



Wednesday, 28 June 1967,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION**

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

*Agenda item 5:*

*Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister  
for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet  
Socialist Republics (A/6717) (continued) . . .* 1

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

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

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

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed with the general debate, I should like to inform Members of the Assembly of my intentions in dealing further with this item. I am sure that, with the greatly appreciated co-operation of representatives, it will be possible for us to conclude the general debate on the morning of Friday, 30 June.

2. As Members will recognize, interventions in the exercise of the right of reply have been unusually lengthy. However, since the matter before us is an important one, the Chair has allowed all representatives who wished to speak to do so, without limiting the time for such interventions. Of course, this will also be done in the future. However, with the confidence I have in the spirit of co-operation among all Members towards expediting the work of the Assembly, I would request them to confine themselves exactly to the point on which they are exercising the right of reply. I wish to make it quite clear that if any speaker in his statement in exercise of the right of reply does not confine himself exactly to the point, I shall have to draw that to his attention, as it is my duty to do.

3. I hope it may be possible, with the General Assembly's co-operation and consent, to set Monday, 3 July, at 11 a.m. as the time-limit for the submission of proposals. The time-limit for the submission of amendments will be determined later, after due consultations. I am indicating this timetable just for the Assembly's information at this stage. I shall confirm the time-table after I have had further consultations on the matter. Representatives who may have different views are requested to meet with me in my office this morning, this afternoon and tomorrow morning before 10 o'clock so that I can have the benefit of exchanging views with them before I confirm the time-table.

4. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): Before beginning my statement, Mr. President, I

should like to express my delegation's appreciation of the wise, calm and impartial way in which you are conducting these difficult discussions.

5. Having attended twelve sessions of the General Assembly, I trust you will believe me when I say that I am not given to hyperbole or verbal intoxication. Without oratorical exaggeration, I venture to say that the United Nations has never seen more difficult times than these and that the very existence of the Organization depends on the decisions we make. Still without hyperbole or rhetoric I have to say that my delegation feels it would be a dangerous illusion to believe that we are dealing with faits accomplis and conflicts already over. Directly or indirectly, the conflict and the threat to peace will remain, not only in the Middle East but throughout the world, if we do not succeed in finding realistic, objective and just formulas to solve the grave problem facing us.

6. I propose to keep impartially to the facts, and the first of these is that a Jewish State, later to become Israel, was established by resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947. That State was created on 5 Iyar 5708 of the Jewish calendar, or 14 May 1948 of the Christian calendar. The United Nations admitted Israel as a Member State by resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949; it would therefore be hardly realistic today to make any retrospective judgements. My Government enjoys friendly relations with Israel, and it therefore considers that one of the objective bases for any solution must be the acceptance by all States Members of the United Nations of the principle of respect for the sovereignty of States—logically including Israel.

7. The second fact to be pointed out is that long before the creation of Israel there was strife between Arabs and Jews in Palestine which was then continued between the State of Israel and the Arab States.

8. Neither the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel, signed at Rhodes on 24 February 1949, after negotiations conducted under the able leadership of that great servant of peace Dr. Ralph Bunche, nor the Protocol of Lausanne of 12 May 1949, nor the arrangements which followed the dramatic events of 1956, amounted to a peace treaty. They were all provisional truces or armistices that halted hostilities momentarily without achieving the peace which should have been their objective.

9. It should also be remembered that since November 1966, when the Security Council met to consider the Israel-Jordan problem, there have been clashes which have produced serious accusations on either side, particularly those of 16 March and 7 April of this year on the Syria-Israel border.

A further conclusion to be drawn is that as long as the state of war continues it will be difficult to study and solve the basic problem.

10. It also follows from these facts that, if there has been no state of peace in the area but simply truces or armistices, interrupted by frequent skirmishes, the Soviet contention that Israel has committed aggression against the Arab States is unacceptable; similarly we reject the contention that there was aggression against Israel by the Arab States before the recent conflict.

11. In sixteen years of discussion in the United Nations, since the item was first included in the agenda of the General Assembly by resolution 378 (V) of 17 November 1950, it has not been found possible to define aggression. But it can be described as an act of force menacing the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a State in violation of the United Nations Charter. We cannot speak of aggression in regard to acts occurring after the peace has been breached. Such acts can only be called belligerent acts. In the so-called Litvinov formula, which was submitted by the high Soviet official Litvinov to the Disarmament Conference of 1933,<sup>1/</sup> the essential feature of an act of aggression—whether a declaration of war, an invasion by armed forces, a bombing raid, a landing or incursion of troops or a naval blockade—was that it must occur "first", i.e. before a state of war can be said to exist. The same enumerative definition was supported by the Soviet Union at the fifth regular session of the General Assembly in the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression,<sup>2/</sup> and indeed whenever this item has been debated.

12. If we were to regard each and every belligerent act as an act of aggression, we would be weaving an interminable Penelopean winding sheet. The Charter itself seems to identify; or at least equate, act of aggression and breach of the peace: Article 1 (I) refers to "acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace", while Article 39 would seem to indicate that breaches of the peace and acts of aggression are similar in character.

13. Furthermore, although my delegation steadfastly upholds the competence of the General Assembly to consider any subject bearing on international peace and security pursuant to the terms of Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter—which is why my Government agreed without hesitation to the holding of the present special session—we would nevertheless have certain doubts as to whether the Assembly is competent to condemn a Member State as an aggressor, and would feel that further clarification is needed.

14. While we cannot accept that an act of aggression is involved, we must recognize a new fact, namely, that we are confronted by belligerent acts which have brought Israel to occupy the territory of other

States by force of arms after a victorious phase of military action.

15. I should like to recall that, when it was laid down in article 1 of the Treaty of Paris of 27 August 1928—the Briand-Kellogg Pact—that "the High Contracting Parties solemnly declare... that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies",<sup>3/</sup> an imperative rule of international law came into being which was to become a principle of jus cogens.

16. In the American context this principle was incorporated into the Stimson doctrine contained in the letter addressed to China and Japan by the United States Secretary of State on 7 January 1932, which intimated that agreements at variance with the Treaty of Paris were not acceptable to his country. The Anti-War Treaty (Non-Aggression and Conciliation) known as the Saavedra Lamas Pact, signed at Rio de Janeiro on 10 October 1933; the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Re-establishment of Peace signed at Buenos Aires on 23 December 1936, and the Convention to Co-ordinate, Extend and Assure the Fulfillment of the Existing Treaties between the American States, signed at Buenos Aires on the same day are some of the international instruments which reflect the principle later to be embodied very succinctly in article 5 of the Charter of the Organization of American States: "Victory does not give rights".<sup>4/</sup>

17. As has been pointed out from this rostrum, we must bear in mind that the crisis of the League of Nations, which led to the most ghastly holocaust in history, arose from the abandonment of the rule of law which proscribes war as a means of creating, extinguishing or modifying rights.

