

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**1888th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 28 October 1970,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

Agenda item 22:

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)..... 1

**President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).**

**AGENDA ITEM 22**

**The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)**

1. Mr. ZEMLA (Czechoslovakia): We welcome the fact that the General Assembly in plenary meeting has begun a substantive discussion of the current developments in the Middle East, which are rightly a cause of grave concern. During the commemorative twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly [1881st meeting] my delegation, in the intervention of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Marko, pointed out that, apart from certain favourable elements which have been gaining ground in the present international situation, there is still concern over the smouldering hotbeds of war in various parts of the world. In addition to the United States aggression in Indo-China there is, in the first place, the Middle East crisis, in which, moreover, there have recently been some alarming moments. As has been confirmed by the course of the discussion of the problem, this attitude is shared also by other delegations in this hall.

2. Recent developments have seriously endangered the prospects of obtaining progress in resolving the crisis brought about by the Israeli aggression. They occurred shortly after hopes for a wider political settlement appeared as a result of the reaching of the agreement on a cease-fire in August this year.

3. There is another reason for the holding of a General Assembly debate on the question of finding a just political solution of the consequences of the Israeli aggression. In the general debate we repeatedly heard statements to the effect that the United Nations should intensify its active share in the strengthening of international peace and security. It is precisely in regard to the question now under our consideration that the United Nations has a chance to show that it has both the intention and the means to live up to its role. That is all the more possible since in the past the United Nations has become actively involved in the right direction in this matter. An evident example thereof, among others, is Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

4. Peace in the world is indivisible. The Czechoslovak people, therefore, cannot be indifferent to the developments in the Middle East. It is sincerely and profoundly interested in an early elimination of that dangerous hotbed of war so that it will not create further complications in the general international situation. Moreover, our people is linked to the people of the Arab countries by long-lasting and traditional bonds of friendship and co-operation. That is why we feel in duty bound to express the position of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic concerning the situation and welcome the fact that the debate in the General Assembly in plenary meeting is offering us such a possibility and opportunity.

5. Several weeks ago we all, obviously, still proceeded from the assumption that, in consequence of the well-known developments, there was a certain hope that the possibilities of a political solution in regard to the situation in the Middle East were opening up.

6. What is the reason for such a sudden and substantive change for the worse? The answer to that question is unequivocal. The prospects of a political settlement of the Middle East crisis have been endangered by the obstructive position of Israel, which rejects co-operation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Jarring. Israel is hindering the resumption of the activities of Mr. Jarring's mission, the main objective of which is the political solution of the conflict through implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

7. For obvious reasons, Israel could not have afforded to reject openly the appeal to start negotiations. In order to deceive the world public, particularly after the Arab States had expressed their readiness to negotiate, Israel had to invent a pretext for its obstructive attitude. This time Israel made use of accusations concerning an alleged violation of the cease-fire on the part of the United Arab Republic. Such hypocrisy on the part of Israel is remarkable. The State that unleashed the aggression as a consequence of which it still occupies vast Arab territories, the State that itself has many times violated the cease-fire since its declaration, now tries to divert attention and to shift the responsibility on to the victim of its crimes. The Israeli manoeuvre is too transparent to be accepted by the world public and our Organization. After all, the representative of the United Arab Republic has convincingly refuted the unjustified Israeli fabrications.

8. What is the motive for this aggressive and arrogant position assumed by Israel? It is trying to gain time, to consolidate its territorial gains and to prepare for further aggressive acts. It is not so difficult, either, to discern what is behind Israel's attempts to sabotage effective talks by underscoring the requirement of direct negotiations between the two parties. How can you conduct direct negotiations between an aggressor and its victim when the aggressor, which still continues to occupy the Arab territories, tries to act from a position of strength? No such way can lead to a positive result.

9. Since the signing of the cease-fire in 1967 Israel has repeatedly violated it by aggressive and terroristic actions against the people of the Arab countries, particularly the people of the United Arab Republic. Israeli aircraft and guns have spread death daily among the innocent civil population, even killing children, and ruthlessly and wantonly destroyed Arab towns, villages, communications and industrial enterprises. When the other party—the victim of aggression—protects itself by the effective means of anti-aircraft defence accessible to it, namely, missiles, against those piratic air raids of the Israeli planes, it is a sin and, at the same time, a pretext for rejecting Security Council resolutions and for sabotaging the activities of Ambassador Jarring's mission.

10. In the occupied Arab territories, from which it is expelling the Arab population, Israel is, at the same time, building vast military and other installations to serve as a base for the consolidation of its territorial gains and for further expansion. Furthermore, Israel has continued its provocative and aggressive actions against its Arab neighbours, for which it has again and again been denounced in Security Council resolutions. The number of resolutions adopted by United Nations organs and sabotaged by Israel has thus been constantly increasing.

11. Israel's present position is both dangerous and short-sighted. It is similarly dangerous and short-sighted to allow these aggressive and obstructionist Israeli policies to continue to receive open support from the United States and some other Western Powers. No one has any doubt that without their support Israel could not pursue its policy of aggression and arrogance. The policy of the United States in the Middle East is, with all due respect, incomprehensible. On the one hand, we have heard declarations that the United States takes a sincere interest in the political solution of the Middle East crisis; on the other hand, we have witnessed actual deeds.

12. If it were not for the fact that the United States supports the most reactionary group of the Israeli ruling circles, that country could hardly afford to throw down the gauntlet repeatedly at world public opinion by its refusal to start talks. One of the recent manifestations of such assistance on the part of the United States of America was the latest announcement concerning further deliveries of United States military equipment to Israel. It is paradoxical that the most sophisticated types of United States tanks, aircraft, guns, carriers

and other military equipment will be delivered as a part of the \$450 million credit to Israel, that is, to the aggressor, under the pretext of maintaining the "military balance" in the Middle East; a remarkable contribution, indeed, to the efforts aimed at a peaceful solution to the conflict.

13. The provocative course of action taken by Israel creates grave concern not only among the public in the Arab countries but also throughout the world. The general debate in the Assembly and also the present deliberations very clearly prove that.

14. I have already mentioned the short-sightedness of the Israeli policies. After all, is it not Israel's vital interest to strive for a peaceful settlement of the situation in the region in which it lives?

15. The arrogant attitude of the Israeli ruling circles further intensifies the resistance of the world public to this policy. The artificially created image of a small, peace-loving country menaced from all sides by hostile neighbours is disappearing like a castle in the air. Both the history and the present policies of Israel, denounced by numerous decisions and resolutions of United Nations organs, convincingly reveal the true face of Israeli policy and who is the aggressor and who its victim.

16. The Czechoslovak delegation does not consider the purpose of the debate in plenary on the Middle East crisis at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly as being merely the identification of the party guilty of creating the situation that has arisen; we should, in the first place, find or help to find a way of eliminating the dangerous hotbed of war in that region.

17. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) points out the road towards a solution. The General Assembly should chiefly seek a way to achieve its immediate and early implementation. The above-mentioned Security Council resolution, quoted probably by all representatives of Member States during the general debate, proceeds from the presumption that the Middle East conflict may be definitively solved only by political means, while ensuring the rights of all countries in that region, including Israel and the Palestinian people. A complete withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the occupied Arab territories remains an essential requirement. Nothing has to be changed in the contents of the Security Council resolution. There can be no doubt that consultations of the Big Four may also play a positive role in the efforts to begin negotiations on the political solution of the crisis.

18. We identify ourselves with the view expressed here by many delegations that the primary task is to create conditions for an expeditious resumption of Ambassador Jarring's mission and thereby to bring about the opening of indirect negotiations between the Arab countries and Israel. The Arab countries have several times expressed their complete readiness to start negotiations through Ambassador Jarring's mission. Now it is Israel's turn.

19. In this context, the Czechoslovak delegation considers it also necessary to recall Article 25 of the United Nations Charter which binds States Members of the United Nations to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. Israel's behaviour, long maintained in the past, with regard to resolutions of United Nations organs is to be condemned. It shows what a cavalier attitude Israel takes towards our Organization.

20. How long is the world to be exposed to a potential catastrophe because of the selfish interests of the ruling circles of Israel? Is it not high time to put an end to Israel's mockery of the efforts of the United Nations to make peace? We cannot but agree with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Riad, who, at the beginning of his statement on Monday, 26 October noted: "Throughout its history, the United Nations has never faced a more serious challenge to the most sacred principles of the Charter, nor a graver threat to peace, than it does today" [1884th meeting, para. 1].

21. The position with regard to the solution of the Middle East crisis, which I express here on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, is not a new one. On many an occasion, the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic underscored the solidarity of the Czech and Slovak nations with the just cause of the Arab peoples and the people of Palestine in the struggle for the liberation of its country and with the requirement of a full withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories. In the same way, the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has constantly reaffirmed its support of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which we continue to consider as the best possible starting point.

22. Our delegation believes that by virtue of joint efforts our plenary session can achieve positive results and help the Security Council in its task of ensuring a peaceful solution of the situation in the Middle East in accordance with the provisions of its own resolution.

23. Mr. EBAN (Israel): On 7 August the Middle East seemed to be moving towards a new opportunity. The cease-fire unilaterally denounced by the United Arab Republic on 29 March 1969 had been renewed. For the first time in many months the guns were silent. Israel, the United Arab Republic and Jordan had decided to appoint representatives for discussions under the auspices of Ambassador Jarring. They had declared that the purpose of their talks was to be the establishment of a just and lasting peace between them. They had confirmed their adherence to the text of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The United Arab Republic and Israel had committed themselves to a detailed formula for a standstill so that the limited cease-fire could not be used to secure a military advantage in preparation for a new phase of war.

24. Now, Egypt's acceptance of the standstill provision more than anything else decided Israel's affirmative response to the United States initiative. It ensured that the cease-fire would not endanger the security

of our forces at the cease-fire line and therefore the security of our nation. It also gave reason to hope that the United Arab Republic might be ready for an authentic peace and not merely for a manoeuvre in preparation for the next stage of conflict. We had no illusion on 7 August that our road would be easy or short. The Arab-Israel conflict has deep, tangled roots in the memory and consciousness of both peoples. But once on the road of honourable dialogue we might celebrate a new atmosphere in Arab-Israel relations.

25. So the cease-fire, the standstill, the agreed auspices and the common documentary framework all came together to kindle a new hope. When we ask why this prospect has been darkened we come back inescapably to two acts of policy by the United Arab Republic. First, the cease-fire standstill agreement was violated—massively violated—through the construction and forward movement of a great missile system. The result was that the equilibrium of the 7 August agreement was broken. Israel's acceptance of the cease-fire standstill had been perfidiously exploited and confidence in the validity of Egyptian commitments was undermined.

26. More recently the United Arab Republic has carried its negative actions into the political field. Instead of taking the steps necessary to permit discussions under Ambassador Jarring's auspices, it has insisted on launching an international campaign of invective. This is the diplomatic equivalent of the missile build-up. Both on the ground and in the diplomatic domain the effect of recent Egyptian actions has been to wreck agreements, not to build understanding, to prevent the peace dialogue, not to facilitate it.

27. Mr. Riad's opening speech on 26 October [1884th meeting] hangs in the air of this Assembly like a heavy cloud. It has created an atmosphere in which it is hard for peace to breathe. We can read that speech through and through, up and down, without finding any sign of elevation, truthful understanding or peaceful intent. Rancour and hostility flow from every line. The quality of Mr. Riad's statement can be measured by the opening sentence, in which he refers to what he calls the Israeli aggression of 5 June 1967.

