations cannot depart either.

66. The question should be asked over and over again: how much larger would be the means devoted to the economic development of the world if the thousands of millions of dollars spent on American aggression in Viet-Nam were released for productive and not destructive purposes? As a matter of fact, the United States people themselves could profit from it. How harmful to the economy of Asia is the destruction by fire and chemical poisoning, by the policy of scorched earth, of the resources of that great rice granary that South Viet-Nam had always been? What would the economy of all countries look like should it be possible to cut the burden of military budgets of individual States?

67. But a mechanical decision to appropriate a given percentage of armaments budgets for aid to developing countries can hardly be the solution. What we need is a meaningful action for a decisive change in the whole international situation. Economics and politics condition each other. A world free from war would mean a world of economic growth. International tensions always have a negative effect upon international economic relations. Economic blackmail and discrimination in trade, which are inseparable from international tension, undermine economic co-operation. I am uttering a truism, but one that is disregarded.

68. The latest world economic survey indicates that the developing countries now have the lowest rate of growth in industrial, commodity and agricultural production. The terms of trade continue to deteriorate. The only positive exception here is the trade between the developing and the socialist countries, which in the short period from 1960 to 1965 doubled in volume. This is the background against which the United Nations has to act.

69. In a few months' time we shall participate in the second session of the United Nations Conference for Trade and Development. A number of targets set forth by the previous session, but never attained, have to be discussed. I am sorry to say there were too many targets unfulfilled. The Conference will also have to discuss ways and means of eliminating the existing barriers and discriminatory practices in international trade.

70. Trade is an entity. Any restrictive measure or closed preferential arrangement can only have a negative effect upon our common effort undertaken

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 67, 86, 69 and 73, document A/C.1/L.254 and Add.1-3.

^{3/} Subsequently circulated as document A/6858.

^{4/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1A (A/6301/Add.1), section II.

within the framework of the United Nations to establish a new international division of labour, more just and economically better founded. We also face the important task of preparing the United Nations Development Decade. We would wish to adopt towards it an attitude of optimism, and thus to assume an accelerated rate of economic growth. Our own socialist experience shows that this is possible. Countries can solve their problems, given the necessary conditions, if they are no longer treated as intrusive clients or merely as markets for post-colonial exploitation. They can, indeed, solve their problems once they are no longer considered only as objects for political subordination. They too, however, must wish to help themselves since the sources of international aid are not and will never be unlimited.

71. Approaching the end of my remarks, I should like to make a few observations concerning a problem which has already been raised in the general debate, namely, the question of the universality of United Nations membership. Much attention has been paid to this problem, and rightly so. Accumulating international problems call for a joint effort from all the countries of our globe, and especially of those which hold a key position in their respective geographical regions and whose exclusion from our midst, as we all know, has already brought about definitely unfavourable international consequences.

72. I refer, of course, to the People's Republic of China. But the two German States should also be mentioned. One of them, true enough, enjoys the right of maintaining an Observer at the United Nations; the other one, the German Democratic Republic, is not even admitted to observe our work, in spite of the fact that it is a country with one of the world's highest industrial potentials, a country with which a large number of Member States either maintain diplomatic relations or have established extensive commercial, scientific and cultural contacts, and a country whose contribution, particularly to the economic work of the United Nations, seems indispensable.

73. Anachronisms, one might justly say. But are there no other anachronisms in our Organization? Is it not still haunted by remnants of the cold war? We shall, for instance, discuss at the present session matters connected with the future of Korea. But how has it happened that the United States forces occupying South Korea are still allowed to use the flag of the United Nations? And this in spite of the fact that their Command submits no reports whatsoever to the United Nations and that it is not from this building that directives are issued to them.

74. It is high time to do away with such remnants—one might even say such ignominious remnants—of the past. But it is necessary above all to overcome here the resistance of the big Power whose equally anachronistic policy now weighs heavy on our Organization's freedom of action.

75. In the course of the general debate a number of problems have been taken up concerning the shortcomings in the functioning of various organs of the United Nations, especially in the sphere of peace-keeping. The Polish delegation has also much to say on these matters and we shall not fail to present our

views in the Committees. However, the best possible blue-print will not help as long as there are Members that do not observe the principles of the Charter and believe that theirs is the right to subordinate the vital interests of other nations to their own global strategy—and occasionally even to subordinate United Nations activities to it.

76. The present session coincides with the fiftieth anniversary of the Great October Revolution. A great many sacrifices and efforts, and much hardship, blood, sweat and tears, above all on the part of the Soviet peoples, were needed to consolidate and expand the achievements of that historic event. Abortive were the attempts of reactionary forces which tried first to strangle the revolutionary upsurge, and afterwards to treat the Soviet State *per non est*—as non-existent—and to isolate it from the rest of the world. All this failed, and so did similar attempts directed against other socialist States.

77. Socialism has now come to be a force sharing in the responsibilities of the world of today. No great problems of our time, whether in Europe, in Asia or in other parts of the globe, can be solved without the participation of the community of socialist countries.

78. Proper conclusions ought to be drawn from this historic and often dire experience. From what great number of conflicts and losses, of disappointments and sacrifices we would thus now be spared. And the stakes are now much higher than in 1917. At stake now are the indivisible cause of peace in the whole world and, in the final analysis, nothing less than the destiny of mankind.

79. The year 1917 opened a new era. The socialist countries, my own country and people among them, will remain faithful to the great ideas of the October Revolution and to its historic achievements in the service of peace and progress. We shall follow these ideas in our contribution towards the future of the United Nations—and peace and progress do not seem to be hollow phrases in the meaning of our Charter, either.