18. The United Nations Charter took up the principle of outlawing war as a means of resolving conflicts when it included a provision forbidding the threat or use of force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any State, and in consequence established a system of peaceful settlement of international disputes. The very existence of the international community, and hence of the United Nations, rests on this principle.

19. I should recall that, although in its early days, the United Nations was intended to include only those nations which had united to fight against the Central Powers and their allies—there are ominous and anachronistic traces of this in some Articles of the Charter—the Organization proved in due course to be a dynamic instrument capable of representing the international community. Having passed through the stage of "homogeneous universality", it has achieved full universality based on the peaceful co-existence of States.

20. The progressive development of international law achieved through the Charter rules out the application to the painful realities of today of methods, measures and solutions which were possible at the end of the Second World War, when the United Nations was taking its first infant steps. To act in this way would be to swim against the tide of history.

<sup>1/</sup> See League of Nations, Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Report of the Committee on Security Questions, Conf. D/C.G.108, Conference Documents, Vol. II, p. 679. (League of Nations Series, 1935, IX, 4).

<sup>2/</sup> General Assembly, Official Records, Ninth Session, Supplement No. 11, Annex, A/C.66/L.2/Rev.1.

<sup>3/</sup> League of Nations Treaty Series, vol. XCIV, 1929, No. 2137, p. 63.

<sup>4/</sup> United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 119 (1952), No. 1609, p. 52.

21. In this connexion, I have specific instructions from my Government to state that we absolutely reject any territorial conquest through force and the retention of occupied territories as a means of exerting pressure for later negotiations; we shall therefore vote in favour of the withdrawal of the Israel forces to the lines of the status quo ante.

22. We fully appreciate the difficult situation in which Israel finds itself and its contention that it acted in response to threats by the leaders of neighbouring States and the concentration of forces on its borders. I believe, however, that, even if it were accepted for the sake of argument that Israel had acted in legitimate self-defence, under Article 51 of the Charter it would still be bound to accept "the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security".

23. It is conceivable that a solution to the grave problem before us could be based on these two principles, namely, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and the jurisdiction and competence of the appropriate United Nations organs to deal with matters concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes, under the terms of the Charter.

24. It is clearly idle to suppose that a complex situation which has dragged on for twenty years could be straightened out overnight at a moment when the gravest tensions ever known prevail in that part of the world. Any realistic approach would have to attempt to balance the inexorable reality of the factual situation against intangible questions of principle, and it might be advisable to contemplate two stages of negotiation that would gradually lead to a final solution rather than merely to uneasy truces.

25. On this hypothesis, the stages would have to be regarded not as two isolated operations, each dealing with a different type of problem, but rather as a gradually widening approach to a single problem. The first stage, seeking immediate solutions to the most urgent aspects of the problem, might cover the recognition, at least de facto, of the situation which previously existed, the withdrawal of troops and a declaration of an end to belligerency under conditions guaranteeing the security of both sides and recognizing their respective rights and so avoiding a further deterioration of the already tragic refugee problem as a result of new waves of population displacement. The second stage might cover peace negotiations proper, considered in a wide context, leading to definitive treaties which would be invalid if concluded while the territory of any of the parties was under military occupation.

26. My delegation has been particularly interested in the meaning to be attributed to paragraph 3 of the United States draft resolution (A/L.520) which states that a stable and durable peace "should be achieved through negotiated arrangements with appropriate third-party assistance". It is not clear what may be meant by a "third party"; but it would appear that any action by a third party must inevitably take one of three forms: good offices, mediation or

arbitration. Nor is it clear how this "third party" would initiate action, since action by a third party can either be invited, as in the case of mediation or arbitration, or can be offered voluntarily, as in the case of good offices. It would also be necessary to determine whether action by the United Nations would come within the definition of "third party" action. If the idea of the "third party" is intended to signify a mediation commission, my delegation would warmly welcome it, especially for a preliminary stage of negotiations.

27. My Government also believes that it is highly important to halt the arms race in the Middle East as one of the basic moves towards a durable peace, and that an appeal should be made to all States to refrain from supplying war material to the parties.

28. I should now like to refer to some of the conditions which the United States draft resolution considers fundamental for a stable peace. In the first place, it refers to "freedom of innocent maritime passage". In my opinion, this right must not be confused with the principle of the freedom of the seas. "Freedom" relates to the high seas while "innocent passage" refers to territorial waters. The high seas system is one of condominium by the international community, the old British contention—the United Kingdom representative, if he is listening, might be interested in this point—whereas the territorial sea is under the full sovereignty of the coastal State which regards it as the liquid portion of its territory. Thus it is to be understood that the principle of innocent passage does not affect the sovereignty of the State and its rights but conditions such sovereignty.

29. Article 14, paragraph 4 of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone considers that "passage is innocent so long as it is not prejudicial to the peace, good order or security of the coastal State". Paragraph 5 of the same article excludes from innocent passage "foreign fishing vessels...if they do not observe such laws and regulations as the coastal State may make and publish in order to prevent these vessels from fishing in the territorial sea".<sup>5/</sup> Although my country has not subscribed to the Convention, I think that these definitions are quite clear-cut.

30. My Government, while reaffirming and reserving its rights to determine, by sovereign decision, the width of its territorial sea, recognizes the right to innocent passage. By the same token, we believe that the conditions for a stable peace in the Middle East must include the right to free passage through the Suez Canal, which is governed by the provisions of the Constantinople Convention of 29 October 1888, and also the right of innocent passage through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran for all ships, including those of Israel.

31. Lastly, I wish to refer to the refugee problem, for which paragraph 3 (c) of the United States draft resolution (A/L.520) proposes a "just and equitable solution". No definition is given of what

<sup>5/</sup> United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, *Official Records*, vol. II, Plenary Meetings, Annexes, A/CONF.13/L.52 (United Nations Publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, Vol. II, p. 134).

is meant by a "just solution", but the term usually means a legal solution whereby each party receives what is its due. "Equitable solution" is not defined either, but the term is generally understood to mean an ethical solution based on compromise. To make the position of my delegation clear, therefore, I must recall two basic facts.

32. In the first place, the refugee problem is linked with the territorial one. The refugees did not leave their homeland of their own free will but as a result of warfare which occurred in three phases: one between partition and the truce agreements; another as a result of the military events of 1956; and the third which is still in progress.

33. The second fact is that three possible solutions have been suggested: repatriation, resettlement in neighbouring States, and transfer to countries in other parts of the world which are willing to receive the refugees. The first method is opposed by Israel, despite resolution 194 (III); the second is passionately opposed by the Arab States and by the great majority of the refugees themselves; and the third has never been seriously entertained.