28. Now, this is the very heart of the Middle Eastern crisis today. Everything depends on how we define and explore the meaning of June 1967. Israel still lives with the intense memory of those events. They give shape and colour to our experience, our emotion and our policy. Israeli aggression indeed! Not since the downfall of Hitler has a State been more exclusively responsible for an unprovoked design of assault and massacre than was Egypt in its aggressive threat to Israel in the summer of 1967. All the main definitions of aggression in all the textbooks are represented in the Egyptian policy of those days: blockade, encirclement, intimidating troop concentrations, direct threats of destruction, the declaration of a juridical state of active war and the organization of armed expeditions against a neighbouring State—all these were combined in that single dramatic adventure.

29. What effrontery it is for Mr. Riad to come here and speak of Israeli aggression in June 1967! Does he think that we have forgotten the horror that gripped all civilized men when his Government violently disrupted the regional structure three and a half years ago and told the Security Council to mind its own business while Egypt tried to strangle Israel to death? Does he think that we have forgotten how Israel was brought face to face with the most awful danger that can ever face a man, his home, his family, his country and his nation's destiny? Has anyone here forgotten the exaltation of enlightened mankind when Israel tore the murderous fingers from its throat? The United Arab Republic comes here not as the victim of that aggression but as its unrepentant author. So Israel refuses to hear Mr. Riad's abuse in any attitude of apology or defence. Indeed, the central theme of our policy today is our tenacious resolve to avoid such perils as those from which we so narrowly escaped no more than 40 months ago.

30. Every Israeli with the memories of 1967 behind him knows well that if we were to fall into military inferiority everything that we have built, revered and cherished would be extinguished. The irony of describing Israel's refusal to perish in 1967 as aggression has degraded the international debate ever since the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic brought that phrase here in June 1967.

31. Despite their enormous numerical advantage in international bodies, the Arab and Soviet Governments failed in all their efforts to win endorsement of that wicked charge. On 7 June 1967 the Soviet Union in the Security Council proposed a resolution that spoke of Israel's aggressive activities. The resolution was properly and emphatically defeated. On 19 June 1967 the Soviet Union proposed a resolution asking the General Assembly vigorously to condemn Israel's aggressive activities. That resolution was defeated by vote on 3 July. On the same day a resolution sponsored by Yugoslavia and other States, calling on Israel to withdraw all its forces to the position it held prior to 5 June 1967, was defeated. Amendments proposed by Cuba and Albania repeating the myth of Israeli aggression were defeated.

32. Yet here comes Mr. Riad, with the guilt of June 1967 heavy on his country's hands, repeating this myth of Israeli aggression, in tedious and tasteless repetition. Everyone who talks of Israeli aggression in June 1967 commits a juridical falsehood, a moral outrage and an historical distortion.

33. The offence done by Egypt to Israel and to world peace does not begin or end with June 1967. Mr. Riad's history is intolerably selective. Nobody who heard his narrative would imagine from his words that Egypt had sought to destroy Israel by armed aggression in 1948; had made a mockery of the Armistice Agreement by maintaining a blockade against Israel in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Eilat for 19 years; had kept Gaza under its military conquest for nearly two decades, while cruelly preventing any integration or resettlement of its refugee population; had conceived

and organized the terrorist infiltrations against Israeli homes and lives as early as 1955 and 1956; had made its capital the world centre for anti-Semitic, racist literature and propaganda; had proclaimed, organized and launched what President Nasser called "a war for Israel's destruction" in the summer of 1967; had conducted wars and pressure campaigns to ensure Cairo's dominance over other Middle Eastern States; had formulated the Khartoum Declaration of September 1967: no peace with Israel, no recognition of Israel, no agreement with Israel; had denounced the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council in March 1969; and was now keeping the area in tension by refusing to correct its violation of an agreement by which it is solemnly bound.

34. A Government which has this kind of record in policy and in action is not entitled to the self-righteous posture which Mr. Riad assumed here on 26 October. He would do better to change his country's future policy towards Israel than to give us a surrealistic picture of the past. The second quarter-century of United Nations history would have a more promising beginning if Mr. Riad would use this Organization as an instrument for solving conflicts, not as an arena for waging them.

35. The hope that we might turn from recrimination about the past to the building of a new Middle Eastern future moved the Israeli Government to give a new expression of its policy on 4 August 1970. Despite our strong conviction that there is no effective substitute for direct contact, we accepted a negotiating procedure, under Ambassador Jarring's auspices, that would be indirect in its first phase. Despite objections of principle and well-founded military doubts, we acquiesced in a cease-fire of limited duration. The cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council of June 1967, which we support, have no time-limit and no extraneous conditions. We stated with the utmost clarity our readiness to accept and to seek agreement on the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts. In order to make clear that our objective in the territorial negotiations is not arbitrary expansion but legitimate security, we stated our willingness to withdraw Israeli forces, on the establishment of peace, to agreed, recognized and secure boundaries, to be determined in the peace negotiations. That policy was conveyed to Ambassador Jarring on 6 August in the form of an affirmative response to the United States peace initiative. At the heart and centre of that initiative was the cease-fire standstill agreement accepted by Egypt and endorsed by the Soviet Union. Under that agreement the parties undertook to refrain from changing the *status quo* within a zone extending 50 kilometres to the east and west of the cease-fire line and, specifically, to do nothing but maintain installations at their present sites and positions. They agreed not to introduce, move forward, construct or otherwise install missiles in this zone. They agreed not to construct any concrete structures for the emplacement of missiles. They agreed not to carry out any work for the establishment of any new sites for missiles.

36. Contrary to those precise undertakings, Egypt has established between 500 and 600 operational Sam-2

and SAM-3 missiles in the standstill zone. When the agreement came into force on 7 August, there were 17 SAM-2 missile batteries within the standstill area, of which only one was situated within 30 kilometres of the Canal; on 14 October, there were about 40 to 50 missile batteries within the 50-kilometre perimeter, out of which 30 to 40 were within 30 kilometres of the cease-fire line. Thus, in the 30-kilometre area, the number of missile batteries has grown from one to between 30 and 40. A third of the missiles in the standstill zone are SAM-3, manned exclusively by Soviet personnel. The Soviet military personnel in the standstill zone, including advisers, is estimated at 3,000 men. The missile system established in violation of the standstill provisions is one of the most advanced in the world.

37. It would be irresponsible to expect Israel to ignore this violation or to acquiesce in it. First of all, the military implications are important. The missile range covers an area of up to 15 kilometres within the Israeli side of the cease-fire line. Their obvious purpose is to prepare for the resumption of war, not for the attainment of peace. This is demonstrated by the fact that Egypt has simultaneously violated the agreement by moving into the standstill zone new and heavy artillery batteries and engineering equipment to build bridges, amphibious craft and rafts.

38. Now, these are violations of the agreement of 7 August. These are not defensive measures in their purpose, but offensive preparations designed to change the cease-fire lines not by peace negotiations but by renewed war. Egypt seeks immunity from Israeli air reaction so that its artillery may resume its bombardment of Israeli positions and so that Egyptian forces may try to cross the Canal. It is proposed that Egypt and Israel conduct the Jarring talks under this threat, instead of under the agreed conditions accepted by both Governments on 7 August.

39. The violation of these agreements goes forward from day to day. The United Arab Republic has refused even to address itself to requests for rectification; it declines to restore the position which should lawfully prevail. Cairo has preferred the illicit presence of its new missiles to the prompt renewal of the Jarring talks, for it knows that it cannot reasonably or realistically have both. What is more extraordinary is that it now requests the General Assembly, in effect, to approve, to endorse, the violation of its agreement, of its signature and of its contractual obligation.

40. The validity to be attached to Egypt's engagements transcends every other question in this dispute. It is certainly the central issue in Israel's mind. How can a new agreement be negotiated while an existing agreement is torn up under our eyes? If a peace agreement were reached under Ambassador Jarring's auspices, or in any other way, Israel would give up something concrete and tangible; Israel would withdraw to agreed peace boundaries which have not yet been determined. Egypt, in return, would at best give up something intangible, easily revoked, namely, an undertaking—an undertaking to abandon the fallacy of Israel's non-existence and to live with Israel in peace and mutual recognition.

41. The question is what confidence we could place in such an undertaking, even if it were given. This is the psychological effect, the political effect, of the violation.

42. By far the most urgent business before us is to restore the confidence necessary for a peace dialogue to take place.

43. The General Assembly, in Israel's view, should approach this debate with a sharp perception of dangers to be avoided and of opportunities to be seized. If it were to act in the spirit of Mr. Riad's speech it would injure the serious potentialities of conciliation which still exist. For not everything is dark, and there is still much to lose. For one thing, the cease-fire is still in force, Israel is ready to prolong it. And nobody seriously believes that the United Arab Republic would bring upon itself the immense suffering which would ensue from a rash decision to renew hostilities after 5 November. But the cease-fire, although of primary concern, is not the only gain achieved through the acceptance of the United States peace initiative in the summer of this year.

44. For the first time in over 20 years Egypt, Israel and Jordan have given their consent to the same formulation of principles, namely, to those set out in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). For the first time they have given their consent to an agreed procedure of discussion, namely, under the auspices of Ambassador Jarring, in pursuance of his mandate under that resolution. Even with those gains the outlook for peace is admittedly complex and uncertain; but if they were to be annulled the clock would be set back towards something very close to despair. The General Assembly should vigorously refuse to destroy the existing consensus on Security Council resolution 242 (1967) by giving a new formulation, or balance, or emphasis, or by any technique of selective quotation.

45. The Charter is alive to the dangers of confused jurisdiction. Article 12 stipulates that:

“While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.”

The same Article goes on to provide that:

“The Secretary-General . . . shall notify the General Assembly . . . of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council . . . .”

46. The Security Council is exercising its function in respect of this situation. It met only a few days ago and decided [*1555th meeting*] to reaffirm and not to change resolution 242 (1967) or to give it a particular interpretation. The Secretary-General has formally notified the General Assembly that this question is

under current examination by the Security Council. It is thus absolutely certain that any recommendation by the General Assembly which implied a change in the balance of the Security Council's resolution would be offensive to the Charter, which we have all signed.

47. But beyond the formal aspect of this question lies the broader issue of peace and security. It took more than two years of persistent effort to bring Egypt, Israel and Jordan—despite their reservations, despite their contradictory interpretations—to the acceptance of a single formula and an agreed procedure of discussion. The text of the Security Council resolution is so finely balanced that a single word added or subtracted, a single phrase or principle affirmed outside its context, a single selective or exclusive quotation would undermine the agreement so arduously achieved.

48. Israel was able to confirm its adherence to the resolution in the terms of our statement to Ambassador Jarring on 6 August because, despite its imperfections, it placed the main emphasis on the need to establish a just and lasting peace. It did not call for withdrawal ahead of the establishment of peace; it did not equate the previous armistice lines with secure and recognized boundaries; it left the precise definition of the secure and agreed boundaries open for discussion, for negotiation, for agreement.

49. In his speech of 26 October, Mr. Riad does not mention the Security Council resolution once without distortion. For example, he gives the false impression that United Nations organs have voted for a mandatory restoration of the 4 June 1967 lines, when in fact they have rejected many such resolutions—four or five times at least. Of even greater significance is the fact that Mr. Riad misquotes the resolution directly. In his words: "It called upon Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories and for the termination of the state of belligerency." Of course the Security Council resolution called for nothing of the kind. It called not for the mere termination of a state of belligerency, but for the establishment of a just and permanent peace between Egypt and Israel and between Jordan and Israel, and the mutual acceptance of all the obligations which sovereign States at peace owe to each other. It did not call upon Israel to withdraw from "the" occupied territories. The omission of the definite article was made after days of debate and with absolute deliberation, for the specific purpose of keeping the final boundary delimitation open for negotiation and agreement.