80. Mr. CAGLAYANGIL (Turkey) (translated from French): Mr. President, joining with the eminent speakers who have preceded me at this rostrum, I wish to extend to you the warmest and most sincere congratulations of my delegation and of the Turkish Government on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly. The warm support you have received on that occasion is eloquent proof of the confidence placed in you by this Organization at a particularly serious moment in world developments.

81. The attention of the entire world is once again turned to this Assembly, which is being called upon at its current session to examine some extremely difficult problems of world peace and security. I feel sure that your high qualifications as a statesman and your experience, which I had occasion to appreciate at first hand in international affairs, guarantee the success of our deliberations. As a neighbouring country, Turkey has observed with appreciation your efforts to consolidate peace in the Balkans and to promote co-operation among the countries of that region. I should like to express to you my sincere wishes for the accomplishment of your difficult task

by assuring you of the full co-operation of the Turkish delegation.

82. I am also happy to pay tribute to the outgoing President, the eminent representative of Afghanistan, Ambassador Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, who presided with wisdom over our labours during a very full year. I believe that I express the feelings of all Members of this Organization when I say that Mr. Pazhwak's untiring efforts will be recalled with gratitude and admiration in the annals of the United Nations.

83. Despite the various difficulties it has encountered up to now, our Organization remains the sole hope of mankind, which more than ever is aspiring to the attainment of international peace and security. Even those who from time to time harbour doubts as to the effectiveness of the United Nations cannot but admit that in the end the very existence of such an organization, embodying the conscience of humanity and world public opinion, has a beneficial influence on international relations. It is our responsibility if the Organization suffers from imperfections and inefficiency, since we ourselves created it; and it is up to us to find the means of restoring its prestige. One of the means of accomplishing this would in our opinion be to concentrate our efforts on the problems on which the United Nations can achieve some notable progress.

84. Peace-keeping operations constitute such a promising area. True, no positive developments have occurred in this field since last year. Nevertheless, we must not allow ourselves to be discouraged by that state of affairs; on the contrary, it should stimulate us to tackle vigorously the various aspects of peace-keeping operations, and in particular the political, constitutional and financial aspects. Once those obstacles are out of the way, the United Nations would be equipped with permanent machinery through which it could put down conflicts by reasonable and appropriate means, while seeking permanent solutions.

85. While we are meeting here, mankind is being faced with serious problems. One of the basic questions we shall have to consider during the present session is without doubt the situation in the Middle East. It is regrettable that in the course of the emergency special session held this summer we were unable to arrive at the adoption of a resolution on this matter. Such a resolution, by expressing the general feeling of the Assembly and world public opinion, could have contributed to the improvement of the conditions which have prevailed in that region since June. In the absence of such a resolution, not only has there been no progress towards the restoration of peace, but some positions have hardened and the facts accomplished brought about by the military operations have persisted in a dangerous way. It is becoming increasingly clear that the United Nations should at the least assert its moral authority and indicate the general principles which must guide the actions of the parties to the dispute.

86. When I spoke during the fifth emergency special session [1532nd meeting], I suggested that a distinction should be made between short-term and long-term problems. Over a shorter period, the basic question is to ensure the withdrawal of Israel forces from

the territories they have occupied, while taking steps to remedy the situations which brought about the June crisis. That could contribute not only to eliminating present tension and confrontation, but would also create a better atmosphere for the efforts to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Then, in the long term, our duty would be to reach a general settlement of all problems in the area, in conformity with justice and equity.

87. That position still seems to us the most realistic and the most appropriate. It would be inadvisable to attempt to settle all problems at once, and to set as a condition the opening of negotiations to that end. Present-day political realities do not permit of a general settlement in the near future. Only a restoration of confidence will enable us gradually to work towards the final goal.

88. If it continues to adopt an unyielding attitude in the matter, Israel will put itself in the position of a country trying to perpetuate the advantages it has gained through the use of force. We believe that that attitude would be prejudicial not only to the cause of peace, but also to the true interests of Israel. Israel has always maintained that its desire was to live in peace with its neighbours in respect for independence and its territorial integrity. How can it now reconcile that expressed wish with its refusal to withdraw from the territories it has occupied, with the unilateral measures it has adopted in Jerusalem, with its actions in the territories it is occupying, with its intransigent attitude on the refugee question and with the territorial demands it is making?

89. I must repeat that, for our part, we cannot accept the acquisition of territories or political advantages through the use of force. We cannot allow facts accomplished to become bases for the settlement of disputes. That attitude is in conformity with the basic principles which have always formed the foundation of our foreign policy. As a country of this area, it is natural that we should show a special interest in the security and peace of the Middle East. Threats to the independence and territorial integrity of the countries of the region and the use of force in the settlement of disputes would serve neither the Middle East nor world peace.

90. With regard to the Arab countries, we rejoice to see that they are acting in a constructive spirit which leaves the door open to an improvement in the situation. The Arab countries have shown proof of their desire to promote a political settlement of the problems created by the armed conflict of last June. They are being reproached for wanting simply to return to the conditions which prevailed before 5 June 1967. But that is not the basic question. The fact is that the Arab countries have given proof of goodwill, realism and flexibility, and if that spirit could be reciprocated it would undoubtedly serve to bring an end to the political deadlock which has until now barred the opportunities for a peaceful settlement.

91. Therefore, it is high time to direct our attention to that difficult and complex problem and to act, above all, with realism and objectivity. We must admit that progress in this area will depend not only on the will of the parties to the conflict, but also on the efforts

put forth by all of us to contribute to an honourable settlement. Furthermore, it is undeniable that the permanent members of the Security Council, especially those most directly involved, have an important role to play.