34. We prefer to base our hopes for a solution of the refugee problem on the fact that few peoples in history have encountered as serious a problem as that which Israel now faces. It is to be hoped, therefore, that Israel will show all the more understanding. The Jewish people has been identified with the Diaspora, and to meet this problem, the very three solutions I have mentioned have emerged in the course of their history: adaptation and assimilation within the nations in which they lived; emigration to new lands, as advocated by Baron Maurice de Hirsch, who settled 10,000 Jews in Argentina during the last century; and the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine, an idea which originated in the book *The Jewish State* by Theodor Herzl,<sup>6/</sup> originally published in 1896, which sowed the seed of the Zionist movement that began with the Congress of Basle in 1897. I do not wish to prejudge the problem, but the future may perhaps indicate that, in any case, the road to be taken is that of consulting the wishes of the refugees themselves, who are suffering and desperate human beings, in order to find a solution to this great problem by one of the three methods mentioned, or a combination of all three, under effective international control and in accordance with the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

35. In conclusion, I shall say a few words on the problem of Jerusalem. I must recall that resolution 181 (II) establishing the State of Israel also contained the declaration that Jerusalem was *corpus separatum*, which amounts to giving it international status under United Nations control. The Trusteeship Council adopted three resolutions: No. 32 (II) of 10 March 1948; No. 34 (II) of 21 April 1948 and No. 232 (VI) of 4 April 1950, formulating a statute for the City of Jerusalem concerning which the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of the General Assembly

adopted a resolution.<sup>7/</sup> We know what happened later, but in our opinion those events have in no way changed any rights and it is possible that the problem of Jerusalem, since it is a distinct problem, should be discussed outside the context of the immediate peace negotiations at the next regular session of the General Assembly.

36. I wish to state on behalf of my delegation that we greatly appreciate the interest shown by Israel in seeking a satisfactory régime for the Holy Places within the context of what was once called "functional internationalization" on the basis of negotiations with the spiritual heads of the three great biblical religions, only one of whom—His Holiness the Pope—is also a Head of State. Negotiations in a spirit of goodwill to this end, however valuable they might be and however important as preliminary steps to the restoration of peace, might perhaps be juridically less sound than territorial internationalization in direct relationship with the United Nations, as representing the international community, within the terms defined by His Holiness the Pope. If the problem of Jerusalem were excluded from the peace negotiations, except in a limited way, it would be possible to take it up later.

37. It has been stated with pertinent realism that the Middle East, the cradle of religions and the womb of great cultures, has also been the part of the world where the great confrontations of history have taken place. We are in duty bound to avoid any repetition of such confrontations. It would be naive or hypocritical to believe that a turning-point has been reached in the Middle East. If no just peace is established, all we shall achieve is an uneasy truce. What is required, therefore, is the imagination to seek solutions, the honesty to work them out, the realism to accept them, and the courage to implement them.

38. We have at times heard it said somewhat pessimistically that the small States are merely the chorus of the tragedy because so frequently little heed is paid to what they say. It should not be forgotten, however, that the chorus in Greek tragedy had the active and admonitory role of warning the protagonists of their fate, when the Gods had blinded them in order to lead them to destruction.

39. Allow me, Mr. President, to say in conclusion that for my people, and for me personally, the blood of both Arabs and Jews is equally sacred. My country opened its gates to the last distressing Jewish diaspora, and enjoys cordial relations with Israel. There is no Arab community in my country, since the large influx of Arab immigrants who sought a home and a motherland there has been fully assimilated into our national life, sharing our misfortunes and our achievements and creating wealth and culture as loyal Ecuadorians. We owe a debt of love and veneration to the Arab peoples for their contribution to our culture through Spain the everlasting. It is because we share the pain and suffering of that tortured part of the world called the Middle East that we long to see it find a just peace. The

<sup>6/</sup> Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State. An attempt at a modern solution of the Jewish question* (Tel Aviv, Newman, 1954).

<sup>7/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Annexes, Agenda item 20, A/1724, para. 11.

duty—a difficult one—of this Assembly is to find ways of harmonizing realities and principles. My delegation will perform that duty by co-operating on both the regional and the world level in the search for a just and permanent solution.

40. Mr. LUNS (Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands): Before expressing the views of the Netherlands delegation on the subject of our deliberations, I should like briefly to preface my remarks with a few considerations which my delegation has in mind as it joins others in the discussions at this fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly.

41. Three weeks ago, the world held its breath as it witnessed the fateful outburst of violence in the Middle East. A situation already tense for years suddenly erupted into a war, causing general anxiety everywhere in view of the tremendous potential dangers for the peace of the world. During the ensuing ten days, the Security Council dealt almost continuously with the Middle East question. In the course of its frequent meetings, the Council adopted five resolutions on the question, while other draft resolutions and suggestions concerning the conflict were, and still are, under consideration. Although the Charter contains specific provisions against simultaneous discussion by the Security Council and the General Assembly of matters concerning the maintenance of international peace and security, the present emergency special session was convened because a majority of Member States concurred with the request of one of the permanent members of the Security Council to discuss the situation in the Middle East at short notice in the General Assembly.

*Mr. Diop (Senegal), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

42. The Netherlands Government, however, maintains its views expressed more than once in the past, namely, that the interests of the United Nations require strict observance of the provisions of Articles 11 and 12 of the Charter. This means that, while the General Assembly may discuss any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, any such question on which action is necessary must be referred to the Security Council; and, furthermore, that the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to a dispute or situation with respect to which the Security Council is exercising its functions.

43. In addition to these reservations of a constitutional nature, the Netherlands Government entertains strong doubts as to the political wisdom of seeking a solution in the Middle East through a debate in the General Assembly.

44. It is in the light of these reservations that I will offer my Government's views on the question of the relations between the Arab States and Israel.

45. When considering the sad situation in the Middle East, our thoughts and anxieties are directed first and foremost to the appalling human tragedies wrought by the eruption of violence, with all its inherent sufferings. In particular, we feel deep compassion for the refugees—the women and children—who are

the first to suffer from the consequences of events in which they had no part. In this connexion, the Netherlands delegation warmly welcomes the resolution 237 (1967) on the humanitarian aspect of the situation which was unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 14 June. We did note with satisfaction the repeated assurances of the Government of Israel that it is aware of its heavy responsibilities in this respect.

46. The Netherlands Government has already contributed goods for the relief of the suffering of refugees in Jordan, sent by special military plane, and has furthermore decided to extend this assistance with a substantial gift of supplies for the benefit of the victims of the war in Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic, amounting to a total of more than \$100,000.

47. These relief measures are, of course, only of a temporary and emergency nature. The basic problem of the Palestine refugees after twenty years remains unsolved, and still is a main obstacle on the road to better relations between the States in the area. In the past few weeks this question has assumed even larger proportions, and my delegation believes that the solution cannot be postponed any longer. The Netherlands Government sincerely hopes that all countries concerned—first and foremost Israel, but also the members of the League of Arab States—will now be prepared actively to co-operate in finding a solution to this long-standing problem.