50. The term "secure and recognized boundaries" was first introduced into United Nations jurisprudence in November 1967 in resolutions drafted originally by the United States and later by the United Kingdom. The latter resolution was accepted. Israel was able to accept the Jarring mission on the basis of the resolution, in the light of public and private explanations received from sponsoring Governments.

51. On 15 November 1967 the United States representative stated in the Security Council:

"Historically there have never been secure or recognized boundaries in the area. Neither the armistice lines of 1949 nor the cease-fire lines of 1967 have answered that description. . . . such boundaries have yet to be agreed upon. An agreement on that point is an absolute essential to a just and lasting peace just as withdrawal is . . . history shows that imposed boundaries are not secure and that secure boundaries must be mutually worked out and recognized by the parties themselves as part of the peace-making process."<sup>1</sup>

52. Since the formulation in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) was proposed by the United Kingdom, particular interest attaches to the following statement by the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Michael Stewart, who said:

"As I have explained before, there is reference in the vital United Nations Security Council resolution both to withdrawal from territories and to secure and recognized boundaries. As I have told the House previously, we believe that these two things should be read concurrently and that the omission of the word 'all' before the word 'territories' is deliberate."

53. So the plain fact is that the Security Council resolution, within the framework of the principles that it lays down, does make provision for an agreed boundary settlement, just as it requires the parties to promote agreement on the other principles to which it refers. This position is in full conformity with international law and precedent. Wars are followed by peace in which the territorial and security structure is adapted to the specific aim of avoiding the outbreak of future wars and of ensuring a more stable security than before.

54. The Security Council doubtless had this experience in mind, as well as the more particular fact that the Arab-Israel region had never known permanent, agreed and recognized boundaries. It has known only temporary truce lines, armistice lines, cease-fire lines. The time had clearly come for secure and recognized boundaries, not to be unilaterally dictated either by the Arab States or by Israel, but to be agreed upon between them as part of the peace-making process.

55. The same thought was conveyed in article 5 of the previous Armistice Agreement in 1949<sup>2</sup> between Israel and Egypt which stated:

"The Armistice Demarcation Line is not to be construed in any sense as a political or territorial boundary, and is delineated without prejudice to rights, claims and positions of either Party to the Armistice as regards ultimate settlement . . . ."

56. Israel is thus acting within her international rights by insisting that such flexibility as Security Council resolution 242 (1967) allows and implies on this and other matters should not be eroded, otherwise the understanding on which Israel's acquiescence in that

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1377th meeting, para. 65.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid., Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 3.*

resolution was secured would have to be set aside and our communication of acceptance on 6 August would no longer apply.

57. We do not suggest that the General Assembly, by insertion, omission or selective quotation, do anything to weaken any of the principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) that are of particular interest to the Arab States which have adhered to it. Similarly, the Security Council had good reason for not committing to paper the detailed attitude of Middle Eastern States concerning the future of the Palestinian Arabs. The truth is that their future, like that of all the other peoples in the Middle East, depends on peace.

58. Let us not forget that 99 per cent of the Arab nation in the world has achieved its self-determination in 14 sovereign Arab States, in an area of 11 million square kilometres. Few peoples in history have ever attained such a high proportion of their total ambition. What is at stake is not the self-determination of any part of the Arab nation, since Arab self-determination is lavishly, legitimately and irrevocably assured. What is at issue is a deliberate attempt to deny national self-determination in its sovereign State to the oldest of all nations, to the only nations which stands or falls in history by the way in which this conflict is resolved. Israel's secure existence is the overriding moral imperative in this dispute.

59. In conditions of peace Israel's eastern neighbour would be an Arab State, a majority of whose population would be composed of Palestinian Arabs, and the majority of all the Palestinian Arabs would be citizens of that State. This has been true all these 22 years of Jordan, whose structure, name, leadership and régime were determined by Arab and not by Israeli decisions.

60. Our position, which is indeed the international position, is that the area of the original League of Nations Palestine Mandate on both sides of the Jordan contained two nations, neither of which has a monopoly in the right of self-determination. Accordingly, the original Palestine area on both sides of the Jordan must, under any peace settlement, accommodate two States, the State of Israel within the secure, recognized and agreed boundaries to be determined in the peace negotiation, and an Arab State which, whatever its structure and name, would in fact be predominantly composed of Palestinian Arabs.

61. There has been, there will always be, a sizable Palestine Arab community in Israel, but even this will have no negative significance if close co-operation across an open frontier exists between Israel and its eastern neighbour, if we create a community pattern of mutual accessibility. In short, there are no solutions without peace, just as there are no problems which peace cannot resolve.

62. I have said that the General Assembly should avoid intervention by addition to, subtraction from, specific emphasis on or selective quotation from, Security Council resolution 242 (1967). I would like

to point out two other dangers which should be avoided. Surely the General Assembly will do nothing which would indicate acquiescence in the violation of agreements?

63. Now the question whether international agreements have been negotiated within or outside the United Nations framework has no effect at all on the United Nations responsibility for supporting their faithful implementation. It is only when men and nations become capable of reaching binding agreements with each other that they pass from individual anarchy into a world of social and international stability. Most of the contracts and accords which hold the fabric of world peace together have been worked out outside the United Nations framework. This does not mean that the United Nations owes them any thing less than perfect respect, or is entitled to be neutral between their observance and their violation. Our Charter calls for respect for treaties and other sources of international law, and the basis of all international law is the validity of all engagements and contracts which sovereign States voluntarily undertake towards each other. Though negotiated outside the United Nations, the United States peace initiative, of which the cease-fire standstill agreement is an integral part, has been incorporated into the United Nations peace-making efforts and recorded, of course, in United Nations documents. The Secretary-General's report of 7 August 1970 to the Security Council,<sup>3</sup> specifically refers to this initiative as the basis on which Ambassador Jarring, with the agreement of the parties, would resume his mission. The cease-fire standstill agreement of 7 August is an international document of primary importance. On the military side, it creates conditions in which a cease-fire can be maintained without any party to it suffering disadvantage. In its political aspects, it is a crucial test of goodwill and pacific intention. Juridically and psychologically, the restoration of the conditions under which it was signed is indispensable for the opening of the peace dialogue. Israel wants this dialogue to take place. There is no other obstacle to the resumption of Ambassador Jarring's mission except Egypt's refusal to cancel its violations of the cease-fire standstill agreement by restoring the position that existed on 7 August, and this obstacle exists only between Israel and the United Arab Republic.

64. In logic and objectivity, the General Assembly should criticize the violation of this agreement. It is anyway of vital importance that it should make an affirmative statement for the maintenance by the parties of what they have agreed. If it refuses to overthrow the delicate balance in the Security Council's resolution, and stands firm and explicit in defence of the integrity of agreements, the General Assembly can, by an act of prudence, avoid another pitfall. It should not support in its resolution any invective or unilateral denunciation. The quality of the Security Council's resolution which made it a document of international importance was its objectivity. It laid down principles without seeking to criticize any of the parties at issue. They were and are quite capable of criticizing each other.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1970, document S/9902.

65. A similar example of thoughtful and responsible international action is the resolution adopted recently at The Hague by the Inter-Parliamentary Union. That is a body which, unlike another body whose resolution has been quoted, included both Arab and Israeli representatives, indeed, representatives from all régimes and all continents. That resolution of the Inter-Parliamentary Union reads in part:

“Affirms its support for the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East pursuant to Security Council resolution 242;

“Urges all parties concerned in this conflict to take all steps required to reduce tensions in the Middle East, and to create the circumstances and the conditions which would permit the resumption as soon as possible of the talks under the auspices of the representative of the United Nations, Mr. Gunnar Jarring;

“Calls on the parties concerned to carry out in good faith all cease-fire standstill agreements that they have accepted so as to enable Ambassador Gunnar Jarring to fulfil his mission.”

66. Israel comes to this discussion with a perfect sense of rectitude. If the General Assembly were to adopt the acrimonious ideas to which Mr. Riad gave expression, it would gravely prejudice the prospects of peace. These then are the three dangers to be avoided. We urge the General Assembly, not in Israel's interests alone, but for the sake of the wider human cause, not to change the Security Council resolution or to pre-empt those matters in it which are deliberately left open for the discussion and agreement of the parties. We urge you not to give any support to the idea that the General Assembly is indifferent to whether valid international agreements are honoured or violated, and we urge the General Assembly not to burden the Middle Eastern atmosphere with hostile attitudes towards any of the legitimate positions of the parties at issue.

67. The positive choices available to the General Assembly are evident from an analysis of the dangers which face it. First, there is a legitimate and urgent international interest in the continued respect of the cease-fire recommended by the Security Council in June 1967 and embodied by the parties in the cease-fire standstill agreement of August 1970. Second, it would be appropriate for the General Assembly to call for the restoration of the 7 August situation in order that the Jarring mission can go forward promptly in the Egyptian-Israeli sector as well as in others. For, in spite of the regrettable obstacles which have recently arisen, Israel sees no cause for despair. If the General Assembly reacts to the present discussion with prudence and restraint, we shall be able to persevere in the attempt to overcome the obstacles which lie on the road to peace. The immediate need is to avoid a tragic situation in which—while the missile problem is now the sole obstacle to the talks—the existing textual and procedural agreements could be wrecked by unbalanced General Assembly statements if they were

made pursuant to the Egyptian address. The effect of such action would be to drive the Middle Eastern peace effort outside the United Nations and the United Nations from the Middle Eastern peace effort. This would be a sad way to begin the second generation of United Nations history.

68. Israel, for its part, will never renounce the pursuit of peace, be the journey towards it short or long. If the United Nations respects the 7 August agreements and the terms under which the parties accepted the United States peace initiative, Israel will continue to respect its commitment to those policies. We did not seek the renewal of public international controversy. Once it was imposed upon us, we could not shirk it. But our real concern, our urgent concern, is to conserve and not to squander the modest but important gains which illuminated the Middle Eastern sky with a new vision a few months ago. The vision is one of peace between two free and sovereign nations. One of them is Israel, which represents the most tenacious and enduring nationhood in history—a people reunited with the conditions and environment in which it reached its highest creativity and sent strong currents of thought into the ocean of universal history. The other is the Arab nation, which 13 centuries ago built a brilliant civilization out of the parched and arid desert, and which in the era of its freedom has earned a large, though not an exclusive, place in the enactment of Middle Eastern history.

69. Now every grievance which either of these nations has ever entertained towards the other has been expressed again and again beyond all due measure in public debate. The question today is not how we explain or describe the hostilities of the past, but rather how we can transcend them by new efforts of conciliation in the future.

70. Before long the General Assembly will disperse, but we, the Governments and peoples in the Middle Eastern region, will remain inescapably charged with the burdens, the dangers and the possible splendours of the region's history.

71. In one form or another the pursuit of peace based on mutual respect of sovereignty and freedom and the integrity of agreements must go forward. We ask you to do nothing to make that journey more difficult and to do what lies in your hands to advance us along the road.

72. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to inform the Assembly that a very short time ago a draft resolution on the situation in the Middle East was submitted by the delegations of Afghanistan, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, India, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia [A/L.602].

73. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The item before us is entitled “The situation in the Middle East”. We have just heard Mr. Eban with his diction and oratory.

do doubt he deserves to be a journalist in addition to being a diplomat, and I would say that he would graduate into being quite a literary man from the choice of words that he has used in his speeches ever since I have listened to him. But in his speech Mr. Eban gave the impression that the whole solution of the problem which bedevils us devolves upon resolving the conflict between Israel and the United Arab Republic. He devoted about 45 minutes to what is known as the war of 1967, which is incidental to the whole problem of Palestine. One would have hoped that he would go into the genesis of the question, not since 1967 but since the creation of Israel by this Organization, nay, since the Treaty of Versailles.