92. All roads and possibilities for a settlement should be explored within the United Nations. The principles, procedures and institutions provided by the Charter are certainly sufficient for settling the problem. It is up to us to apply them with courage and perseverance, not only for the restoration of peace in the Middle East, but also for the re-establishment of United Nations prestige.

93. In the meantime, I should like once again to point to two aspects of the Middle East situation which give us serious concern.

94. First, there is the question of Jerusalem. We deeply regret that Israel has not seen fit to comply with the resolutions [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] adopted by the General Assembly. We should like to stress once again that the status of Jerusalem is a question which goes beyond the framework of the Israel-Arab conflict. It is in any case a question which very closely concerns a large number of countries and one which is being followed attentively by world public opinion.

95. Second, we cannot remain indifferent to the tragic fate of the Arab refugees, whose number has grown considerably as a result of the war. It is absolutely essential to consider this humanitarian problem apart from the political problem of the Middle East, and to take all necessary steps to alleviate the sufferings of these unfortunate people.

96. Turkey has always felt sympathy for those Arab refugees. It has done its best to help them within the means at its disposal and has made it its duty to lend them assistance.

97. The war in Viet-Nam continues to pose a serious threat to world peace and stability. The various initiatives taken with a view to finding a common area of agreement for the opening of negotiations have not, unfortunately, met with success. But that situation must not dishearten those who wish to see an end to that tragic war, which has already gone on far too long. We must not forget that the war is by no means helping to solve the problem. It may, on the contrary, set off a general conflagration whose outcome would be difficult to foresee. If mankind is to be saved from such a peril, every effort must be made to bring the parties concerned to the conference table. Indeed, experience in recent years has shown that the only way to break out of the vicious circle created in Viet-Nam is to be found in negotiation, as was the case at Geneva in 1954. Any initiative aimed at bringing about a peaceful settlement to this conflict must therefore be encouraged and supported by all the Members of the United Nations. It is in that spirit that we were heartened by Mr. Goldberg's statement [1562nd meeting].

98. Another conflict constituting a constant threat to peace in Asia is the Kashmir problem, which for twenty years has set Pakistan and India against each other. It is to be regretted that that latent conflict

has for so many years prevented those two great countries from living in harmony and from uniting their efforts for the well-being of their peoples, as well as for the consolidation of peace in Asia. We devoutly hope that wisdom and common sense may triumph, and that an area of agreement may be found so that this conflict separating the two countries can be brought to an end. We continue to hope that it will be possible to arrive at an agreed and equitable solution in line with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

99. The problems which continue to disturb the peace and remain unresolved unfortunately include that of Cyprus which, since 1963, has been a serious cause of tension and strife in the Mediterranean area. An unstable peace is being maintained on the island thanks to the presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, which is endeavouring with skill and with limited means to prevent fighting and to ease the frictions which constantly arise between the two communities. The tragic events which have occurred in the Middle East have proved to us, if proof were needed, how much such a presence is necessary. Without that United Nations Force, a vacuum would immediately be created, and that state of affairs would be bound to lead to an increase in tension and to even more serious developments. It is therefore with a full appreciation of the role played by that force that I should like, on behalf of my Government, to renew my thanks to all the countries which have placed their contingents at the disposal of the United Nations and which are contributing to the voluntary financing of that Force. I must also add that we are grateful to our Secretary-General for the interest he continues to show with regard to this question and the situation on the island, as well as to his distinguished representative, Mr. Osorio-Tafall, and to the Force Commander, General Martola, who are striving unceasingly to maintain peace in Cyprus.

100. The situation in Cyprus has not improved since last year. During the last session, I stressed in this Assembly [1422nd meeting] the need for a return to normal conditions in order to promote the search for a peaceful solution and in order to enable the Turkish community to lead a life free from threats and pressures. Despite the efforts of the United Nations authorities in Cyprus, the situation on the island is far from satisfactory. Nevertheless, in the absence of a solution, the improvement of the situation on the island remains a pressing need if we wish to prevent a worsening of the conflict. Of course, that improvement must be brought about within the framework of the prevailing situation and nothing in it should in any way prejudice an eventual solution of the problem. Measures that might have such political aims would not be of a nature to contribute to normalizing the situation, but might on the contrary increase mistrust.

101. With regard to the search for an agreed and peaceful solution, Turkey has in this area shown irrefutable evidence of its good faith and sincerity. It has constantly and unambiguously stated that it remains firmly and resolutely opposed to the use of force in reaching a settlement. It will hold to that position while continuing to fulfil its contractual and moral obligations to the Turkish community. We have

always advocated negotiations, and we have entered into them with the greatest goodwill every time an occasion has arisen. It is in that spirit that we have undertaken talks with Greece aimed at promoting the search for a solution acceptable to all parties concerned. Although these contacts have enabled both sides better to understand each other's positions and views, it has proved impossible to arrive at a common understanding.

102. For our part, we shall always do all in our power to reach a just and peaceful settlement. Our attitude on this subject has always been clear. We devoutly hope for a settlement which, based on the treaties governing the status of Cyprus, can reconcile the legitimate interests of the parties concerned and enable the two communities to live and work together in peace, security, respect for each other's separate identities and historic rights, and in mutual trust.

103. We consider that a solution might be worked out on the line of those general principles, provided that neither party persists in advocating set and rigid formulas.

104. It is comforting to note that beyond this sombre list of problems and conflicts there have been other developments which give rise to some optimism.

105. The most encouraging evidence of progress has been the easing of tensions between East and West. That trend, desired by the great majority of the international community, will be an important factor in stabilizing international relations. As part of that trend, contacts between all the European countries are rapidly increasing, and trade and cultural exchanges are expanding in a satisfactory manner. While it is true that the European countries are acting with a better spirit of understanding and are endeavouring to eliminate as far as possible the barriers separating them, it is also very true that the differences dividing East and West remain. Problems such as the reunification of Germany have not been solved. We believe that the German people has the undeniable right freely to ensure its unification, and we hope that that problem will be resolved in the best conditions of security for all European countries.