48. Many speakers in this debate have voiced the anxiety of their nations over the situation with regard to the Holy Places, which are of such importance to three of the world's religions. The protection and the inviolability of these spiritual shrines are a matter of concern to the people of my country. My Government, along with other Governments, deems it necessary that a solution for the Holy Places contain the guarantee of free access to all. In this connexion, various past proposals, as well as the views of the Holy See recently expressed by His Holiness the Pope, deserve careful study and consideration.

49. Turning to the substance of the question before us, it is superfluous to point out that no other problem has been discussed so frequently and so elaborately in the United Nations as the relations between Israel and the Arab States. In the course of the past twenty years, the Security Council has devoted well over 200 meetings to this question. The efforts made by the United Nations have, however, achieved but limited results. True, until the recent outbreak of hostilities, it has been possible in most cases to stabilize the situation and prevent the frequent small clashes from escalating into a full-scale war. Nevertheless, the underlying political conflict has remained a serious threat to the peace of the area, as events of the last weeks have demonstrated.

50. As I pointed out a moment ago, the Security Council has, between 6 and 10 June, adopted a number of resolutions demanding that hostilities cease forthwith. Thereupon, the fighting was halted and the



handling of the conflict was shifted from the battlefield to this conference hall.

51. Whatever my delegation feels about the usefulness of this emergency special session of the Assembly we are convinced that our Organization, as such, has an important task in this respect. The United Nations would render an invaluable service to the cause of peace if it could help create an atmosphere in which fruitful discussions between the parties can take place, leading, we hope, to a just and lasting settlement. It is indeed beyond doubt that the tragic sequence of events in the Middle East from 5 to 11 June last was primarily caused by the fact that in the past twenty years it has not been possible, either inside or outside the United Nations, to achieve such a durable settlement acceptable to all parties.

52. In this connexion, my delegation does not believe that a mere withdrawal of troops, advocated by a number of delegations, can in itself bring about durable peace. There is ample ground for fear that if such a withdrawal is not encompassed by a set of arrangements designed to solve the basic problem of the area, it will merely result in a revival of the dangerous conditions existing before 5 June.

53. We have heard many times during this debate how intolerable has been the pressure created for the Arab States because of the military occupation by the armies of Israel of quite large parts of Arab territory. I will not deny that this is an argument seriously to be considered, but I think it would be less than fair were I not to remind this Assembly of the equally intolerable pressure exercised upon Israel since it became a sovereign State by the constant refusal of the Arab States to recognize its existence, coupled with the maintenance of a state of war. Therefore, my Government is of the opinion that a just settlement should take into account both these aspects of the present situation and solve them simultaneously.

54. Consequently, my Government shares the views of many other Members that at this time efforts should be deployed in order to arrive at a final political solution of the problems that have for far too long plagued the peoples of the area. Such a solution should embody the following elements, amongst others:

(1) The arrangements, in order to hold a promise of durability, should be just and acceptable to all parties;

(2) The right to national existence of all States in the region, Members of the United Nations, should be recognized beyond discussion;

(3) Rights deriving from international principles, like those of free access to the open sea and free passage through international waterways such as the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, should be secure to all;

(4) The arms race between the States in the area, which in the past has worsened an already explosive situation, should be stopped;

(5) The twenty-year-old problem of the Palestine refugees, now further aggravated by the recent war, demands a final settlement in which both the national interests of the States concerned and the fundamental rights of the refugees should be fully vouchsafed;

(6) Any final settlement should also provide for a solution of certain pressing problems in the economic field, including questions like the just distribution of the Jordan River waters, possibly along the lines of plans drawn up years ago;

(7) Finally, in view of the special importance of certain parts of the area to three of the world's great religions, a final solution should, as I mentioned before, also provide for free access to all the Holy Places.

55. It follows from this summary of my Government's views that my delegation could not vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.519]. That draft, which puts all the blame for what has happened on Israel and ignores the long chain of preceding events, would merely restore the explosive status quo of 4 June. It would simply put the clock back, and put it back to the position where its ticking was more like that of a time bomb. Once again we are faced with a situation with which the United Nations has often had to deal—that is, it had to stop the fighting, but also solve the underlying problems which caused the fighting. Although in a number of cases in the past the United Nations has succeeded in its first task, it has all too often left the underlying problems unsolved. In so doing, it did put the lid back on the boiling pot—but only until the lid flew off again. We should not repeat this mistake if we are not to see a war in the Middle East every ten years.

56. For these reasons my delegation considers far more satisfactory the draft resolution submitted by the United States [A/L.520], which acknowledges different inseparable aspects of the problem. But it would seem to us that these various aspects might be spelled out even more explicitly in a new draft resolution. My delegation is prepared to support any resolution which aims at resolving the basic problems of the relations between Israel and the Arab States because this is the only way to bring real peace to the Middle East on the basis of mutually accepted coexistence.

57. In view of the foregoing, it would seem clear that the General Assembly of the United Nations is not the place where such highly complicated problems can be brought to a solution. My Government believes that the parties concerned would be well advised to undertake negotiations around the conference table, negotiations perhaps best undertaken with the participation or mediation of an international organ or of other countries.

58. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom as well as other speakers have suggested that the Secretary-General should nominate a special representative to be sent out to the Middle East. One of the tasks of this special representative would be "to play an active part in relations with all the parties in the area itself". [1529th meeting, para. 27.] My delegation believes that

such a step, of which the modalities, of course, require careful study, might indeed be helpful in leading to what should, under the circumstances, be the first objective of the international community: to pave the way for discussions between the parties.

59. In turning to negotiations, the parties concerned may be prompted by the conviction that their short-time and long-term national interests can thus best be served, since the course of the past twenty years has only led to disaster.

60. In the meantime, the Security Council undoubtedly will, for yet a considerable time, have to occupy itself with the situation in the Middle East. During these deliberations the Council might, in the view of the Netherlands Government, consider establishing some form of United Nations presence in order to ensure continued implementation of the cease-fire and prevention of recurring clashes of arms.

61. A first step to this end could be the strengthening of the present activities of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. This would enable the Chief of Staff, General Odd Bull, to whom I should like to pay a well-deserved tribute here, effectively to perform his duties, which have been multiplied and complicated to such a great degree. My country will continue to put at his disposal, as has been the practice since the Truce Supervision Organization was initiated, observers whenever they are called for. During the recent crisis the Netherlands Government has assisted General Bull in the performance of his arduous task by putting at his disposal a Fokker Friendship airplane from the Netherlands Air Force units, earmarked for United Nations peace-keeping operations.

62. If the Security Council were to decide to initiate some form of peace-keeping operation, this would lead to a certain degree of military disengagement and might furthermore be part of a system of international safeguards which could not unilaterally be abrogated, by only one party.

63. The views I have just expressed stem from the great concern of the Netherlands Government over the very serious situation in the Middle East. We do hope that with the assistance of the United Nations the parties concerned will make all efforts to solve their issues in the interest of all the peoples in the area, an area bridging three continents, the birth-place of three religions, and the cradle of civilization.

64. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (translated from Spanish): At no time has my delegation spoken from this rostrum with a more tragic awareness of the international situation or a deeper feeling of the responsibility of all the States Members of the United Nations.

65. Just one month ago, on 28 May, the Secretary-General went to Geneva and commented at a conference there on the Encyclical "Pacem in terris"; he said that the policy of evading international responsibility when it was convenient seemed to him to be highly dangerous and quite capable of leading us to the brink of a third world war, if it had not done so already. The idea that we might be witnessing the prologue to a third world war had already been

put forward a few days previously by the Secretary-General in a statement to the United Nations Correspondents Association. His words, half thinking out loud and half prophetic, left everyone aghast. They had been used by a man who does not usually sound the alarm needlessly or give way to facile emotions. But the alarm only lasted a few hours. Once the first shock had passed, a certain cheerful confidence returned. Perhaps, we all thought, U Thant has exaggerated somewhat, thinking it to be in the best interests of peace and coexistence in the face of the threatening clouds which darken the sky. But now we know that the Secretary-General's diagnosis was sound. An implacable war of aggression has spread across the Middle Eastern lands, raising a storm of hatred and upheaval in the hearts of the people living there such as had not been known in those parts for many centuries. We are enveloped in a feeling of universal anxiety.

66. All that the Spanish delegation has to say here today is based on three convictions or, if you prefer, three aspirations: the first, is the paramount desire to serve peace, which is basic; the second is the policy of genuine friendship between Spain and the Arab countries; and the third, the vital importance of the geo-political situation of those countries for Europe and, consequently, for the whole Western world.

67. I am anxious first and foremost to state quite simply and truthfully that the Spaniards, their Government and, consequently, the representative who now has the honour of addressing the Assembly, do not harbour the slightest hostility or the least feeling of ill-will towards the people of Israel. The fact that we do not maintain diplomatic relations with the State of Israel does not reflect the slightest political, religious or racial prejudice on our part. On the contrary, over the past few years, and even in the past few days, Spain's conduct in this regard has been impeccable. Anyone who seeks proof of what I have just said will have no difficulty in finding it.

68. Our policy which we wish to continue and, if possible, improve and extend, of maintaining the closest possible relations with the Arab States, is based on much more than mere sentiment. Much incidental literature has been written about the Alhambra of Granada, the Mosque of Córdoba, the Giralda of Seville, the Alcazaba of Málaga, and about the water channels which for centuries have irrigated the orchards of Valencia, Alicante and Murcia. But, more important than the literature, even including great literature, there have been eight centuries of coexistence, 800 years of love, at times shared and at others disputed, eight centuries of mutual hope and grief enacted on the same soil, eight centuries of poetry and learning, of war and peace. Thus the Arabs have become part of us, and we of them.

69. Alongside the fundamentally European future of my country—for as General de Gaulle said, "Europe without Spain would lack depth"—and our blood and family ties with Hispanic America, an age-old tradition leads us to feel close to the Arabs both in times of joy and in times of sorrow. At the present, they are passing through a time of hardship; and for that

very reason, Spain would like to give them, with renewed fervour, a token of friendship. Let us hope that this expression of fellow-feeling may help them to rise above any sense of discouragement and direct their efforts towards a future of prosperity.

70. The situation in the Middle East today is much more serious than it was before the recent war. Far from abating, the wrongful, iniquitous situation which led to the outbreak of hostilities has deteriorated alarmingly. The situation is variously referred to in terms of "displaced persons", "Jordan waters", "starving refugees", "confiscation of property" or "difficulty of access to the Holy Places", in short, of mockery of justice.

71. I have seen the tragedy of the Palestine refugees for myself, in the region of Jericho under a burning sun. I witnessed the trials and tribulations of these people, reduced to minimum subsistence level, and I wondered, "Did these men and women ever have a fire burning in the hearth? Were they ever a family united under one roof? What sin did these children commit by being born, that they should be condemned to poverty and suffering from the dawn of their days?"

72. For many, many years, the world has looked on while these events have taken place in the Middle East. It was inevitable that appalling consequences would be the outcome.

73. But why should we be surprised if, in matters where the freedom of mankind, sovereignty and law is challenged, we find that over and over again, from this very rostrum and in the Committees of the General Assembly, clear and unquestionable acts of aggression have been denounced and the United Nations has remained impassive, or its reaction has been so half-hearted and feeble that the aggressor has been able to continue enjoying the fruits of his violence?

74. Here, I say, we have listened to statements by peoples whose national entity has been humiliated and trampled under foot by others more powerful. Despite everything, the mockery goes on. Such roads lead to disaster. Thus an atmosphere of vengeance and hatred has been created in the Middle East and today it has reached a greater pitch of violence and bitterness than ever before. Toleration of an unjust international situation invariably has to be paid for dearly.

75. Spain has never egged any country on to a policy of aggression. We firmly believe that war is the worst of all possible solutions. The truth of this is self-evident today in the Middle East; the situation is tenser, more difficult, more pernicious, more dangerous than it was before the beginning of the hostilities.

76. It has been said here, and oftener still outside the Organization, that the stability and security of the Arabs must be safeguarded. It would be preferable by far to say that they must be guaranteed a life based on dignity and justice. Stability and security are not compatible with the precarious existence of a people persecuted and branded with shame.

77. Some may think it would suffice to provide economic aid to the Arab world. It would be a grave

mistake to think that that is all we need do. Material progress is of course very important for any human society, and physical well-being contributes to its happiness and self-control. But it would be foolish to forget that people, and especially those who throughout the ages have been faithful to a strict spiritual and moral code, seek first and foremost a higher form of gratification than the immediate satisfaction of their needs, and if they were compelled to choose, would prefer to live irreproachably in austerity and even in poverty but with pride rather than lead a plentiful but unworthy life. Let us therefore not deceive ourselves nor make errors of judgement in regard to the remedies needed to settle the situation in the Middle East. Quite simply, the remedies are such as can lead to the establishment of a just order. As long as the Arabs see their lands invaded, their orchards occupied, their valleys used as camps for the conquerors and their most treasured rights violated at the point of the sword, it is futile to talk of their position as secure and stable.

78. Nothing can be made of a land of abandoned hearths, scattered families, captive souls, trampled flags, breached frontiers, concentration camps where the refugees die of starvation and grief, except a breeding ground for human misery or for hatred.