74. Understandably Mr. Eban avoids going into the genesis of the question because he may find that the foundation on which Israel was created was not a sound one.

75. I shall see to it that no hatred, no rancour and no invective will creep into what I am going to say from the rostrum of this Assembly, because this is not a question of emotion. It is not by retribution or by casting aspersions on others that we will solve this question. It is a matter of laying the facts not before the United Nations here, but before the peoples of the world, hoping that what we say today may reach the ears of those who have been sitting on the fence, leaving aside those who have been indoctrinated by zionism.

76. Mr. Eban spoke about building peace between Egypt and Israel and between Jordan and Israel. But what about the whole Arab nation, extending from Morocco to the confines of Iran, down to the Arabian peninsula, along the Red Sea? His speech dealt with an incident, the 1967 war, but the fundamentals were sadly neglected.

77. Mr. Eban's speech rests on the premise that Israel is a sovereign State. Of course. It was made a sovereign State by the United Nations. The other day [1870th meeting], in a long reply, I mentioned many historical facts which I need not rehash today. I have been speaking on this question since 1947, and even before 1947—indeed, I have been personally seized of this question of Palestine since I was a boy, in 1920.

78. Israel was established in 1948 by force and by violence. But let us turn to the partition of Palestine in November of 1947. I was sitting in Lake Success then, across the East River. Time and again the world must be told how Israel was created. It was created by partition. But let us go into the facts before partition, step by step, and not begin with Herzl, the father of zionism. Let us go step by step. I submit that Israel was created by manipulation on the part of the Zionists. That is understandable. They wanted to build a so-called national home in Palestine. Palestine happened to be a Holy Land to the three monotheistic religions, and it was natural that they wanted a motivation for their movement—so the motivation was: to go back to Palestine.

79. We have the benefit of the recent book by Dean Acheson entitled *Present at the Creation*. I shall not weary the Assembly by reading chapter and verse from that voluminous book. I shall content myself with reading out one paragraph from it so that representatives may become familiar with how Israel was created. Here is the quotation from Dean Acheson's book:

"I did not share the President's views on the Palestine solution"—the President was Mr. Truman—"to the pressing and desperate plight of great numbers of displaced Jews in Eastern Europe, for whom the British and American commanders in Germany were temporarily attempting to provide. The number that could be absorbed by Arab Palestine"—why these words "Arab Palestine"? The Americans used to call that territory Arab Palestine—"without creating a grave political problem would be inadequate, and to transform the country into a Jewish State capable of receiving a million or more immigrants would vastly exacerbate the political problem and imperil not only American but all Western interests in the Near East. From Justice Brandeis"—parenthetically, may I say that he was a Justice of the United States Supreme Court—"whom I revered, and from Felix Frankfurter"—another Justice of the United States Supreme Court—"my intimate friend, I had learned to understand but not to share the mystical emotion of the Jews to return to Palestine and end the Diaspora. In urging Zionism as an American governmental policy, they had allowed, so I thought, their emotion to obscure the totality of American interests"—I repeat, the totality of American interests—"Zionism was the only topic that Felix and I had by mutual consent excluded from our far-ranging daily talks."<sup>4</sup>

80. I think that every member here who wants to know about Palestine and Israel should by a copy of that book. There are other useful passages in this book written by an American who had no axe to grind with us Arabs—or, I believe, with the Jews as such, although he had many friends amongst them, including Mr. Brandeis and, I believe, Felix Frankfurter.

81. The Zionists pursued the same policy in the United Kingdom by making British interests subservient to their own. How do I know? We met Mr. Bevin of the Labour Party and he told us about the pressure he was under from the Zionists inside his country.

82. I have spoken to several Secretaries of State of the United States. Who am I to go and ask for an appointment? I am a simple representative, but usually the Secretaries of State in this country are gracious enough to invite some of us and to have talks with our principal representative—usually the Foreign Minister—and, being here in the United Nations, we accompany them. Time and again, since the inception of this problem in the United Nations, we have asked the United States Government to take the Zionist question out of the orbit of its domestic politics. It has

<sup>4</sup> D. Acheson, *Present at the Creation—My Years in the State Department* (New York, W. W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1969), p. 169.

never done so. On the contrary, we find that Zionism nowadays dominates United States policy regarding the Middle East more than ever before. When I last spoke, I referred to an advertisement in *The New York Times*. I thought then that I had put it in my pocket, but I had actually forgotten to bring it with me. This time I did not. It is addressed to Governor Rockefeller:

“Governor Rockefeller, you can rest assured we are grateful people with good memories . . . . When the survivors of Hitler’s holocaust were languishing in DP”—that stands for displaced persons—“camps hoping for a chance to rebuild their shattered lives in lands of peace and opportunity, you formed a committee of Christians to raise funds for the United Jewish Appeal. That was in 1946, and you have been an active leader in that committee ever since!”

I think that Governor Rockefeller should be lauded for that paragraph. But wait. What comes next? It is stated:

“When the fate of the United Nations resolution to establish a Jewish homeland in the Holy Land was hanging in the balance in 1947, you delivered the crucial votes—from your friends in Latin American nations—to tip the scales in favour of the creation of the State of Israel.”

83. I am starting from our days and going backwards so that I shall not trouble you with the genesis, from the beginning, because there were many chapters after Genesis. Even in the Bible, Genesis is the first book, and then you have several other books. I am starting from today and going back in history and showing you what happened.

84. Here are statistics that are more eloquent than any words. You remember, Sir, that your illustrious father was not only a member of the League of Nations, he was a President of the League of Nations and you, being the son of such an illustrious father, must have delved into the proceedings of the League Nations. And I would remind, you, Sir, that the people of Palestine were recognized by the League of Nations as an independent nation. It is stated in Article 22, paragraph 4, of the Covenant of the League of Nations that they were a provisionally independent nation “subject to rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone”. That was in 1919. Palestine as well as Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Trans-Jordan were placed by Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations under a class “A” Mandate and their populations were recognized. In 1919 there were in Palestine—mark my words—700,000 Arabs, 50,000 Jews and many of those Jews were native Jews. They were our brothers; they were not European Jews they were indigenous Jews.

85. I am not going to talk about perfidious Balfour and the nefarious policy between 1919 or 1920 and 1945. I have covered this time and again, sometimes from this rostrum, in other committees of the United Nations and in the Security Council. But by 1947 the Arabs had multiplied and we find that they numbered

1,350,000. They were Palestinians. Forget that they were Arabs. They spoke Arabic, they were the indigenous people known as Palestinians. The Lebanese also spoke Arabic but they were called Lebanese. The Iraqis also happened to speak Arabic but they were called Iraqis, not Arabs. All these in 1919, with Syria too, were placed under the Mandate of Britain and France. There were 650,000 Jews. These were transplanted mostly by the United Kingdom. That was the year of the partition. Look at the difference. They were less than half of the Palestinian Arab population. Why did the Charter enunciate the following purpose in Article 1, paragraph 2:

“To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace”?

86. Self-determination, a Mandate given to the British by the League of Nations in order to prepare the people for self-government. What did they do? They allowed immigration, they created a problem for all the Arab nations and for themselves. Finally, in 1947, they threw the whole Palestine question into the lap of this Organization because allegedly they could not handle it. The partition was in 1947, and this Charter was signed in 1945. Did not the General Assembly of 1947 cast to the four winds the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people? And Mr. Eban speaks of Israel as if it had existed since time immemorial. By what yardstick of justice? What double standard is this? Was not Dean Acheson right in saying that such a creation would exacerbate American interests and relations with the Arab world? Whom are we fooling around here? The situation in the Middle East does not encompass only the war of 1967, which, I repeat, was an incident in a long chain of tragic events.

87. Hence, the admission of Israel to the United Nations was brought about by pressure and manipulation, and was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations.

88. Again, I will go a little further into past history and quote from the Jewish encyclopaedia, as all students or scholars, whether they are Jews or Gentiles, should do, because after all scholars are devoted to finding the truth in history, and not just to acting like politicians, as many of us do in this Organization. Pages 1 to 5 volume 4 of the Jewish encyclopaedia contain a history of the Khazars, who were converted to Judaism in the eighth and ninth century, and who constituted a large part of the Jewish population of central and eastern Europe. Political Zionism was not an oriental movement, it was a movement of Europeans who had incidentally emigrated from the northern part of Asia in the first century, and who subsequently were converted to Judaism, just like Saint Augustine, who emigrated from northern Africa—from what today is Tunis—to Europe and converted many of those European heathens to Christianity.

89. Political zionism is a European movement that has used Judaism as a motivation for a political and economic end, just as the European colonialists, when they established colonies in Asia, rationalized their presence there as having a civilizing purpose, aiming to educate the Asians and the Africans. They forgot that the Asians and the Africans were the heirs of cultures, of many succeeding cultures, at a time when the Europeans were mere barbarians. They were civilized only yesterday, historically speaking.

90. Therefore, we of the Arab nation consider the establishment of Israel as an intrusion by a colonial people from Europe into our midst. Nothing less and nothing more.

91. The motivation, again, was religion, as it was in the days of the crusaders. Pope Urban II in 1087, when he found his supremacy over the Christian community was weakening, made his famous declaration to the Europeans: "Why are you sitting here in this poor land, go and wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels." This can be read in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* under the heading "The Crusades". That started another intrusion into our midst; it was religion used as a motivation for a political end.

92. The Arab people have reacted, as has been shown, from the shores of the Atlantic to the heart of Asia, down to the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Sea. It is not a question of whether you or I would have liked them to react, it is a question of modern history, and Mr. Eban spent 45 minutes trying to concentrate on the incidentals—the cease-fire, the alleged emplacement of missiles in Egypt—but he did not catalogue the arms he received. Where is Mr. Yost, is he there? But what can Mr. Yost do, although I would like him to hear and tell his President that we have always been friends of the United States but that they are embarrassing us. Our people are all astir. We have economic interests with the United States, but there are politicians like Nelson Rockefeller and this man called Lindsay, the Mayor of this city.

93. I will tell you something so that you may understand the impact of political zionism on the policy of the United States. His Majesty King Feisal was invited by and graciously accepted an invitation from Mr. Johnson, the President of the United States, and the programme planned was that when His Majesty visited New York City the Mayor would give a banquet for him. We did not plan anything. I remember I received a programme which was a very kind gesture on the part of the Mayor. In Washington, the Press Association held a conference and wanted His Majesty to say a few words about the Middle East. Of course, they asked some questions and one of the correspondents asked His Majesty: "When will there be peace in the Middle East?" Simply, naturally and with dignity His Majesty did not hesitate. He said: "There will be no peace as long as there is a State called Israel among us." That was a statement of fact which has been borne out by events.

94. I was in Washington and, as official guests are lodged in Blair House, one day I happened to be there and who should come but an emissary from—had it been an emissary from the Mayor of London, I should have said from His Lordship. I don't know why he cheapens himself; the Lindsays, I have found out, are a good family, not a cheap family. There is nobody cheap, I only use the common jargon. He sent an emissary, and this poor emissary—he didn't know who I was—said: "Why cannot the King's messenger say he is sick and cannot attend the banquet?" I replied: "Our King never lies and any king who lies does not deserve to be a king. Get out of here." Of course, he had already cancelled the banquet in order to obtain the Zionist vote in New York City. This is what we have to contend with—a strong faction inside the United States that shapes the policy of the United States in the Middle East. They go in circles. Of course, we were told: "You know, the man could not act otherwise. In order to be Mayor of New York he has to court the Zionists." So how can we expect any justice from a State whose representative, none other than Ambassador Goldberg, was at the root of working, with some other Zionists perhaps—I do not know who they were—on the decision of the Council known as resolution 242 (1967)? And by whom was it amended? The British. Why did the others accept it? As an accommodation. Since then we have learnt that the veto is no longer important in the Council. The word "consensus" came into style. What a word, "consensus". What does it imply? It is all manoeuvring.

