



CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the memory of Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, former Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs . . . .	1
Agenda item 22: The situation in the Middle East ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	4

*President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).*

*Tribute to the memory of Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, former Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs*

1. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
2. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The death of Ralph Bunche this morning is a grave loss to the United Nations, to his country, to all his many friends the world over and especially to those of us in the United Nations who knew and worked with him. I myself have lost an incomparable friend and colleague.
3. Ralph Bunche was an international institution in his own right, transcending both nationality and race in a way that is achieved by very few. He was the most effective and best known of international civil servants, to my knowledge, and his record of achievement as an individual member of the Secretariat was unsurpassed. He was an outstanding example of that new twentieth-century breed of international officials who devote all of their gifts and their very lives to the service of the community of mankind.
4. Ralph Bunche was already well known in the academic world and in government circles when he came to the United Nations in 1945, first as a member of the United States delegation and, a year later, as a member of the Secretariat. He was perhaps best known for his work as Mediator in the Middle East in 1948 and 1949 and for the negotiation of the Armistice Agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbours, for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, but he left his mark in many other areas. He was a leader in the United Nations' work on colonial questions during his years as Principal Director in the United Nations Trusteeship Department, and he laboured longer—and did perhaps more than any other man—to build up and maintain the pioneering peace-keeping operations of the United Nations, with all of which he was closely associated from their beginning. He was a uniquely valuable member of the Secretariat and, despite increasing ill health, he played until recently a major role in the day-to-day work of the Organization. Only last year he bore the brunt of the complex private negotiations which finally led to the solution of the problem of the status of Bahrain. Until the very last, his extraordinarily clear mind remained in touch with and preoccupied by the problems of the world as reflected in the United Nations.
5. Great though his many achievements were, I remember particularly his qualities of mind and character—his unshakable integrity, his indefatigable and selfless sense of responsibility, his extraordinary ability as a negotiator and adviser, his unfailing insight into the tangled affairs of mankind, his sense of the importance of human dignity, his determination, in the face of all odds, to do whatever he could for justice and peace in the world, and, above all, his kindness, humour and deep compassion. In a characteristically realistic and clear-minded way, and without any illusions as to the difficulties, he believed passionately in the necessity of making the United Nations work and in all the noble aims for which the Organization stands.
6. After a full and immensely effective life, a great friend of mankind has left us. I share the deep sorrow of Ralph's devoted wife, Ruth, and his family, to whom I extend all my sympathy and condolences.
7. May I suggest, Mr. President, that the Assembly rise for a minute of silence in tribute to this outstanding servant of international peace.
8. The PRESIDENT: May I ask the General Assembly to stand for a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Ralph Bunche.  
*The members of the General Assembly observed a minute of silence.*
9. The PRESIDENT: As President of the General Assembly I should like to add my own expression of condolence to the members of the family of Mr. Bunche, to you, Mr. Secretary-General, and to the American nation.
10. The tribute which the General Assembly has just made came at a time when we are once again discussing the question of the situation in the Middle East. Ralph Bunche had devoted a great deal of his time and his talents seeking a peaceful solution to that situation.
11. I call on the representative of Zambia on behalf of the African States.
12. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche died early today after a long and painful illness. His death has deprived us all of a career of long and constant service to the United Nations and to humanity as a whole. Dr. Bunche was born in Detroit on 7 August 1904. He won a scholarship and obtained a bachelor's degree from the

University of California at Los Angeles, a master's and a doctor's degree from Harvard University. After having travelled in Africa on a research fellowship, he did post-doctoral work in colonial policy and anthropology at Northwestern University, the London School of Economics and the University of Cape Town.

13. Dr. Ralph Bunche established the Department of Political Science at Washington's Howard University where he served as an academic Professor for many years. From the academic life, Dr. Bunche moved to the United States Office of Strategic Services as Chief of the Africa Section. Later he became President Truman's appointee as Commissioner for the Caribbean.

14. He was seconded to the United Nations in May 1946 as Director of the Trusteeship Division, becoming Under-Secretary in 1955. Dr. Bunche took a deep personal interest in matters pertaining to racial discrimination and human rights, not only on his own behalf, but on behalf of all victims of racial discrimination. Long before legislation guaranteeing Afro-Americans full access to all public accommodation, he was involved in personal and much publicized disputes with hotels in the southern parts of the United States and with the prestigious West Side Tennis Club in New York.

15. Dr. Ralph Bunche was an authority on peace-keeping operations. One of his most outstanding achievements in this field was his mediation role in the Palestine Armistice Agreements between the Arabs and the Israelis in 1949, for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

16. Dr. Ralph Bunche was truly an outstanding public servant, whose performance can at best be equalled, but not surpassed. His dedication to duty went beyond the normal call of duty. His patience and negotiating skill commanded the respect of the most bitter opponents. He contained within himself the forcefulness of character, the capacity for leadership and the humility and gentleness of a public servant.