106. We are pleased to note that considerable progress appears to have been made in the field of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The identical draft treaties submitted to the Committee of Eighteen by the United States and Soviet Governments^{5/} are not perhaps drawn up in such a way as to meet all the criteria set forth in General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX). But we must bear in mind that the draft treaties proposed by the United States and Soviet Governments are the result of lengthy discussions which entailed certain concessions on both sides. What appears to us essential in this matter is to conclude as quickly as possible a treaty which will effectively ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The objections to particular aspects of the problem raised by a number of countries, such as the balancing of obligations and responsibilities between nuclear and non-nuclear countries, the extension of international control to include the peaceful

nuclear activities of the nuclear countries, the safeguards against nuclear aggression or the threat of such aggression to be accorded non-nuclear countries—all these objections are certainly understandable and legitimate. They should be given full consideration in any discussion, but they should not be allowed to delay the conclusion of the non-proliferation treaty.

107. We consider that we must increase our co-operation to bring about an agreement which would meet the minimum requirements, namely, effective control and universal accession. In our view, the principles of supervision and universality should constitute the basic conditions of any non-proliferation treaty. Effective control is essential to protect the vital interests of countries against any secret violation. Similarly, the accession of all countries to such a treaty would largely dispel the fears that signatory countries might legitimately entertain with regard to countries which refused to accede to it.

108. Through its untiring efforts, the United Nations has greatly contributed to speeding up the process of decolonization. I am convinced, and I know that my conviction is shared by all of you, that the United Nations will have attained truly universal status only when colonialism has completely disappeared and that its task of promoting respect for the fundamental human rights will only then be fulfilled. It is true that we have come a long way, but it is just as true that there are still difficult problems to be resolved in that field. We trust that the total eradication of colonialism will be achieved in the near future and that the administering countries will conscientiously carry out their task of preparing the peoples under their administration and of guiding them towards independence as quickly as possible.

109. Turkey, which was one of the sponsors of the resolution [1514 (XV)] containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, is prepared as always to support the efforts of nations towards the implementation of that resolution.

110. Today, the African continent finds itself faced once again with serious problems. In the opinion of my delegation, those problems concern not only Africans, but the whole international community. That is why we must endeavour in every way to find just and practical solutions to the problems of the African continent. Experience has plainly shown us that the solutions put forward—even though they may have seemed satisfactory to us—have not been effective without the full support of the international community.

111. Among these problems, the situation in the Territory of South West Africa continues to be of serious concern to my delegation.

112. Mindful of its responsibilities, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions [2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V)] under which the Mandate conferred on the Government of the Republic of South Africa was terminated, the Territory of South West Africa was henceforth to come under the direct responsibility of our Organization, a United Nations Council for South West Africa was set up to administer the Territory until its accession to complete independence

^{5/} Documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193.

and the Acting United Nations High Commissioner for South West Africa was appointed. It is unfortunate that instead of co-operating with our Organization, the South African Government has seen fit to give a negative reply to the Council's request. In so doing, that Government has taken upon itself a very heavy responsibility. If I have dwelt on this question, it is because Turkey, as a member of the Council set up under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), is fully aware of its responsibilities towards the population of that Territory.

113. The crisis in Southern Rhodesia, which has grown more pronounced since the unilateral declaration of independence of the minority régime now in power, still continues to be of concern to the United Nations. It is regrettable to note that the measures taken by the international community have not so far been able to put an end to the illegal régime controlling that Territory.

114. Turkey's position with regard to this problem is known to all. We have stated on many occasions that we unreservedly support the right to self-determination and independence of all of Southern Rhodesia, and that we would reject any political system based on a minority régime and any sort of racial discrimination.

115. Turkey fervently hopes that the rebellion may end as quickly as possible and that a constitutional government may be set up in that country. Until that is done, Turkey will continue to apply fully the resolutions on that problem adopted by our Organization. I should like to take this opportunity to inform the General Assembly that Turkey, by a decree of the Council of Ministers, has forbidden the import and export of the strategic commodities indicated in Security Council resolution 232 (1966), as well as their transport by Turkish aircraft or ships.

116. It appears to us that the policy of racial discrimination practised by the South African Government remains the root cause of the problems in southern Africa. It is unthinkable that such a policy should be applied in defiance of the principles and provisions of the Charter, which the South African Government, by its accession, undertook to respect. The continued existence of such a situation in the world is a source of shame and an insult to the dignity of man. Turkey repudiates any policy of racial discrimination, including that of *apartheid*, and is ready as always to assist in bringing that practice to an end.

117. I should now like to say a few words about economic problems, which are among the major concerns of our Organization.

118. The existence of a wide gap, and a gap which is widening day by day between the level of the developed countries and the economically less-developed countries is one of the more unhappy features of our era. Poverty, ignorance, destitution and under-nourishment are serious threats to peace.

119. Praiseworthy and energetic efforts are of course being made to eradicate these evils from man's life. The results of these efforts, however, are still far from encouraging. The goals set for the United Nations Development Decade have not been

achieved, and the steps taken since 1960 have not served markedly to improve economic conditions in the developing countries. We are aware of the many reasons for that state of affairs. Unfavourable fluctuations in the terms of trade, difficulties encountered in the external financing of development, the burden imposed by the servicing of foreign indebtedness, the insufficient volume of the aid itself and the rapid rate of population growth are some of the main problems impeding the economic development of the countries in question.