95. But that is not all. In 1957 another incident took place—I am going back in history—the occupation by Israel of Arab territories. Listen to a great President of the United States—may God rest his soul—none other than the late President Eisenhower. I am quoting from him—these are not my words:

"The use of military force to solve international disputes could not be reconciled with the principles and purposes of the United Nations. We approach a fateful moment when either we must recognize that the United Nations must renew with increased vigor its efforts to bring about Israeli withdrawal . . . ."<sup>5</sup>

I am not quoting everything Mr. Eisenhower said, but here I think it is relevant to adduce a few more paragraphs:

"If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order. We will in effect have countenanced the use of force as a means of settling international differences and through this gaining national advantages."<sup>5</sup>

Further, he says:

"If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then

<sup>5</sup> *American Foreign Policy—Current Documents 1957*, Department of State Publication No. 7101 (Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1961), p. 923 et seq.

we will have destroyed the very foundation of the Organization and our best hope of establishing a world order. That would be a disaster for us all. I would, I feel, be untrue to the standards of the high office for which you have chosen me if I were to lend the influence of the United States to the proposition that a nation which invades another should be permitted to exact conditions for withdrawal.”<sup>5</sup>

Finally, he winds up by saying:

“We cannot consider that the armed invasion and occupation of another country are ‘peaceful means or proper means to achieve justice and conformity with international law’. But the United Nations faces immediately the problem of what to do next. If it does nothing, if it accepts the ignoring of its repeated resolutions calling for the withdrawal of invading forces, then it will have admitted failure. That failure would be a blow to the authority and influence of the United Nations in the world and to the hopes which humanity placed in the United Nations as a means of achieving peace with justice.”<sup>5</sup>

96. What about the Declaration we adopted here last Saturday 24 October [*resolution 2627 (XXV)*]. Does it not reaffirm the right of self-determination? Are the Palestinians a people or are they a herd of sheep? I do not think they have proved themselves to be a herd of sheep to be slaughtered. They have been slaughtered enough. The young among them have emerged as one to try to regain their homeland.

97. That is how Israel was created—by manipulation, by pressure, by manoeuvring—and Mr. Eban spoke about the incident in 1967 and then waxed literary about the amity that could be established between the Jews and the Arabs. That idea is rhetoric. Supposing it were not rhetoric but based on good intentions, the Arab people do not wish to accept it, for their experiences with Zionism are so painful that they cannot possibly believe that anything good will come from such a relationship.

98. We will go back into history a little. This time I did not begin with the Genesis, and I am not going to deal with the Genesis, for I will have another occasion to talk. Mr. Samuel Lenman of London, a Zionist—from 1917 to 1922 he was the secretary of the World Zionist Organization—discloses in an official pamphlet, *Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine*, published by the New Zionist Press, London, 1956, how the World Zionist Organization in 1916 entered into a secret agreement with the British War Cabinet by the terms of which Great Britain promised Palestine to the Zionists as payment for using Zionist pressure in the United States to railroad the United States into the First World War as Great Britain’s ally. Mr. Lenman states on page 4:

“The only way to induce the American President”—at that time Mr. Woodrow Wilson—“to come into the war was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine and thus

enlist and mobilize the hitherto unsuspectingly powerful forces of Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a quid pro quo contract basis. The American people were never told the painful truth, that the great sacrifices in lives and money suffered by the United States in World War I were not to protect American interests but were made solely to enable Zionists throughout the world to acquire Palestine for their Jewish state, their Jewish national home.”

The treasonable role played by the Zionists in the United States speaks for itself. I have to leave some of those quotations for another intervention, as I do not wish to tax the patience of representatives.

99. But what can we do here? Sir, you are one of the most honest men I know. What will speeches, long or short, accomplish in this United Nations, with which I have been associated for the last 25 years? Will they accomplish anything in the Middle East situation? It pains me to have to say: No. Why “no”? Because we have become the arena of power politics between the great Powers. Why should the United States, 7,000 miles from our shores, concern itself with us and become the arbiter of our destiny? “Well,” they tell us, “in order perhaps to save us from communism.” They wine and dine with the communists. They have established coexistence with the communists. But they tell us: “Russia is in the area.” What brought Russia into the area but United States policy? After all, Russia is not very far from our region in the Middle East. It is contiguous with the Middle East. After all, the Middle East includes Turkey and Pakistan—and Russia has common frontiers with us.

100. The United States’ argument is not valid. Do they want to make us afraid? We are afraid of every great Power, for that matter. Why is it invalid? After all, they have no right to be the arbiters of our destiny. Secondly, and more important, it is invalid because the United States Middle East policy is conditioned by the Zionists. It cannot be objective. That is why they made a big mess. If they had listened to Mr. Acheson, they would not have been in such a mess. But the politicians want to perpetuate themselves in power. Many of them would sell their mothers, their daughters—their own families—down the river for that purpose. The advice of wise men is not heeded. And this is the consequences.

101. Most of us here are wearing the strait jacket of instructions provided to us by our respective Governments. That is why the die is cast. Everybody knows how he is going to vote and how he is going to dispose of this situation—except two great Powers: Russia and the United States. They hold the balance. They may have a confrontation one of these days. At whose expense? At our expense—and also at their own expense, unless they narrow the region where they will conflict, and God forbid that they should do so.

102. But why are we not left alone? Do we, as Arab nations, put our finger in the American pie or in the

Russian pie, for that matter? Do we interfere, physically or otherwise, in the domestic affairs of the State of New York—not to speak of the Federal Government—or in elections in the United States? We do not interfere in their affairs. Why should they send arms against us? Oh, because they are committed to Israel. Why are they committed to Israel as American people—not to speak of the Government? Why is there not a referendum amongst the American people to find out what is true?

103. I mentioned Jerusalem the other day. There are 600 million Moslems. I have washed my hands of the Christians. They do not give a damn about Jerusalem any more—I am talking not about the Christians of Asia but about the Christians of Europe and America. I have washed my hands of them. They do not care who occupies Jerusalem. We care. We are 600 million. I speak for Islam because Saudi Arabia is the custodian of the Holy Cities of Islam. We get pilgrims from the four corners of the world. We know what they are thinking.

104. We cannot but state again from this rostrum that the Moslem world will never admit by any standard that Jerusalem should be occupied by those Zionists. They could live there as our brothers, without a flag. If we here in the United Nations or in any other international organization want to follow democratic procedures, what right have 16 million Jews—out of which only 10 or 20 per cent are Zionists—to set the law that Jerusalem should belong to a million and a half or two million Jews? What about the 600 million Moslems—not to speak of the Christians; I have washed my hands of them, unless there are some who one day will say that Jerusalem should not be for the Jews.

105. Most Jews are law-abiding citizens, identifying themselves with their country of birth or adoption. But there is this insidious indoctrination that they are a race apart from others. Religion does not constitute a race. We have discussed this time and again in the Third Committee and in other committees in connexion with *apartheid*. There is no such thing as religion constituting a race. This does not mean that religious groups do not come together or would not like to form a State. We have, for example, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania. We have Pakistan. The inhabitants of those two countries are preponderantly Moslems and they are identified by Islam. But there is no such thing as Islamic Blood. There is no such thing as Christian blood, Arab blood or Jewish blood. And here the Zionists want to set themselves apart from humanity by saying that they are exclusive, the chosen people of God—as if God is a discriminator. We will not accept such a notion in the United Nations because it will set us apart as *homo sapiens*. It will fragment us into peoples that think they are superior because of certain self-given attributes.

106. Jerusalem, to all intents and purposes—and according to what Mr. Eban said from this rostrum three years ago—is not negotiable; it is a Jewish city. We will not admit that. Therefore, resolution 242, 244, 246—whatever number one wants to give it—will not

achieve anything. Mr. Jarring, that gentleman who has shown infinite patience, instead of leaving his post in Moscow—he is the Ambassador of his country there—and frittering away his precious time, waiting for Mr. Eban or another emissary from the Zionist State to come and talk to him, would be well advised to have a mandate from the United Nations, from you, Sir, if that is possible constitutionally, to go and talk to the people of Palestine, and not to the aggressors.

107. That territories should not be acquired by force is a principle, that was decided upon years before the United Nations. It has been confirmed and reaffirmed by the United Nations.

108. The core of the problem is the Palestine people, and anyone who sadly neglects them will eventually have in enmity all the Arab world and eventually a good part of the Moslem world. Let this warning from this rostrum be heeded lest the United Nations dynamite itself by the injustices it would perpetrate on a people who have had the right of self-determination since 1919 and lost it on account of the manipulations, manoeuvrings, pressures, bribery and other means brought to bear by certain Zionists who have power, ingratiating themselves, as they have, like a cancer in the body politic and body social of the big Powers.

109. Please do not mistake my style of talking as coming from a heart that hates. As a person—and I am representative of my region—I know that hate consumes the person who engages in it. If I have stood and spoken with a little vehemence, it is perhaps to drive home the truths as they obtain from history, to transmit those truths, hopefully, to those who are outside these halls, perchance to the Zionists whom we consider to be worthy in their individual fundamental rights, whereby they should enjoy dignity but never superiority. If they want to live among us, be they Zionists or Jews, from whatever clime or country, not under the flag of Israel, which will be the symbol of aggression to the Arab nations, but as people who revere the Holy Land of Palestine—then, and only then, as Jews, as brothers, would they be able to bring about peace and live in amity with us.

110. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): There is a pitiless irony that seems to pursue the United Nations in its efforts to fulfil the high promise held out to mankind at the birth of the Organization 25 years ago. Hardly ever has it happened in history that a venture on such a vast humanitarian scale has been inaugurated to the accompaniment of such sinister and forbidding omens in such striking contrast to the magniloquence that attended the occasion. We need only recall that the Organization's birth was celebrated in the macabre setting of the horror of Hiroshima to realize how inauspicious the circumstances of its creation were. This same irony has stalked it throughout 25 years and was punctuated by the triple nuclear blast on the occasion of its 25th anniversary.

111. But far the most painful irony of all is that almost the first breath the Organization drew marked also that

heartbeat of humanity that led to the creation of the State of Israel in expiation of the crimes of a monster but at the expense of the guiltless Palestinians. The irony is sharpened and heightened by the fact that the greatest beneficiary of the human conscience should now turn out to be the most undutiful child of the United Nations.

112. Throughout 23 of the first 25 years of its existence the United Nations has been plagued with the Middle East problem. A few days ago, in this hall, we adopted, in an atmosphere of due solemnity, with reservations by a few impenitent and incorrigible delinquents, certain declarations of good faith and honest intent. One enunciated a set of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)]. Another took the form of a declaration on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations [resolution 2627 (XXV)]. Had our proceedings ended there, the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations might well have earned the soubriquet of "ostrich session". Those declarations referred, in impeccable diplomatic phraseology, to the duties of States in their relations with one another. They affirmed, among other things, the principle that no territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal; they proclaimed the dedication of the Members of the United Nations to the Charter of the United Nations and the reaffirmation of their will to carry out the obligations assumed by them under the Charter. It was almost as if we felt compelled to create the illusion of progress and positive achievement by turning our eyes away from the realities of the international situation. The debate on the Middle East situation, however, serves to remind us that we are still standing—somewhat nonchalantly, it would seem—on the brink of a crisis.