79. As I have said, Spain nourishes and reaffirms its friendship with the Arabs; but, apart from that, it is constantly aware that as a country, in terms of its society and its culture, it belongs to the threatened Western world, and consequently it cannot forget that the Arab peoples live and develop their personality in an area geographically adjacent to Europe, where land, sea and sky are altogether vital to European interests. Hence any policy designed to turn the Arabs away from our old continent, to isolate them from contact with us, to ignore their worries and cares, would only provoke a dangerous clash and create tense situations whose consequences might be extremely serious. I venture to say that some Western countries appear to have buried their heads in the sand or do not interpret the facts in their true sense and at their real value. My delegation feels that these facts impose certain responsibilities on the whole of the Western world. If we do not do our duty, if the West does not treat the Arabs with the friendship they deserve, interests and influences quite alien to our destiny will appear irrevocably on the horizon of the free world, and positive warning signs can already be seen. Some of them are not only alien but quite adverse; furthermore, certain Powers will inevitably establish themselves on the shores of the Mediterranean and disrupt the present balance.

80. In formulating such views and directing its action accordingly, Spain is not pursuing selfish ends. We merely wish to promote the good relations between Spain and the Arab world and our concern that other Western countries shall establish and maintain equally strong links with the Arab world. Thus we shall prevent the alien interests I have mentioned from feeling tempted to exploit and take advantage of the tensions created in the region where the Arabs have lived since time immemorial.



81. The word "aggression", has reverberated in this hall like an undying echo of the war in Sinai, in Jordan and in Syria. It will be said, not without good reason, that it is by no means easy to detect and name an aggressor, officially, at any rate, within the legal context of the United Nations. Indeed, so far we have not been able to come to any agreement on delimiting and defining the concept of aggression. Where does aggression begin and end? How does it affect the life of a people? What conditions have to be fulfilled and what precise circumstances have to exist to warrant calling a country an aggressor in accordance with the strict terms of international law? What proof must be produced? The legal system which the United Nations is creating does not at the present stage provide any definite answer to these questions. Rather, it offers many answers which, to date, it has not proved possible to combine in one single decisive answer. I think that in the present case the United Nations might well have decided to initiate a serious investigation. By failing to do so, it has probably made a grave mistake and committed a sin of omission.

82. But irrespective of whether it is easy or difficult officially to define aggression, we can picture the train of events in the Middle East with a high degree of accuracy. We have only to consider the deployment and movement of the combat troops of the attacking army, and the massive surprise bombing technique, to arrive at a strong moral conviction as to who unleashed the hostilities. In any case, what we can be quite sure about is the meaning of the military operations and the acts of conquest. On that point there is no uncertainty whatever.

83. We know that within the United Nations the principle is not admissible that weapons of war may be used in the face of provocation, because if provocation justified acts of war, it would be an easy matter for any country, once it had decided to attack, to find pretexts or invent provocative situations, and it would become pointless and impossible to apply the principle of peaceful settlement of international disputes. Provocation! But perhaps it has slipped from our minds that the life force of modern international law and the Charter of the United Nations itself require that, even in the event of provocation, the party provoked must explore and exhaust all the possibilities for settlement, negotiation, appeals, international hearings and peace before resorting to the use of force? Are not these the ideas, the ideals and the principles which lie at the very heart of the Charter? An army, that of Israel, is occupying the territory of neighbouring peoples. This, at the present moment, is the crux of the matter. The United Nations does not, nor can it, confer legitimacy on the annexation of lands and property as a result of armed action.

84. In this connexion, I should like to recall resolution 378 (V) of 17 November 1950, adopted at the fifth session of the General Assembly. Its title reads: "Duties of States in the event of the outbreak of hostilities"; and operative paragraph 1 (b) provides that any State shall "withdraw all its military forces which have invaded the territory or territorial water of another State or crossed a demarcation

line, either on terms agreed by the parties to the conflict or under conditions to be indicated to the parties by the appropriate organs of the United Nations".

85. Operative paragraph 1 (c) states that "the conduct of the States concerned in relation to the matters covered by the foregoing recommendations [shall] be taken into account in any determination of responsibility for the breach of the peace or act of aggression in the case under consideration and in all other relevant proceedings before the appropriate organs of the United Nations".

86. Thus, quite apart from the spirit and the letter of the Charter, we can find sufficient reason and justification in this resolution for requesting the Security Council to require the immediate withdrawal of the troops in the Middle East which have invaded and are at present occupying the territory of neighbouring States, in order thereby to restore the authority of international law. The annexation of territory by violence, and expansion resulting from armed attack are not acceptable. Once legality is restored in this way, it will be possible to conduct the extremely complex but vital negotiations which will enable the countries concerned to live their lives in dignity under a just peace. For it is difficult to imagine serious negotiations taking place in the Middle East while one of the parties continues its military occupation of the territory of the others. Any agreement reached under those circumstances would be null and void from the outset. Or is the idea that the rule of unconditional surrender should be applied to the Arab peoples? A life in dignity and a just peace must be our aims. To this end, Spain offers its unconditional co-operation, motivated solely by its desire to contribute to the coexistence of peoples and the security of the world.

87. Anyone who has come into contact with these two peoples, the Arabs and the Jews, is aware of the great gulf which separates them. The fact is that ever since the State of Israel was created there has been latent or open war in the Middle East. Taken in conjunction with the displacement of the indigenous inhabitants and, today, the bitterness caused by the tragic war, this makes it clear that any solution to the problem must safeguard the whole region against new conflicts. Consequently, such a solution must inevitably start with the establishment of a demilitarized zone between the two, under United Nations jurisdiction and responsibility.

88. I have kept the question of the Holy Places for the end of my statement. I need not point out the anxiety felt by the Spanish people whenever a threat of destruction or serious damage looms over the holy cities, peoples, houses, gardens or highways which were the setting for the life, passion and death of Christ.

89. The representative of Ecuador appositely recalled in his eloquent speech that on 29 November 1947, in the debate on the future of Palestine, the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II) recommending that Jerusalem be established as a *corpus separatum* under a special international régime. The failure

to implement that resolution is one of the causes of the present situation. The desire of the United Nations was quite clearly expressed on that occasion, but soon other arguments of a quite different kind, calculated to create confusion, crept in. A year later, an attempt was made to replace the "special international régime" with one of international supervision. This change appeared in a draft instrument<sup>8/</sup> prepared by the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Committee in charge of regulating the corpus separatum. The General Assembly voted against the draft and reaffirmed the principles it had approved the year before (see resolution 303 (IV)). The Trusteeship Council was then instructed to draw up a special statute for the city of Jerusalem. From that moment onwards twenty years of oblivion and dust have fallen on this clear-cut decision of the United Nations, as is unfortunately happening to many other resolutions which deserved a better fate.

90. When Jerusalem was partitioned, a demarcation line was drawn. Generally speaking, the old part of the city was kept by the Arabs and the new part came under the power of Israel. Jordan maintained control of the Garden of Olives, the Pretorium, the Via Dolorosa and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre among other Christian treasures. The Moslems held the Great Mosque, and the Israelis the Wailing Wall. Israel kept control of such spiritual treasures as the scene of the Last Supper and the Tomb of King David, to mention only those which sprang to mind as I was preparing my speech.