120. The task of our Organization and of the specialized agencies responsible for assisting in the solution of these problems is thus rendered more complex and more difficult. Nevertheless, I do not believe that those problems are insoluble. Indeed, the developing countries are in the process of making great efforts to speed up the development and diversification of their economy by means of a more energetic mobilization of their internal resources. This arduous task, however, could be more easily undertaken and achieved if national efforts were to be augmented and supported by parallel efforts at the international level.

121. In this respect, I can only point with appreciation to the great work that the United Nations and the specialized agencies are in the process of accomplishing to assist developing countries. In this connexion, I also believe that the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development^{6/} should constitute a new stage in effective international co-operation for the economic growth of developing countries and the growth of the world economy as a whole.

122. To implement the "global development strategy" recommended by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,^{7/} it is indeed essential to unite and synchronize the efforts of the developing and developed countries.

123. The first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held at Geneva in 1964, set forth the principles of a bold new policy of international trade and development. It will now be the task of the second session to discuss and define measures for implementing that policy.

124. The agenda of the twenty-second session contains important items dealing with economic questions, such as the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Development Decade, the external financing of the economic development of the developing countries, multilateral food aid and the activities of the United Nations Development Programme, all of which must be considered fully and constructively by the General Assembly.

125. I have just set forth my Government's views on the serious and important problems facing us. We know that the United Nations does not have the means to provide remedies and solutions for all those problems. Today's political realities do not allow for that. But let us not lose hope on that account. Whatever the limitations on its ability to

^{6/} The Conference is to be held at New Delhi from 1 February to 25 March 1968.

^{7/} See document TD/B/146, page 10.

undertake effective and direct action, the United Nations can nevertheless make a substantial contribution towards the settlement of disputes and the consolidation of peace, and to the furthering and expansion of the world economy. It can do so, on the one hand, because of the moral authority of its decisions and appeals and, on the other hand, because of the effectiveness of its activity in areas where it has the means to act. We remain convinced that our faith in the United Nations must be maintained. We have no alternative, for it is only within the United Nations that we can go beyond our individual interests and attain a full awareness of the common interests of all mankind.

126. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

127. Mr. EBAN (Israel): I rise to reply to the addresses made recently by the Foreign Ministers of Egypt [1573rd meeting] and Jordan [1575th meeting]. Those representatives would have shown greater respect for their fellow representatives if they had looked at some of the facts in the face. Rarely in the history of nations have two Governments been more specifically and clearly responsible for a war than were those of Egypt and Jordan in May and June 1967. Yet the speeches of their Foreign Ministers present them as having been innocently attacked. This is the most preposterous travesty ever witnessed in an international organization.

128. At the beginning of May 1967 there had not been any clash of arms between Egypt and Israel for ten years. The Jordan frontier had been quiet for months. Israel's main security concern was to frustrate the Syrian policy of organizing and dispatching armed bands into Israel for the purpose of murder and sabotage. The majority of the Security Council had condemned this policy and had determined Syrian responsibility for it. There were no Israel troop concentrations anywhere at all. Not even the most tentative mobilization had been undertaken. There was no prior indication of the dramatic and explosive aggression which the United Arab Republic was soon to inaugurate and to which Jordan was to give its active and lethal support.

129. There now took place a series of Syrian, Egyptian and Jordan moves which the two Foreign Ministers suppressed in their addresses from this tribune. Both of them have underestimated the memory as well as the intelligence of their audience. They have not told this Assembly how a so-called guerilla war was launched and maintained through the whole of 1966; how Egypt moved its troops into Sinai in mid-May; how the Egyptian Government sought and secured the swift removal of the United Nations Forces for the purpose of preparing for a renewal of hostilities; how 90,000 Egyptian troops and 900 tanks were brought up against Israel in Sinai; how Sharm el Sheikh was occupied with belligerent purpose; how the Secretary-General of the United Nations was invited to Cairo so that, with careful timing, the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba was announced while he was in mid-journey; how letters were sent by the United Arab Republic to other Governments on 1 June announcing that the United Arab Republic was in a

state of war with Israel and would therefore henceforward exercise the "right" of blockade; how President Nasser told the Pan-Arab Federation of Trade Unions on 26 May that "war will be total and the objective will be to destroy Israel... We feel confident that we can win and are ready now for a war with Israel"; how the Egyptian Ministry of Religious Affairs ordered all preachers to make Holy War—Jihad—the subject of their sermons in the mosques; how Egyptian, Jordanian and Iraqi representatives informed the Security Council in May of the Arab claims of "belligerent rights"; how the Jordanian monarch on 30 May signed a pact in Cairo and returned to Amman with the sinister Mr. Shukeiry gloating at his side; how the Arab contingents from Iraq, Kuwait and Algeria moved into battle positions; how Egyptian air commanders were, in written instructions on 28 May and thereafter, allotted Israeli targets to bomb; how Jordanian brigades were instructed in writing that Israeli villages were to be occupied and all their inhabitants put to death; how several hours after Egyptian aggression had been resisted Jordan was still being asked to keep out of hostilities; how Jordan, as its King has publicly confessed, made a decision to attack Israel, which had not touched a hair of Jordan's head; how Jordanian artillery and mortar shells were poured into Jerusalem's streets and buildings. None of any of this was told you by the two Foreign Ministers. All this they concealed and suppressed in chanting their hymns of hate and aggression from the tribune of the General Assembly. And so the Governments of Egypt and Jordan, saturated with war guilt, heavy with unprovoked responsibility for aggression, have come here in plaintive accusation of Israel for refusing to be destroyed.