113. More than three years after the June 1967 conflict and the occupation by Israeli armed forces of large areas of territory belonging to the Arab States—the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria—the hope of a settlement is as remote as ever. The essential elements of a just, honourable and peaceful settlement, which Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 by common consent appeared to offer, have receded into the background.

*Mr. Johnson (Jamaica), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

114. What Israel would have us treat as the heart of the matter today is the dismantling by the United Arab Republic of a part of its defences in its own territory as a condition precedent to indirect negotiations through the medium of the United Nations negotiator, Ambassador Jarring. As one side in the conflict would have it, the price of default would be the further strengthening of Israel's military capacity and potential far beyond what would appear to be the reasonable requirements of defence and national security. This is not where the emphasis should be placed so far as the United Nations is concerned. The Middle East

question comes before the General Assembly of the United Nations because resolutions of the Security Council, the organ of the United Nations primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace and security, and resolutions of the General Assembly itself have been ignored by Israel. The failure by the United Nations to secure observance of those resolutions poses a grave threat to peace.

115. We have been told by the Foreign Minister of Israel that this debate is a diplomatic equivalent of the missile build-up on the Suez Canal. It would be more true to say that we have seen and heard on this podium today, in the person of the Foreign Minister of Israel himself, the combined diplomatic counterpart of the Skyhawk, the Phantom and the M-60 tank, and that more threatening and blustering than all those formidable armaments. With artful but not quite convincing selectivity, the Foreign Minister of Israel stated that the first opportunity for peace in the Middle East arose on 7 August 1970. We hope that the rest of the United Nations Members maintain their archives in better shape than does the Foreign Minister of Israel. If they do, they will know that it was on 22 November 1967 that the first opportunity for peace in the Middle East was created, and that by the Security Council itself.

116. What has long been forgotten and appears now to be little realized is that during the three years since the adoption of the several Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the main thrust and purport of which was the restoration of frontiers altered by the military operations of June 1967 and a request to Israel to give some slight evidence of its loyalty to the Charter and of its readiness to comply with its obligations under it, Israel's only response has taken the form of insulting references to the moral, political and juridical bankruptcy of the United Nations, whatever that may mean; the consolidation of territorial gains acquired through military operations, acquisitions which the Security Council has declared inadmissible; the adoption of administrative and legal measures unmistakably designed to consolidate the acquisition of, and perpetuate the Israeli presence in, the occupied territories through the establishment of permanent settlements on property occupied without any pretence to legality; and worst of all, a cavalier repudiation of the authority of the United Nations. It is this three-year record of effrontery towards the United Nations and the rule of law as expressed by the United Nations that we are here to discuss and arrest, as it constitutes the greatest impediment to a peaceful settlement.

117. A paralysis of mind and body appears to seize the United Nations in its dealings with some of its most recalcitrant Members. In Israel's case, it seems as if Israel has only to catch a cold for the entire United Nations to sneeze. I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that Israel suffers from cold feet; certainly not. It would be more true to say that it suffers from hot heads.

118. Speaking from a position of strength and with powerful backing, Israel demands that the United

Nations bow to its will and accept its terms, which are that Israel must for ever remain in a position of overwhelming military superiority over its Arab neighbours; that it alone must be free to determine for itself where its boundaries shall be drawn and how far they shall extend—according to the pronouncements of some of its leaders, up to the Euphrates itself; and that international accounts in the Middle East should be settled only in the counterfeit coinage of Israel's moral, political and juridical currency, despite its limited circulation, rather than in the legal tender of the United Nations Charter principles. It gives us no pleasure to speak in these terms of a Member State.

119. The time for recrimination and acrimonious controversy is long past. The Middle East should not be allowed to become a cockpit of cold-war conflicts. The present opportunity must not be lost or frittered away in futile argument. If the United Nations wants peace in the Middle East, let it not have any truck with flimsy pretexts, idle excuses and tenuous alibis such as those advanced by Israel and its supporters. Let it look for justice. It will find it in the total evacuation of territories occupied by force and in the eradication of all traces of military conquest; in full and fair restitution to the dispossessed, evicted, homeless and stateless Palestinians; in the opening of international waterways to free and unrestricted navigation; and in the recognition of the right of nations to live in peace, side by side as good neighbours, but without the right to change their boundaries whenever it pleases them to do so. This is the justice that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 offers. Despite the conflicting and contradictory interpretations given to key elements in that resolution, we do not believe that there was any deliberate political chicanery or duplicity in the drafting or acceptance of that resolution. We are fully convinced of its validity and have no doubt as to its efficacy as the best instrument for a lasting settlement in the Middle East. Let us go back to it.

120. Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Because of its acute nature and potential danger, the situation which has arisen in the Middle East is undoubtedly one among the number of problems requiring urgent consideration and settlement. It was in the Middle East, more than three years ago, that Israel committed its act of aggression against the Arab States, an act the consequences of which have not yet been eliminated. The Middle East is a source of constant tension and expanding conflict which threatens international security.

121. The position of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on the question of the Middle East has always been and remains a principled and clear position. We steadfastly oppose aggression and the acquisition of territory by means of war, and we demand that there be no question of rewarding aggressors. We are convinced that the solution of the problem must lie in a peaceful political settlement which will ensure the legitimate rights of all the peoples and countries of the region to peace and security.

122. The President of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian Republic, Comrade Scherbitsky, speaking on this question at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on 22 June 1967, said:

“If the present crisis, which has been created by the Government of Israel and its protectors, is not put an end to by peaceful means, we may witness dangerous consequences for which humanity would not forgive us . . .

“. . . we are firmly guided by the principles of consistent defence and strengthening of the peace; these principles are the basis of the foreign policy of socialist States. Our position on this matter is also influenced by the fact that the aggression occurred in the immediate vicinity of our frontiers and consequently represents a threat to the security of the Ukrainian people.” [*1532nd meeting, paras. 20 and 21.*]

123. In less than a month it will be three years since the adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which opened the way to a solution of the crisis in the Middle East in the interests of all the States in that area. The need for the prompt implementation of that resolution has often been stressed. The most recent events still further confirm the self-evident timeliness of such a decision.

124. For three years the world has watched one side, the Arab countries, continually displaying its readiness for a peaceful solution in the light of United Nations decisions, and the other side evading the implementation of those decisions, on all kinds of pretexts, and directly sabotaging them. The spectacle of a State that has committed an act of aggression not only justifying but glorifying it is hard to credit in this day and age. Yet that is what the representative of Israel did when he spoke quite recently from this rostrum [*1851st meeting*] on the victory which, he said, was a milestone on mankind's road to justice, peace and truth. Indeed, even in the statement he has made today, the same representative has departed very little from his previous assertions. But to what lengths of cynicism one must go to present Israel's criminal attack on the Arab countries—an act which is a mockery of justice, a blatant violation of peace and a flagrant breach of the rules of international law in such colours!

125. From this same rostrum we recently heard words of gratitude to the United Nations for its role in the creation of Israel. But how has Israel repaid the United Nations?

126. It has done so by repeatedly committing acts of aggression against its neighbours, States Members of the United Nations, in violation of the Charter of the Organization; and for more than three years now it has occupied extensive Arab territories. It has done so by systematically ignoring and failing to carry out decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. And on the very day when we heard those words of gratitude to the United Nations, the press

published a statement by another highly-placed representative of the Government of Israel, announcing in advance that Israel would not consider itself bound by a resolution of the General Assembly on the Middle East question.

127. But this hypocrisy is scarcely surprising. Representatives present in this chamber know that Israel, together with the racist and fascist régimes of Portugal and South Africa, has many times been condemned and warned by the Security Council for violating its obligations under the Charter and the decisions of the Council.

128. Israel's obstructionist attitude towards the efforts aimed at bringing about a peaceful settlement in the Middle East shows that its leaders continue to be dominated by chauvinist frenzy and adventurist plans of territorial aggrandizement.

129. By launching aggressive war against the neighbouring Arab States, ruling circles in Israel have tried to bring to fruition long-cherished plans for creating a so-called Greater Israel. As subsequent events have shown, the seizure of the occupied territories, and the attempt to consolidate them, serve that same purpose, and it was to achieve that purpose that the Israeli leaders annexed their neighbours' lands.

130. One need only glance at the map to convince oneself how far—both literally and metaphorically—the Israeli leaders have gone. The area of the Arab territories now occupied is four times that of the territory assigned to Israel under the United Nations plan of 1947. The plan of territorial expansion put forward as early as 1919 by the World Zionist Organization, which then seemed unbelievably ambitious, has been exceeded by far; and all that thanks to the seizure of Arab territories by means of war and aggression. How it all resembles the plans and actions of the Hitlerite aggressors in their efforts to put into practice that notorious concept, the conquest of "*lebensraum*".

131. With the open cynicism displayed by the Prime Minister of Israel in her statement of 2 October, lists are made of the foreign territories embraced by Israel's expansionist appetite, territories which, to all appearances, Israel intends to appropriate. That is the real truth behind the outwardly innocent talk of "secure frontiers" carried on for the purpose of concealing these plans.

132. The sinister meaning of these statements and plans becomes even more obvious in the light of the practical measures which Israel is taking in order to fulfil its ambitions and consolidate its hold on the occupied territories.

133. The Israeli occupiers, brazenly lording it over the Arab territories, are carrying out for annexationist purposes a programme for the "assimilation"—that is, in plain language the colonization—of the occupied territories. They are methodically establishing new settlements to serve as strong points for the invaders, building strategic roads and so on.

134. Intending as they do to establish themselves firmly and for a long time, the occupiers are taking

over industrial enterprises, plundering natural resources belonging to the Arab peoples, carrying out geological explorations, and exploiting mineral resources—in particular, the oil deposits on the Sinai peninsula. All these measures are accompanied by the forcible expulsion of the Arab population from their homes, the confiscation of their land and property and a policy of mass terror.

135. Evidence of the outrages and brutalities committed by the Israeli aggressors can be found in many documents circulated in the United Nations. At this session of the General Assembly indeed, documents A/8063 and A/8123 have been circulated, of which the latter refers to a report of the International Committee of the Red Cross. The report makes the substantiated charge that Israel has violated the Geneva Conventions on occupied territories; in particular that it has been guilty of the barbarous and premeditated destruction of Arab towns and villages, the destruction of property belonging to Arabs and the execution of mass punitive operations against the local Arab population.

136. Thus it is becoming increasingly evident that Israel is fighting not for its existence, not for its security, not for peace, as Tel Aviv and its protectors and imperialist propaganda would have us believe, but simply for the seizure of foreign lands. It is easy to understand why at the present session as in the past we have had no clear and definite answer from the Israeli representative as to whether Israel intends to return the conquered lands and restore the frontiers violated as a result of aggression.

137. If, in these circumstances, a sincere concerted effort were made by all Powers to ensure the implementation of United Nations decisions designed to eliminate the consequences of the Israeli aggression, we should not have to return to this problem again and again.

138. Israel's stubborn refusal to follow the path of political settlement and its attempt to retain its grip on the territories it has seized is largely explained by the covert and overt support—political, military and economic—which it received from its foreign protectors. The role of protector of the Israeli aggressors is played primarily by the United States, despite the fact that as a permanent member of the Security Council that State bears a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, in the Middle East as elsewhere.

139. How else are we to interpret the refusal of the United States to take a clear stand on the key question of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories, or its support for Israel's false charges against the United Arab Republic?