91. Those who feel as we do on the basis of idealistic concepts and interpretations, that Jerusalem should be internationalized, think in terms of a territory with its own juridical personality—the corpus separatum—under an international régime. We are not thinking merely in terms of protection or a vigilant trusteeship, for even if such an attitude might provide an effective solution for the Holy Places outside Jerusalem, it would be inadequate within the city itself in view of the immense number of Holy Places there and the need for an authority such as would only be conceivable under an international régime.

92. On 5 May 1949 Mr. Abba Eban, in a characteristically brilliant statement to the Ad Hoc Political Committee prior to its submission to the Assembly of the report on the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations, made some interesting remarks to the effect that:

"The Government of Israel recommended that an international régime for Jerusalem be established by the United Nations, concerned exclusively with the supervision and protection of Holy Places, and would co-operate with such a régime.

"It would also agree to placing the Holy Places outside the city under international custody and supported the suggestion that the Holy Places in Palestine should be protected and free access to them assured."<sup>9/</sup>

<sup>8/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, Vol. I, A/973.

<sup>9/</sup> Statement made at the forty-fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, whose official records are published in summary form.

93. In 1967, in the dramatic atmosphere of the events which have brought us to this Assembly, my delegation expresses the fervent wish that all those who, in one way or another, are called upon to play a part in the future régime, in the protection of the Holy Places, and in the free access thereto, will make genuine efforts to ensure that the United Nations decisions of twenty years ago are implemented. I should like again to emphasize the words of Mr. Eban:

"That an international régime for Jerusalem be established by the United Nations".

94. For religious reasons, hundreds of millions of human beings from Europe, Africa, Asia, America and Oceania turn their thoughts towards the skies of the Middle East. For political and military reasons, there is no country which does not constantly keep its eyes turned towards the events in that critical and vital area of the world. Mankind is indebted to it for crucial achievements. Consequently, in a very special way, we are all involved in the misfortunes which are befalling it. Anyone who champions iniquities there is working against peace; anyone who advocates policies of unjust domination, exploitation and humiliation there is only fostering bitterness and war; anyone who disregards the wishes, the needs, the aspirations and the dignity of the peoples there, the age-old claim of that region for its territorial integrity, the honour and pride of the Arab world, or who lets all these factors fall into oblivion, is sowing very grave responsibilities and will reap a harvest of hatred. The United Nations must act as saviour in the Middle East. Let us all strive together to make its mission possible.

95. Mr. HAKIM (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon): The General Assembly is meeting in its fifth emergency special session to consider the grave situation resulting from the Israeli aggression and military occupation of Arab territories in Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic. It is called upon to take historic decisions of the greatest significance to international peace and indeed to the very future of the United Nations itself.

96. The present crisis in the Middle East must be viewed in historical perspective. This latest aggression is the most dangerous and most extensive of a series of aggressions committed by Israel against the Arab States. By acts of force and terrorism in 1948, Israel occupied Arab territories beyond the borders assigned to the Jewish State by the partition plan adopted by the General Assembly in November 1947 [resolution 181 (II)]. Since the General Armistice Agreements of 1949, Israel has launched several large-scale armed attacks on Jordan, Syria, the Gaza Strip and the United Arab Republic. In October 1956 it mounted a large-scale invasion of Egypt and did not withdraw its forces from Sinai and Gaza until it had secured certain advantages from its aggression. Now again it is seeking certain territorial and political gains from a position of military occupation of Arab lands in Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic.

97. All Israeli military actions during the last twenty years fall into a pattern as part of the long-term plan developed by international zionism for

the establishment and consolidation of an expansionist, racist and aggressive Jewish state. The aim of this state is to exercise political and economic domination over the Arab Middle East. It is an ambitious plan, seeking to achieve important strategic, political and economic objectives in our region, a region which contains immense mineral resources and forms the land bridge of the three continents of Africa, Asia and Europe.

98. I understand how many people in Europe and America were moved by a sense of guilt for the sins of anti-Semitism which resulted in the Nazi massacre of the Jews during the Second World War, and have therefore felt an urge to help the Jews achieve security and freedom from fear. But I do not understand why the Arabs should pay for the sins committed by other peoples. I do not understand why the Jews themselves, who had lived for centuries in the Arab countries in freedom and tolerance, should now inflict on the Arabs the same suffering they have themselves experienced in other countries.

99. I would like you to look back briefly over the history of the last fifty years. Fifty years ago, in 1917, the foundations of the Jewish state were laid down in the Balfour Declaration by which the British Government, without having any sovereign rights over the country, promised to help establish a Jewish national home in Palestine. British colonialism had its own strategic, political and economic aims in the Middle East. Zionism had its plan for making "Palestine as Jewish as England was English" and its dream of extending its domain "from the Nile to the Euphrates". The Arab people of Palestine were never consulted and their right of self-determination was ignored. They were eventually to be driven out of their homeland in order to make room for the "ingathering of the Jews in Palestine".

100. During the period of the British Mandate, in spite of the struggle of the Arabs against this unique form of colonialism, Jewish immigration into Palestine provided the basis for the Zionist demand for the creation of a Jewish state. In 1947 the partition of Palestine into a Jewish state and an Arab state was approved by the General Assembly with the support of the great Powers.

101. Reviewing those events of the past fifty years and considering the results of the present Israeli aggression, one can see how methodically and efficiently the Zionist plan has been realized. I shall not go into the history of the Palestine problem, but I should like to give you a few simple facts.

102. In 1917, at the time of the Balfour Declaration, there were only about 56,000 Jews in Palestine, who constituted only 8 per cent of the population, and owned only 3 per cent of the land. In 1947, at the time of the adoption of the partition resolution, there were about 650,000 Jews, who owned only about 6 per cent of the land. Today, twenty years later, there are about 2.5 million Jews.

103. In 1947, the partition plan provided for a Jewish State with an area of about 15,000 square kilometres, giving more than half of the area of Palestine to the Jews, who constituted only one third of the popu-

lation. In 1948 and 1949, Israel took over by force more Arab territories, with an area of over 5,000 square kilometres. Today, after this latest Israeli aggression against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria, Israel occupies Arab territories vastly greater than its own area. These include what was left of Palestine—namely, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank of Jordan, including the Old City of Jerusalem. Israeli leaders have declared that they will not give up these Palestinian territories. They believe they have achieved the complete conquest of Palestine.

104. The creation of the Jewish State by the partition of Palestine was in itself a negation of the right of self-determination of the indigenous Arab majority, in favour of an alien, immigrant minority. But that was not all. The establishment of Israel resulted in the eviction of the Arabs from their own country and their displacement during the last twenty years by over a million Jewish immigrants gathered from the four corners of the earth. A great injustice was thus inflicted on the Arabs of Palestine, who were doomed to live as homeless refugees in misery and degradation.