130. It is natural that once the sequence of misrepresentation is begun, it should be pursued to the end. Thus, the two Foreign Ministers have not dwelt on the peril which threatened Israel's existence in May and June; on the cold horror which this peril evoked in world opinion; on the emphasis with which their ridiculous charge of Israeli "aggression" was rejected time and again in the Security Council and the General Assembly. Thus the allegation made by representatives such as the representative of Poland concerning alleged Israel aggression was ignominiously defeated when presented for vote by the Soviet Union, first in the Security Council, and then in the General Assembly.

131. It is too late for Arab Foreign Ministers, and for others, to invent history. The facts are graven on the tablets of our generation's memory. The concerted attempt in May and June to annihilate a sovereign State and to murder its inhabitants is part of the common knowledge of mankind. So also is Israel's successful and glorious resistance which we shall always recount with thanksgiving and pride. We say to the United Arab Republic and Jordan and other Arab Governments which took part in the hostilities: You planned and made war—wanton, unprovoked, brutal war. The war that you planned and made has killed thousands, maimed thousands more, left behind a vast toll of misery and suffering. You cannot wash your hands clean of guilt for the war which your Governments planned, organized, declared

and launched. Your mood here should not be of accusation and reproach, but of humility, repentance and, above all, of readiness for peace.

132. The greater part of these two speeches was taken up by the suppression of truth about the origins of the war. It is not completely accurate to speak of a "six-day war". There has been a nineteen-year war conducted by Arab States against Israel for the avowed purpose of Israel's destruction. The issue now is whether this war is going to be liquidated by a final peace settlement—or merely interrupted in order to be resumed in conditions more propitious for Arab success.

133. The Foreign Ministers of the United Arab Republic and Jordan have made proposals of which the intention and effect is as follows: let Israel put itself in the position most favourable for us to resume the attempt at its destruction; let us go back to unilateral belligerency; let us go back to blockade; let us go back to terrorist infiltration, to non-recognition of Israel's sovereign rights, to a denunciation which expresses Israel's vulnerability at its highest level; in short, let us reconstruct the explosive scenario which burst into flame on 5 June. Is it not evident that Israel cannot co-operate in such a design? Is it not clear why the General Assembly so emphatically rejected such proposals?

134. The Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic dwelt nostalgically, but selectively, on the previous agreements which Egypt and Israel had signed in 1949. He cannot bear to quote them accurately. He left out all the words indicating that these were provisional agreements, valid as "a transition to permanent peace"; that they were judged to be incompatible with belligerent rights; that his Government flouted that judgement for sixteen years; that in accordance with Security Council rulings those agreements gave Israel's ships right of free passage in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Eilat; that Egypt defied that ruling in both cases whenever it could; that those agreements forbade the guerilla war which the United Arab Republic and others have condoned and encouraged and organized since 1954; that the Arab Governments did not for one single day carry out those agreements in their central purpose of non-belligerency and final renunciation of war; that the United Arab Republic has sought to invoke them while simultaneously claiming the traditional rights of war, and that by their own terms these agreements ceased effectively to exist at the moment when belligerent rights were asserted and Arab Governments spoke of the possibility of a renewed war.

135. And so in May 1967 the Jordan representative was still telling the Security Council—correctly—that the Armistice Demarcation Lines were not permanent national frontiers. And in May and June 1967 the Egyptian representative was declaring that he did not recognize Elath to be a part of Israel, notwithstanding the 1949 map, and that his Government would accordingly exercise "rights of war".

136. In short, the 1949 agreements, which should have been succeeded by peace treaties in 1950, had become by 1967 a formula for belligerency, a prescription for blockade, a cover for guerilla warfare,

a basis for irredentism, a alibi for refusal to make peace. It was thus that they had been corroded and shattered beyond repair. They cannot be rebuilt, but they can and must be replaced by serious contracts of peace, free from ambiguity, contracts which do not make a mockery of international principles and national rights.

137. I have spoken of Israel's inability to return to the political and juridical anarchy or to the strategic vulnerability from which it has emerged. Apart from the cease-fire agreement, there are now no valid effective contractual engagements between the States of the Middle East. What must now be built is not a ramshackle structure based on ambiguity and doubt, but a durable edifice of relations embodied in treaties of peace.

138. In adopting this policy we are faithful to international precedents and traditions. It is a traditional principle of international law, as United Arab Republic representatives have so often pointed out, that a state of war is terminated only by a treaty of peace. It is also a universal tradition that cease-fire lines are superseded by binding frontier agreements and security arrangements; that a transition from belligerency to non-belligerency and peace is effected by negotiation and bilateral agreement. Every item in Israel's current policy conforms with established international practice. We are behaving as any State is entitled to behave against which a state of war is practised and invoked. Israel is not in a position of juridical defence. Never has a State assailed by aggression retired from positions reached in war except together with a clear and precise definition by its assailants of their peaceful relations with it and agreement on the conditions by which such peaceful relations shall in future be regulated.

139. In our previous framework of relations—what we call the June 4 situation—as so many representatives here have pointed out, the Arab States argued that they could lawfully plan and use force by reason of the fact that they were at war with Israel, whereas Israel could not assert or exercise reciprocal rights against them. Surely that era, and all that symbolized it, is over. Strict reciprocity must govern our relationships in every field. These relationships cannot be left to vague or varying interpretations. They must be publicly, specifically, reciprocally and contractually defined, as has been the case after every other war.

140. What these two speeches have omitted is more disquieting than what they have contained. We had heard reports of a willingness to renounce the policies of non-recognition, hostility and belligerency which had led to the present situation. Nothing of all this has come to pass. There is no recognition whatever in either speech of Israel's right to sovereignty, security and peace. There is no understanding of the need to adjust differences by pacific settlement. There is an outright refusal by the United Arab Republic to negotiate the liquidation of a war which the United Arab Republic itself provoked, initiated, declared and launched. There is a call for the restoration of the June 4 situation "without condition or negotiation", that is to say, without peace and security. But this is the very course which the General As-

sembly has emphatically rejected and which Israel can in no conditions accept.