140. Moreover, under the cover of noisy propaganda about so-called violations of the cease-fire agreement, the United States, at the very moment when new steps are being taken with a view to a peaceful settlement, has decided to supply Israel with large additional quantities of offensive armaments, including fighter-

bombers, tanks of the most modern type, air-ground rockets and so on. Israel is also receiving substantial financial aid from the United States. All this encourages Tel Aviv to obstruct and undermine Ambassador Jarring's mission, and incites it to persist in its attempts to solve the Middle East question on the basis of a "position of strength".

*Mr. Hambro (Norway) resumed the Chair.*

141. It is understandable that with that support Israel continues to obstruct the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative by making false charges against the United Arab Republic. Yet Israel itself has many times violated, and continues to violate, the terms of the cease-fire, as the impressive list of such violations cited here by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Riad, has shown. The Government of the United Arab Republic is in favour of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967); it is in favour of continuing contacts with Ambassador Jarring. Of course, nobody would wish to underestimate the importance of the cease-fire. But its objective must be to bring about the urgent, immediate resumption of the Jarring mission; it must not be used for the purpose of prolonging the occupation of Arab States by Israel. Yet Israel is evading a peaceful political settlement and trying to make the armistice extend indefinitely, in order to achieve its purpose of taking over the occupied Arab lands, in other words of obtaining a reward for its aggression.

142. The same purpose lies behind the malicious campaign of lies and slander now being conducted on an unprecedented scale by the Zionist organizations against the United Nations, the Arab countries and the peace-loving States which are striving to ensure peace, security and the restoration of the territorial integrity of the States in the Middle East.

143. Peace-loving public opinion has had the opportunity to see which countries are really in favour of a just political settlement of the problem, and which is trying to keep hold of the territories of others and reap the fruits of its aggression.

144. Both in the United Nations and in many representative international assemblies the position of the countries in the Middle Eastern conflict has been duly weighed and judged. Let me cite, by way of example, the decisions of two of them the seventh ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held at Addis Ababa<sup>6</sup> and the third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned States held at Lusaka.<sup>7</sup> The special resolutions they adopted stress the inadmissibility of the continued occupation of the seized territories, and demand the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied lands and the full and unconditional implementation of the Security Council resolution.

145. Lastly, the Security Council, in the communiqué issued after its first periodic meeting [1555th

meeting], stated that its resolution of 22 November 1967 "should be supported and carried out in all parts".

146. The Ukrainian delegation considers that our discussion of the question at this session should be a constructive step towards promoting a political settlement of the conflict at the earliest possible date, and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

147. We must achieve the implementation in all its parts of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which marked the path to a solution of the problem; and first and foremost we must solve the main problem, which is the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all the occupied territories, the return of the lands seized by the aggressor, and the restoration of the lawful rights of the Arab countries. Only thus, the Ukrainian delegation believes, shall we be able to achieve an over-all solution guaranteeing peace and security in the area in question and ensuring the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and lawful rights of all peoples and States of the Middle East.

148. If that solution is to be brought nearer, Ambassador Jarring's mission must be resumed, without artificial demands and conditions. What is needed are sincere, concrete, practical measures for a peaceful political settlement, not efforts to turn such a settlement, as Israel is turning it, into a matter for bargaining.

149. A prompt settlement is in the interests of all the peoples of the Middle East, and in the interests of international peace and security.

150. The Middle East can and must at last become an area of peace.

151. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Uruguay, a country which is basically pacifist, devoted to peace and justice and possessed of an unshakable faith in the law, has always taken the position that from the moral standpoint it should contribute to the largest possible extent, to the solution of international conflicts and problems.

152. Since my Government has taken this position, on 6 June 1967, in the face of the crisis in the Middle East, we made public our decision to "support any measure likely to bring about a restoration of peace, founded on the rules of international law and the principles of justice which proclaim the inalienable right of nations large or small to survive as a sovereign entity, their right to economic development and to coexistence free from acts of overt or covert oppression and acts of actual or potential intimidation".

153. Guided by this same national spirit, the delegation of Uruguay at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly in 1967 supported a just and stable peace in the Middle East based on the principle that both parties should recognize (a) as irreversible the existence of the two parties as sovereign States; (b) the right of nations large or small to survive free from acts of aggression or intimidation; and (c) that

<sup>6</sup> Held from 1 to 3 September 1970.

<sup>7</sup> Held from 8 to 10 September 1970.

the conquest of territories by force did not create any entitlements.

154. At the aforesaid special session we voted in favour of resolution 2252 (ES-V) on humanitarian assistance, which took up the urgent need to relieve the suffering inflicted on civilian populations and war prisoners, and endorsed the objectives of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) to safeguard human rights, urging Governments to respect these rights, to protect the security and well-being of the inhabitants of the area and to respect the humanitarian principles which govern the treatment of war prisoners.

155. My delegation understands that each and every act of aggression by either party, considered separately and in isolation, constitutes an illegitimate and reprehensible action. Certainly we could listen for many hours to representatives of each of the parties to this dispute expounding a lengthy list of illegitimate acts imputed to the other party, and I say that despite the understandably heated feelings of those who represent the parties to this dispute—parties who feel in their own flesh and blood the sufferings and miseries of war—everyone should nonetheless understand, even those who are directly involved in this armed struggle—that illegitimate and reprehensible acts taken in isolation actually create a warlike situation, an atmosphere which has been introduced and generalized in the Middle East from 1947 until today, a situation made up of multifaceted and varied types of hostilities, sabotage, attacks and armed reprisals, the multifaceted use of violence which affects the entire international community and which, urgently and inescapably requires that all Member States and this eminent Organization, the United Nations, proceed not so much to the determination of responsibilities and the application of sanctions, but rather to a determined search for the suggestion of and the urgent application of the most appropriate means to safeguard or, even better, to restore peace in the Middle East. To pursue this humanitarian and reasonable objective is to comply fully and properly with the duty to safeguard peace, a commitment solemnly undertaken by the Member States. In this instance, that obligation has been seriously overlooked for some time.

156. What I am saying merely reflects, though in an imperfect fashion the constant feeling of my Government, which as recently as 23 July 1970 approached the other Latin American Governments and informed them “of the deep concern of Uruguay at the continuing state of war obtaining in the Middle East, which implies not only the existence of a regrettable armed conflict between States Members of the United Nations, but also of the fact that such a dispute, if continued, would endanger the peace and security of all mankind”. And if my Government addressed the other Governments of Latin America on such terms, it was because it was “well aware of the need to exert our best efforts in the interests of the cause of peace a cause which is common to all the countries of Latin America, united as they are by their will to peace and by their support of the principles of international law”. In the note to which I refer, my Government added that on the basis

of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) it would be possible to co-operate “effectively in the inevitable search for a settlement of the current dispute in the Middle East”.

157. The obligation to contribute to the cause of peace is the common long-standing approach of the Latin America countries and this fact can be borne out by many facts of history. Among the most recent events which are related to the item we are considering, it is interesting to recall that at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, 20 Latin American countries co-sponsored a draft resolution dated 4 July 1967,<sup>8</sup> for which my delegation voted, a resolution that attempted to solve the conflict in the Middle East.

158. That draft consisted of clear and precise principles directed towards the restoration of peace in this tormented area of the globe. It provided for the withdrawal of forces from the occupied territories, for an end to the state of war and non-recognition of the validity of the acquisition of territories by the threat or use of force. In addition, it called upon the Security Council “co-operating with the parties directly concerned” to ensure free transit through international waterways; to obtain an adequate and complete solution to the problem of the refugees; to guarantee the inviolability of the territorial and political independence of the States of the region.

159. These same principles were enshrined in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 which is, in the opinion of my delegation, a harmonious and well-balanced series of measures that satisfy the normal requirements of reason and justice, and that are likely to be capable of having a successful impact on this effort to restore peace.

160. The balanced series of measures contained in resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council and those provided for in the above-mentioned Latin American draft reflect a strict application of the purposes, principles and norms of action expressly provided for in the United Nations Charter.

161. In a manner which is also adjusted to the provisions of the Charter, 23 Latin American States are now sponsoring, in the First Committee, a draft resolution concerning the strengthening of international security [A/C.1/L.517] which takes as its basis another previous text, which supports the common criteria that links these States in favour of the cause of peace.

162. It would be appropriate to state that if this draft resolution were adopted and if it were to be implemented, its application would lead, with inevitable variations of expression, to the same formulation of measures provided under resolution 242 (1967), of the Security Council.

163. It should also be emphasized that along this same line or in the same direction as that followed by resolution 242 (1967), which provided for the appointment

<sup>8</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

of a Special Representative who would establish and maintain contacts with those States concerned, in order to promote an agreement and to help in the efforts to find a peaceful and acceptable solution, we find the same line of thought in the Latin American draft inasmuch as it recommends that the Security Council should consider the desirability of setting up appropriate subsidiary bodies to bring about the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

164. My delegation is not attempting here to propose a new and original formula with such virtues that it could lead to a solution of the dispute in the Middle East.

165. We are fully aware that any progress towards peace and the final achievement of peace in the Middle East will depend in the first instance on the parties immediately and directly concerned, who should be helped to overcome their lack of trust, rancours, anxieties and the many motives that encourage and unleash violence.

166. But we believe that the parties directly and immediately concerned should, in the matter of aid, accept the fact that the decision to provide it lies with other States. But, what is more they are duty bound to provide this aid because the conflict in which the parties are involved, involves, apart from their own interests, the interests of "We the peoples of the United Nations" and the interests of all peoples. Indeed these interests are involved for reasons of solidarity and friendship among peoples, but the conflict involves also the survival of all people, present and future, whose existence is endangered by the question of the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

167. It is possible that the Latin American draft resolution on the strengthening of international security, in repeating an idea which my delegation considers to be a fundamental pivot of the institutional machinery of the United Nations, has suggested the proper course. Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution reads:

*"Urges all States to comply with the decisions of the competent United Nations bodies concerning international peace and security and, in particular, to comply with the decisions of the Security Council, which bears the primary responsibility for these matters under the Charter."*

168. My delegation considers or would suggest that in order to achieve peace in the Middle East, the issue now is to obtain compliance with resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council by alleviating the difficulties that crop up and removing the obstacles to its application.

169. Without discarding or by any means underestimating other formulas or proposals inspired in noble efforts to achieve peace, my delegation feels that it is desirable, that it is in the highest and most decisive interests of mankind that through this course, that is to say, through compliance with the Security Council resolution, we achieve peace in the Middle East.

170. This would strengthen our belief in the efficiency of this Organization to restore or re-establish peaceful and harmonious relations in that vast branch of the human family made up of Arabs and Jews.

171. And at the same time this would indicate that the system conceived and put into practice to preserve peace among nations is functioning normally and in accordance with the purposes for which it was set up.

172. The peoples of the United Nations and all peoples today are living in such close proximity as a result of the progress achieved in every branch of human activity that whether we shall live in peace instead of in the inferno of a world of increasing anarchy and, in the opinion of my delegation, even the question of human survival will depend on compliance with the rules that reasonably govern international coexistence and with the decisions adopted by the competent bodies created by these rules.

173. Mr. DHARIA (India): Hardly had the people of West Asia shaken off their colonial domination than they were afflicted by yet another series of tensions and conflicts. These culminated in the armed conflict of 1967. Since then, the misery and destruction of the people of West Asia have turned their quest for peace into a nightmare of fear and insecurity. Vast territories remain under foreign military occupation. Hundreds of thousands of persons have been displaced from their homes, many of them for the second and third time in their lives. International commerce throughout this region remains severely restricted. The continuous warfare in the area is interrupted only by occasional cease-fires cursorily and sketchily supported by the United Nations presence and unfortunately never accompanied by serious efforts towards a peaceful settlement. Not often has the United Nations faced such a critical situation and such a grave challenge to peace as it does in the twenty-sixth year of its existence.