17. As we mourn his loss, the silence of his voice and his eternal absence from this planet, we should all look back at the greatness that was his life, and seek new strength from the source of his convictions in the United Nations as a true framework of the world in which all nations of the world can live in peace and brotherhood. His personal work may be considered as finished, but the purposes which motivated his many activities are everlasting and our greatest tribute to this great world citizen would be to grasp these noble purposes and continue to work for the values which he so deeply believed in.

18. As the African States join other States in the United Nations and the citizens of the world in praying for Dr. Bunche's soul to rest in peace, let it be remembered that rarely in the history of mankind has so much been owed by so many to one man.

19. We ask the Secretary-General to convey to Mrs. Bunche and the family the sincere condolences of the African States on this indescribable loss they have just suffered. Despite man's many achievements in science and technology, the death of Dr. Bunche has demonstrated

once again that man, no matter what his achievement, is only a stranger visiting the planet of this earth. May whatever Lord we believe in give us the strength to change the things we can, the courage to accept what we cannot change and the wisdom to know the difference between what we can change and what we cannot change.

20. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon on behalf of the Asian States.

21. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, on behalf of the delegations of the Asian States and my own delegation I wish to join in the tribute paid by you and by the Secretary-General and to express the profound sorrow we all feel on the passing away of Dr. Ralph Bunche. Indeed, the United States has lost a great son, the United Nations a devout international civil servant, and the world a staunch advocate of peace.

22. Dr. Bunche's devoted service to the cause of peace earned him world-wide recognition and unique acknowledgement when he was granted the Nobel Prize. His dedication to the ideals of the United Nations and to the purposes and principles of the Charter, as well as his tireless activities to promote and implement them, have become proverbial.

23. Dr. Bunche indeed lived his ideals; he became part and parcel of them, as they were part of him. He set an example of international service hard to match. His impartiality, good judgement and penetrating insight enabled him and the Secretaries-General with whom he was associated to make significant contributions to the solution of thorny problems in the Middle East and the Congo, and all the other questions which came before the Security Council.

24. His good humour, easy accessibility and human and humane qualities endeared him to all people who come in contact with him, whether members of delegations or the Secretariat.

25. He certainly will be missed by all, and mostly by the Secretary-General, and we feel that the United Nations is the poorer for his fading away from our midst.

26. It is a privilege in life to be associated with great people. It was our privilege here to have encountered on the path of our lives Ralph Bunche, the peace-maker. We shall always cherish his memory.

27. The delegations of the Asian States want me to express to our esteemed Secretary-General and, through him, to the bereaved family of Dr. Ralph Bunche, our most heartfelt sympathy and sincerest condolences.

28. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Costa Rica to speak on behalf of the Latin American States.

29. Mr. MOLINA (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Everybody who devotes a major part of his life to the struggle for respect for human dignity without discrimination of any kind should enjoy the sympathy and respect of all men, because he embodies the supreme values of the spirit which are present at all times in all those who truly have an inner life.

30. The image of Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche in a world that is not always governed by understanding and good neighbourliness among peoples stands out as that of a serene figure who in the midst of the storm seeks a return to calm, but a return in dignity that will ensure to all men adequate protection of their rights.

31. Therefore, in paying a tribute in this world parliament to Dr. Bunche, I wish, on behalf of the Latin American States, to express our respectful words of admiration to his memory, and to reiterate our sorrow to his esteemed family, to the Secretary-General of our Organization, and to Ambassador Bush, Permanent Representative of the United States of America, the country whose citizen he was.

32. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Hungary to speak on behalf of the Eastern European States.

33. Mr. SZARKA (Hungary): The delegations of the Eastern European States learned with great sorrow the news of the death of Dr. Ralph Bunche. Dr. Bunche had long been a devoted member and distinguished Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations. Representatives came to know him as a man of wide knowledge and experience, as well as a man of great personal charm. His death represents a great and painful loss to the United Nations family. While expressing once more our sorrow over the passing away of that eminent international civil servant, I wish to request the delegation of the United States of America to transmit to its Government and to the family of Dr. Ralph Bunche the expression of deep sympathy of the delegations on whose behalf I have the honour to speak.

34. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Portugal to speak on behalf of the Western European and other States.

35. Mr. PATRÍCIO (Portugal): In my capacity as chairman of the group of Western European and other States it is my duty to say a few words of tribute to the late Dr. Ralph Bunche, until recently Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs.