141. It is the opinion of the world community that a radical and explicit change in the policy of Arab Governments towards Israel must accompany any movement from the cease-fire situation to the new situation. This emerges clearly as the central conclusion from all the discussions held here in the summer weeks and from those resumed here this month. In our view the transition must be from suspended war to stable peace.

142. We do not seek what one eminent foreign minister has called the "recognition by Arab States of Israel's right to exist"; that right is absolute and does not depend on Arab recognition of it. There is even an invidious implication in the phrase. Recognition of our "right to exist" is not a negotiable concession. What we seek is the public renunciation of hostile policies and the establishment of a contractual and binding peace defining the conditions of our mutual coexistence.

143. In the address by the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic the central questions concerning his country's relations with ours remain unanswered. What are those questions?

144. Is the United Arab Republic prepared now publicly to repudiate the doctrine of "a state of war" which it has upheld for nineteen years?—and to deposit a solemn declaration to that effect? Is the United Arab Republic willing to make a statement from this rostrum acknowledging Israel's rights of navigation in the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran? Is the United Arab Republic prepared specifically to renounce for all time the hope and intention of liquidating Israel's independence and sovereignty? Is the United Arab Republic prepared to negotiate with Israel for the establishment of peace and the institution of agreed arrangements in order to avoid the belligerent confrontation of armed forces and to provide ironclad guarantees of free passage for Israel in the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran? Is the United Arab Republic prepared to forbid and prevent the activities on its soil of organizations which seek the overthrow of Israel's independence and statehood? In short, when the United Arab Republic advocates a withdrawal from the cease-fire line, is it simultaneously prepared for the replacement of war by a state of final and durable peace?

145. These are not rhetorical questions. Any peace-loving State would have no difficulty in giving an affirmative answer. An affirmative answer to all these questions would have important consequences. In the absence of an affirmative answer, the call for withdrawal from the cease-fire line is equivalent to a call for the early renewal of hostilities in the conditions most perilous to Israel's security.

146. The question how this war started and who provoked it is of crucial importance, and we shall return to it again and again, but of even greater importance is the question how to emerge from it. Is it not evident that the deadlock is so sharp, the complexities so great, that only a bold decision to replace total war by total peace can have substantial effect. That decision belongs primarily to the Govern-

ments concerned. Mere polemics will be sterile, whether they are conducted in one organ of the United Nations or another. Simply to transfer the exchange of accusations from one body to another, without any prior attempt to reach a regional or international consensus, will not affect the situation at all.

147. The international discussion will only have real meaning if it is accompanied by a regional dialogue. We need to establish an agenda for peace and to bring about its discussion by the direct contacts and responsibility of the parties. I shall not therefore enter into a detailed discussion of every charge and accusation which the Jordan representative included in his address. He represents a Government which, on the morning of 5 June, with a choice between war and peace, chose war. I do not understand why he thinks that this choice should be praised or endorsed.

148. When he speaks so innocently of his people's tolerant spirit, we should recall certain facts about Jordan's policy. It is a country in which after the hostilities not one Jew was left alive. It is a country in which, after the occupation and annexation of the Old city of Jerusalem for nineteen years, not one synagogue was left standing and no access was allowed for one single hour to the oldest of all the Holy Places. This very week, amongst thousands of refugees authorized to cross from the East Bank to the West Bank, the Jordan Government has seen to it that not one should appear. The problem, then, is not recrimination but peace. An agenda for a peace negotiation would include, first, political and juridical questions. Here the first priority is to establish peace treaties instead of cease-fire or armistice agreements.

149. Second, security and territorial questions. Here the need is to establish permanent frontiers of peace and security instead of vulnerable, fragile and unstable demarcation lines which left all claims, rights and positions open and unresolved. There is also room for security arrangements which should be designed to avoid confrontation. The territorial and security agreements in the peace treaties would determine the location of armed forces.

150. Third, the population problems. It is only by regional effort and international co-operation that the problems of displaced populations created by the wars and perpetuated by two decades of Arab belligerency can be resolved.

151. Fourth, economic questions. I am convinced that in conditions of peace an intense measure of economic co-operation and integration could be envisaged and a co-ordinated approach made to the development of resources which exist in more than one State.

152. Fifth, communication problems. Instead of a region divided and choked by boycott and ostracism, the Middle East could become an open region with a commerce of goods and ideas flowing freely across its expanses.

153. Sixth, cultural and scientific co-operation. I have just seen some sickening texts of Arabic school books used in Syria and Egypt and in refugee camps

in which a violent hatred is inculcated into the minds of children as soon as they can read. Instead of hatred, the schools, the universities and the scientific centres of the Middle East should revive the intellectual traditions of Arab-Jewish co-operation which have illuminated the previous epochs of Mediterranean history.

154. Apart from these specific Arab-Israel issues, there are unfinished tasks to be accomplished in relation to the status of the Holy Places, in which the world community as a whole has legitimate concerns. Moreover, there are development needs and problems in the Middle East which, in conditions of peace, could be the subject of a concerted approach in association with international agencies.

155. These are some of the horizons to which statesmanship should be addressing itself in the Middle East to create a new structure of relations inspired by a new spirit of regional responsibility. This is our task. It is a more worthy, although a more challenging, task than the mere exchange of accusations. Let the neighbouring Governments address themselves to these horizons, to this agenda of peace, and they will receive Israel's sincere and reciprocal response. The old era is vanished; a new one is struggling to be born.

156. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Iraq, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

157. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): Although the statement of the Foreign Minister of Israel was mainly directed to the statements made previously in this general debate by the Foreign Ministers of the United Arab Republic and Jordan—and I am sure that in due course those delegations will offer an adequate and conclusive reply to the statement of the Israeli Foreign Minister—he nevertheless mentioned my own country. He referred to the statements made by me in the Security Council last May; this was in regard to the question of war and peace.

158. Mr. Eban alleged that my delegation, with other Arab delegations, threatened war in the Security Council last May. A reading of the records of the Security Council would reveal the exact opposite. It was the Arab delegations which stated time and time again that they would not initiate offensive action, but no such assurance came from the representative of Israel who spoke in the Security Council in May. On the contrary, the statements made during the two weeks preceding the outbreak of war by responsible Israeli officials, headed by the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Eshkol, and the Foreign Minister, Mr. Eban himself, threatened war unless what they considered to be their interests were fully satisfied in respect of the question of navigation.

159. I agree on one thing with Mr. Eban. The question who started the war is indeed a crucial question. It is an important question, and on the determination of this question the Assembly and the United Nations must take adequate measures and draw the necessary conclusions.

160. Who started the war in the Middle East on 5 June 1967? Whose armies crossed the Armistice

Lines? Whose air force travelled many, many miles in order to bombard airports located deep in the territory of other Members of the United Nations?

161. Mr. Eban spoke about the necessity of not underestimating the intelligence of this august body. I could not agree more with him. But his statement was a challenge to the intelligence of this audience. We all know who started the war. No one could possibly believe that the massive scale of the Israeli attack could have been that of a spontaneous act of self-defence. Anyone with the most rudimentary knowledge of military matters could only agree that such an attack, with its precision and its split-second timing, could have been carried out, and the results thereof could have been achieved, only if there had been painstaking planning and preparation beforehand. But in any case, why do we have to bother about trying to prove this point, when a colleague of Mr. Eban, General Dayan, himself lectured the Arabs about the mistakes they had committed, saying that one of the gravest of those mistakes was that they, the Arabs, did not strike first. When General Dayan says to the Arabs, "You made a mistake in not striking first", is it not the clear and logical implication that Israel struck first because it considered striking first a matter of great military advantage?

162. In any case, the international community represented in this General Assembly, through the statements made by numerous representatives, has categorically rejected the Israeli contention that they were entitled to use military force in order to settle what amounts to a legal argument. Such ideas of pre-emptive strikes or pre-emptive wars cannot coexist with the Charter of the United Nations. This has been stated and reaffirmed time and again by many Members of this body.

163. The Foreign Minister of Israel, in his statement last week, spoke about the emphatic judgement of the emergency special session of the Assembly. For those who are not aware of the facts of the situation, it would appear that the General Assembly, at its emergency special session, took decisions to support the Israeli contentions regarding the question of the attack and the question of the occupation of Arab territory. But what did the emergency special session do?

164. First of all, the emergency special session adopted two resolutions by overwhelming majorities. One resolution [2253 (ES-V)] concerned Jerusalem. Now, was that resolution on Jerusalem in support of the Israeli position? Was it not an emphatic judgement of the General Assembly in its emergency special session? The decision on Jerusalem—which to this day Israel refuses to respect and continues to flout—stated very clearly that the measures taken by Israel to annex Jerusalem were invalid, and called upon that Government to rescind them without delay. We are still waiting to hear from Mr. Eban whether or not his Government intends to respect that emphatic judgement of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

165. The other decision adopted at the fifth emergency special session concerned the refugees [resolution 2252 (ES-V)]. It reaffirmed a previous reso-

lution [237 (1967)] of the Security Council, calling upon Israel to facilitate the return of the refugees to their homes. We have since then had a report from the Special Representative of the Secretary-General,^{8/} stating very clearly that very few refugees have been allowed to return, and that the measures taken by the Israeli Government were inadequate, woefully inadequate, to put into effect that Assembly resolution which represents the unanimous desire of the international community.

166. What, then, is the central issue before the United Nations? Mr. Eban would want us to believe that what the United Nations should do is to remain inactive, to do nothing, to leave the situation as it is, so that the Israeli occupation of Arab lands may continue unhindered and unchallenged by the international community, with the obvious result—they hope—that with the passage of time that occupation will be consolidated and finally transformed into permanent annexation. But any child would know exactly what the real intentions of Israel are regarding the territory at present occupied. We have already heard the statements made by various responsible officials of the Government of Israel regarding the necessity of maintaining Israeli control over those territories, and recently they have taken practical steps to put that particular ambition into effect. I am referring, of course, to the establishment of Israeli

settlements in the West Bank area of the Jordan and in Syrian territory.

167. The main issue, therefore, before the United Nations is whether or not it should do nothing about a situation which the Secretary-General himself, in the introduction to his annual report [A/6701/Add.1], describes as a matter of grave concern to the future of this Organization. Are we going to allow the occupation of Member States? Are we going to allow that occupation to be used as a means for obtaining political advantages? If we are going to do this, then we shall have destroyed any possibility of establishing the kind of civilized international order that the Charter of the United Nations seeks to establish.

168. That, then, is the primary issue before the Assembly and before the United Nations. Shall we keep silence in a matter of such gravity, or shall we take the necessary action on the basis of justice and equity, and upholding the Charter of the United Nations? I am sure of the answer of the international community. It has been pronounced here time and again by many representatives who stated that it is inadmissible, under the Charter, for any country to acquire territorial advantages and to expand at the expense of other Member States by the use of force. That is the central issue. Are we going to permit this to occur or are we not going to permit it? Once we answer that question, all other matters become of secondary importance.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

^{8/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1967, document S/8158.