174. On 22 November 1967, the Security Council, the principal organ for maintaining peace and security in our troubled world, adopted a resolution [242 (1967)] which contains all the elements for a settlement of this dispute. This resolution was unanimously adopted and yet, three years later, it still remains to be implemented. It is not necessary at this stage to narrate in detail the history, both inside and outside the Council, of the implementation of this resolution. Recently, after the United States proposals were accepted by various parties, we hoped for progress, but in vain.

175. We are, therefore, discussing this subject in the General Assembly with the expectation that whatever decision is taken by the Assembly, it will help to persuade the parties to undertake serious negotiations by and through the help of Ambassador Jarring. If this objective of the debate—and this alone—is achieved, then the debate will have been worth-while.

176. Since the United States proposals were accepted, we have heard charges and countercharges

alleging that one party or the other was at fault for not undertaking negotiations. We are naturally not convinced, in the absence of any concrete evidence, that these accusations justify suspension by any party of negotiations through the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Indeed, we are concerned wherever the principle of the inadmissibility of territorial gains through force has not been observed. We are anxious, therefore, that these negotiations through Ambassador Jarring should not be held up any longer on any pretext whatsoever.

177. Our anxiety and concern derive not merely from our respect for the unanimous decision of the Security Council, but also from our conviction that unless adequate progress is made for a peaceful settlement of this problem in West Asia we shall be facing a grave threat to international peace and security. I am sure the representatives are well aware of the danger which the failure of the United Nations to bring about negotiations on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 would entail.

178. Rivalries between great Powers are being freely talked about in this area. Israel occupies large tracts of Arab lands without any justification, through the sheer force of arms. The Palestinian refugees are deprived of all material means and human dignity, and have been driven out from the homes and lands of their fathers. Naturally, this situation has created permanent tension in this area. To avert the tension and its likely consequences we must firmly act on the resolution of November 1967, and at the same time we should take adequate steps to protect the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people in the general context of peace and security in the area.

179. A draft resolution [A/L.602] containing these basic ideas has been submitted and we have co-sponsored it. We hope many more countries will join us in getting the resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

180. Our attitude to the problems of West Asia is consistent with our general approach to questions of international peace and security. On West Asia, we have always taken the view that areas occupied by force of arms must be vacated. As our Prime Minister said [1881st meeting], the relevant question is whether, in this age and time, we can permit any country to occupy the territories of other countries through force. Obviously, we cannot. The second consideration arises from our own experience, as also from the experience of others. We have learnt the bitter lesson that whenever a country occupies or wishes to occupy territories which belong to other States, it never fails to create some justification or dispute or pretext for such occupation. We have yet to comply with the principle formulated by the United Nations that no country should be allowed to benefit directly or indirectly, territorially or otherwise, from its armed action against any other State. The complications which have arisen in West Asia and other countries in the world through the intervention of other Powers are also not a novel phenomenon. We can only hope that in the course

of time these Powers will realize that other countries may not have the military strength or economic power to assert their full independence, but still have enough dignity and self-respect to resent any kind of subordination of their national interests to those of militarily more powerful nations.

181. Our approach to international problems is governed by our policy of peace, justice and friendship with all peoples. A fundamental tenet of this policy is that force shall not be used in the pursuit of national interests and that all international differences shall be resolved exclusively through peaceful means. That is why we oppose any aggression, whenever and wherever it takes place. In concert with other nations, we seek to build barriers against national aggrandizement and overt and covert violence by one nation against another. As in the past, we will continue to work for co-operation and not conflict, for equality not hegemony, for law and justice, not the rule of power and *fait accompli*. It is in this spirit that we have undertaken this debate. While, therefore, we shall be glad to see the prestige and the will of this Organization fully committed to the proper implementation of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council, we are equally anxious that the Council do its utmost to bring about a settlement without the least delay. The danger to West Asia through failure to implement that resolution is so grave that our delegation is most anxious to co-operate with all others to do its utmost to avert it.

182. My delegation has briefly outlined its views on the situation in West Asia and on the way it should be resolved. We insist on the withdrawal of foreign forces from occupied Arab territories and on the non-acquisition of territory by military conquest, for we believe that an honourable and durable peace can be built only upon the foundation of full respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of all States. The road to a lasting peace has been laid by the Security Council resolution and it is now up to the international community to ensure that this resolution is fully implemented. The dignitaries of almost all Member States who addressed this historical session have expressed their hopes and expectations from this great forum. Not mere resolutions, but firm action alone could fulfil these expectations. Let this year open a new era in the life and history of this Assembly and the Security Council.

183. The PRESIDENT: That was the last speaker on the list for this afternoon's meeting. The rest of the meeting will be devoted to the use of the right of reply. I should like to remind representatives of the decision taken that the time-limit for a speech in exercise of the right of reply is 10 minutes. I call now on the representative of the United Arab Republic.

184. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): Mr. President, I have asked for the floor to exercise my delegation's right of reply to some of the falsifications and distortions contained in the statement of the Foreign Minister of Israel. I intend to do so on the lines indicated by you this morning when you rightly described the purpose of the right of reply as being

that of preventing certain misconceptions from growing in the mind. I shall also endeavour to do so within the time-limit proposed by you and agreed to by the Assembly at the end of this morning's meeting.

185. It is regrettable that Mr. Eban saw fit to project into his statement this afternoon the venom of bitterness and the wrath of hate and to deliver it in a hostile and melodramatic performance.

186. As the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic observed in his statement at the beginning of this debate: "Ever since its inception, Israel has practised, for the realization of its expansionist designs, a twofold policy: that of military aggression and political deceit." [1884th meeting, para. 18.] The statement of Mr. Eban this afternoon was in the best traditions of that political deceit, for his statement contained a number of distortions regarding such issues as that of who committed aggression in 1948 and in 1967, who violated the Armistice Agreements of 1949, who denounced and undermined the cease-fire resolution of the Security Council of 1967, and who violated the cease-fire arrangements of 1970.

187. The historical record regarding all those issues was set straight by my Foreign Minister both in his statement at the commemorative session on 16 October [1869th meeting] and at the beginning of this debate on 26 October [1884th meeting]. It appears that that historical record has gravely disturbed Mr. Eban. He refers to it as a statement which hangs like a heavy cloud. It is understandable that such a statement hangs like a heavy cloud for the aggressor. Has it not uncovered Israel's aggression and substantiated its expansionist policy? Has it not recalled Israel's denunciation of all the international engagements it has contracted, including the Lausanne Protocol and the Armistice Agreements? Has it not recounted the rejection by Israel of the 23 resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the rights of Palestinian refugees, the four resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling upon Israel to rescind all measures it has taken to annex Jerusalem, and the 11 resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling upon Israel to respect human rights in the occupied territories and to abide by the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949?<sup>9</sup>

188. The Israeli Foreign Minister has the audacity to express concern for the provision of Article 12 of the Charter relating to the delimitation of the powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Is it not the height of duplicity that such pronouncements are made by the representative of an aggressor State which has violated the basic norms of the Charter of the United Nations, flouted the resolutions of its organs and defied its authority and will? Is it not the height of duplicity for the Foreign Minister of Israel to express concern for the jurisdiction of the Security Council while his Government has persistently obstructed all efforts for the implementation of its resolution 242 (1967), and its representative in the

Security Council did not desist from attributing to the Council "bankruptcy, politically, juridically and morally"?

189. Mr. Eban presented a misinterpretation of Article 12, of distortion of its purpose and an attempt to ignore the practice of the General Assembly as evidenced in a number of the resolutions it has adopted on a number of analagous questions.

190. As regards the purpose of Article 12, I should like to quote from the standard work on the interpretation of the Charter, of which you, Mr. President, are one of the co-authors. I refer to the third edition of Goodrich and Hambro's *Charter of the United Nations*. In the commentary on Article 12 it is stated:

"The purpose of Article 12 is to protect the Security Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security by excluding Assembly interference with its operations . . . . Article 12 (1) was intended to avoid the possibility of conflicting actions by the two organs."<sup>10</sup>

191. Your book also comments on the practice of the General Assembly of the United Nations in adopting a number of resolutions on colonial questions while the Security Council was seized of those questions. Your precise and accurate summing up of the practice relating to the interpretation of Article 12 was confirmed by the Legal Counsel in a statement made at the 1637th meeting of the Third Committee, on 12 December 1968, which is published in the *United Nations Juridical Yearbook 1968*, It reads:

"The Legal Counsel replied to the question . . . whether the adoption of measures of the kind provided for in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution [A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2] [by which the General Assembly would call upon all States to sever all relations with South Africa, Portugal and the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and scrupulously to refrain from giving any military or economic assistance to these régimes] was within the competence of the Third Committee. Article 10 of the United Nations Charter stated that the General Assembly might discuss any question or any matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, might make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council. Article 12 provided that, while the Security Council was exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the Charter, the General Assembly should not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requested. The matters relating to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese rule were on the agenda of the Security Council and, in principle, the General Assembly could not make any recommendations.

<sup>9</sup> Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

<sup>10</sup> L. M. Goodrich, E. Hambro, and A. P. Simons, *Charter of the United Nations — Commentary and Documents*, 3rd revised Ed. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1969), p. 129.

However, the Assembly had interpreted the words 'is exercising' as meaning 'is exercising at this moment'; consequently, it had made recommendations on other matters which the Security Council was also considering. Thus, in accordance with that practice followed by the General Assembly, there were no obstacles to the recommending of measures of the kind provided for in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2."

192. In the book of which you, Mr. President, are a co-author, the commentary on the Article concludes: "In practice, this initial effort to impose a broad restriction upon the Assembly's powers has not been sustained."<sup>11</sup>

193. Mr. Eban comes today to the General Assembly to ask it to divest itself of its responsibility. Israel having persistently refused to express its readiness to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) for almost three years, having obstructed the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, having opposed the four-Power talks and having from the moment it announced its acceptance of the United States initiative set out to suppress it, its Foreign Minister comes today to obstruct the work of the Assembly. He alleges that we are asking the General Assembly to adopt resolutions which would endanger the chances of success of the efforts of the Security Council. I wish to quote from the statement of my Foreign Minister to indicate to the General Assembly what we are requesting from it:

"The General Assembly can and should play a positive role in assisting the Security Council in its task to secure the implementation of the peaceful settlement embodied in resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. Towards this end, every Member of the United Nations could contribute effectively." [1884th meeting, para. 7.]

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 131.

194. My delegation, therefore, has no doubt that the practice which the General Assembly has followed in similar questions, a practice which the stated legal opinion of the competent United Nations authority has clearly endorsed, will not be departed from.

195. It is quite clear that what we are envisaging is not for the General Assembly to obstruct the efforts of the Security Council but rather to help in the implementation of the resolution of the Council and to throw the weight of the General Assembly, as the representative of the international community, behind the weight of the Security Council.

196. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers for this afternoon, but I should like to make one or two announcements before we adjourn. First, I should like to repeat that a draft resolution on the present item has been distributed in document A/L.602. Those representatives whose names are already inscribed on the list of speakers should if they desire—as I hope they will—discuss also the text of the draft resolution.

197. Second, it is the intention of the President to propose tomorrow that the list of speakers should be closed at 6 p.m.

198. Furthermore, also tomorrow, the President will suggest that from the beginning of next week a time limit of 15 minutes should be set for all statements.

199. In order not to rush the Assembly, these two proposals will be made formally tomorrow morning—to close the list of speakers at 6 p.m. tomorrow, and to have a time limit of 15 minutes on all statements, beginning on Monday morning.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*