105. Speaking in the General Assembly in Paris in 1951, His Excellency Mr. Charles Helou, President of the Republic of Lebanon, who was then Minister for Foreign Affairs and Chairman of the Lebanese delegation, said the following:

"...justice, like peace, is indivisible. It would be vain to suppose that an injustice committed anywhere in the world could settle anything or anybody. It would be vain to try to choose between injustice and disorder. Injustice is itself disorder and insecurity. If an injustice is committed, we must realize that all our laws may be disrupted." [345th meeting, para. 148.]

Later in the same session he stated further: "It is necessary to recall that on the issue of our debate depend not only peace and justice in our region but also all the consequences and repercussions which deliberate injustice can have in other parts of the world and the very future of our Organization."<sup>10/</sup>

106. The words of President Helou remain as true today as they were in 1951. Injustice leads to insecurity, and the future of the United Nations is itself endangered.

107. The Arab refugee problem has been before the United Nations for almost twenty years. The solution adopted by the General Assembly in December 1948 [resolution 194 (III)] provided a choice for the refugees either to return to their homes in Palestine or to be compensated for the properties they left behind. Israel defied the will of the international community and refused to implement this equitable solution of the problem, in spite of repeated General Assembly resolutions reaffirming it. More than a million Arab refugees were doomed to live for twenty years on international charity, in conditions of misery and despair. The United Nations and, in particular, the great Powers, which bear special responsibility for

<sup>10/</sup> This statement was made at the 33rd meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

the creation of Israel, have done nothing to force Israel to give the refugees the choice of returning to their homes in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly designed to deal with this humanitarian and political problem. This latest Israeli aggression and occupation of Arab territories has aggravated the plight of the refugees and added to their numbers. For the second time in less than twenty years, Arabs are being evicted from their homes and forced out of their country.

108. I have heard representatives of the Western Powers speak of the need for finding a just solution to the problem of the Arab refugees. They have not said what kind of solution they have in mind. I should like to remind them that there is already on the books of the United Nations a just solution to the problem, giving the refugees the choice of either returning to their homes in Palestine or receiving compensation for their lost property. This solution has been annually reaffirmed since 1948.

109. Many speakers before me have reviewed the events that led up to the present crisis. During the last several months, Israel launched large-scale armed attacks on Syria and Jordan. Early in May, Israeli leaders publicly threatened to invade Syria, occupy Damascus and overthrow the Syrian régime. In order to ensure their mutual defence, the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan were obliged to adopt certain measures. The United Arab Republic requested the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, and the Secretary-General decided to comply with that request. He has made the reasons for that decision perfectly clear. We fully understand those reasons and, together with the majority of Member States, we give him our full support. We have confidence in the Secretary-General's impartiality and good judgement.

110. While the Security Council was engaged in dealing with the new situation, and international diplomacy was trying to find a solution to the problem of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel struck its massive blow. It launched a treacherous surprise attack on the United Arab Republic. The facts are now clear. Israel's aggression was premeditated. It is the result of long and careful planning directed towards the realization of Israel's strategic, political and economic objectives in the region. Israel's actions are sufficient proof of this. They speak louder than words.

111. Today, Israel annexed the Old City of Jerusalem, thus defying the international community and, in particular, the Christian and Moslem nations.

112. The basic principles and provisions of the Charter are clear. Israel has violated them and refuses to fulfil its obligations as a Member State. The Israeli Foreign Minister has already hurled his defiance at the United Nations by declaring that even if the General Assembly were to vote by 121 to 1 in favour of withdrawal to the armistice lines, Israel would refuse to comply. The Assembly must not be intimidated and must face this unprecedented challenge to its authority. Aggression and the use of force are prohibited by the Charter and must be condemned. Israel, the aggressor, must be called

upon immediately and unconditionally to withdraw from the territories it has occupied. It must not be permitted to achieve any territorial aggrandizement. It must not be allowed to profit from its aggression. Nor must it be allowed to use the territories it has occupied as a means of imposing its conditions for a settlement. To permit the aggressor to dictate his terms is to deny the fundamental principles and purposes of the United Nations.

113. In the early part of my statement I asked you to look back over the history of the last fifty years. I would now request you to look forward to the next fifty years. It took international Zionism fifty years to implant the State of Israel in the Arab world by the use of force and with Western support and help. This undertaking was begun under colonialism and was continued during a period of Arab weakness. But the Arab world will develop rapidly in the next fifty years on the basis of its rich human and natural resources. It will grow in population, in economic power and in unity of purpose.

114. How can Israel survive against the undying hatred and enmity of the peoples of the Arab world, in which it has implanted itself by force and terror? How can a small, aggressive, expansionist, racist State, even with all the foreign support it can get, confront and defy a hostile Arab world which will have no choice but to unite against this new kind of conquest? It is by now evident that on the question of Palestine and their confrontation with Israel all Arabs are united.

115. I would like to repeat to the General Assembly what I said in the Security Council four weeks ago:

"The Arab peoples are united and determined to put a stop to Israeli aggression. Let no one make the mistake of doubting this Arab unity and determination. Whatever the suffering and the sacrifices, the Arab peoples will defend their independence, their sovereignty and their national security."<sup>11/</sup>

116. As a representative of Lebanon, I feel I am entitled to draw attention to the growing misunderstanding and mistrust between the Arab world and the Western world. The Arab peoples feel that they have very few Western friends—whose friendship, of course, they value greatly. I personally regret this lack of friendship, and I believe there is a crying need for a better understanding by the Western Powers of the yearning of the Arabs for justice. The Western countries have important economic and cultural interests in the Arab world. They should follow a policy of co-operation with it instead of hostility towards it, and show understanding and respect for the rights and aspirations of the Arab peoples.

117. But today the Arabs are appealing to the United Nations for justice. They are not only asking for friendship and understanding. They are asking for honest and strict application of the Charter. They are asking for loyalty to the principles and purposes of the United Nations. They are asking for the rule of law instead of the law of the jungle.

<sup>11/</sup> See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1344th meeting.

118. Lebanon is a small country which, like other small countries, needs the United Nations as an instrument for international peace and security. We are faithful to the Charter and its principles and have always sought, together with other nations in the Third World, to strengthen the United Nations so as to enable it to fulfil its responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and the promotion of economic and social world development. But we must warn the Member States that if our Organization failed to shoulder its responsibilities and betrayed its own principles, it would doom itself to impotence and eventual disintegration. It would go the way of the League of Nations. Member States would then have to make their own arrangements to defend their security, their territorial integrity and their national independence. The peoples of the world would despair of international co-operation and collective security through the United Nations. What a tragedy that would

be for mankind in an age when it is confronted with the terrible dangers of nuclear war.

119. The failure of our Organization would drive the world down the road of increasing tension, instability and international conflict. Local and regional wars could escalate into more general war and nuclear conflagration. The fate of mankind depends on the survival of the United Nations as an effective instrument of peace based on justice.

120. The General Assembly stands today at the cross-roads of history. It has a choice between the road to peace and the road to war. The Charter demands that it should fulfil its responsibilities and choose the road to world peace and progress. It must not fail in its task.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*