36. To his family, to all his friends, to the United Nations, to the delegation of the United States, and to the American Government and people, we wish to extend the expression of our sincere sympathy. Indeed, it is not only his family and country that have suffered this great and irreparable loss through his passing away, but also the United Nations as a whole.

37. I am sure his was not an easy job. To be a member of the United Nations Secretariat, holding such a prominent position as he did for such a long time, and acting at the same time with independence and integrity as well as a keen sense of justice, Dr. Ralph Bunche possessed exceptional qualities.

38. As Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs since 1958, after having been with the United Nations since its creation, he was called to play a very significant and prominent role in some of the most serious problems raised in the United Nations, namely, the disputes concerning the Middle East, Kashmir, the Congo, Yemen and Cyprus. He was also connected with the organization and

direction of the United Nations peace-keeping operations and acted in a supervisory role with regard to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus; and before that, he had been responsible for matters concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

39. For his work in the cause of peace he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950.

40. We all know that he had been ailing for a long time, but, inspired by a keen sense of duty, he insisted on attending to his job at the United Nations until very recently, assisting the Secretary-General in dealing with some of the thorniest questions of our time.

41. Dr. Bunche's services to the United Nations are too well known to be stressed here, but at this moment of sorrow we must recall the name and work of this truly dedicated international servant who contributed so much to ensure for all a better United Nations in the quest for a better world.

42. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Yemen to speak on behalf of the Arab States.

43. Mr. GEGHMAN (Yemen): It is with a heavy heart that I stand here to pay a tribute to a man whose passing away is a loss to the United Nations and to the whole world. On behalf of the Arab States I wish to express, through you, Mr. President, to the family of Dr. Ralph Bunche, to the Government and people of the United States of America and to the United Nations, our sincere condolences and deepest sympathy. We feel that this Organization has suffered a great loss. Dr. Bunche was an outstanding international civil servant, a great champion of peace, justice and human dignity and a world citizen who took an interest in and devoted himself nobly to justice, peace, human dignity and the freedom of man all over the world. His dedication to the cause of peace with justice and to the lofty principles of the United Nations was unparalleled.

44. The Arab world will always cherish the memory of Dr. Ralph Bunche, because, despite all the pressures, which amounted at times to a threat to his own life, Dr. Bunche was convinced of the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine and would not bargain it away or succumb to pressures. We in Yemen, in particular, will never forget his devotion and his superhuman effort to alleviate the suffering caused by war in Yemen during the darkest hour of our modern history.

45. With the passing of Dr. Ralph Bunche the whole world has lost a great champion of peace; and it is indeed ironical that when the doves of peace are being massacred in more than a quarter of the world the man of peace has passed away.

46. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the United States.

47. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): In the name of the family of Dr. Ralph Bunche, in the name of the Government, people and delegation of the United States I wish to extend profound and heartfelt thanks to the speakers who have preceded me here and spoken on behalf

of the entire United Nations. In the constellation of United Nations leaders, the name of Ralph Bunche holds a unique place of honour. His death marks the end of a United Nations era. His example will be a permanent inspiration to all of us who care about the future of the United Nations as a world organization for peace.

48. As President Nixon said today:

“Present at the foundation of the United Nations and engaged since its inception in its most delicate and demanding missions, Dr. Bunche never relented in his persistence to advance the cause of brotherhood and co-operation among men and nations. America is deeply proud of this distinguished son and profoundly saddened by his death; but we are also strengthened by the inexhaustible measure of dedication and creative action that span his splendid career. His calm and wise counsel will be sorely missed in the chambers of the United Nations.”

49. To the words of the President I would simply add that we in the United States have a special cause to be proud that this eminent American gave his greatest years of service to the United Nations and to the goals of the Charter. There could have been no finer embodiment of this country's enduring support for the United Nations than his impartial service at the highest levels of this Organization for some 25 years.

50. Dr. Bunche rose from very humble beginnings and through the force and goodness of his own character overcame the obstacles of poverty and racial bias; and he learned, as he himself said, to fight without hatred and to harbour no bitterness against anybody. That facet of his character was one secret of his peace-keeping and negotiating powers, which enabled him to achieve the 1949 Armistice Agreements in the Middle East, for which he earned the Nobel Peace Prize, being one of the youngest men ever to be so honoured. From relative obscurity, the name of Ralph Bunche became a household word, not simply in the United States, but throughout the world.

51. Dr. Bunche dealt throughout his life with the weakness and the combativeness of human nature, but he remained, in his own words, an incurable optimist. He once explained the tragic recurrence of war by observing that through war man has been “less virtuous, less constant, less rational, less peaceful than he knows how to be, than he is fully capable of being”.

52. No man in United Nations history has given a finer example of those qualities of which man is capable at his very best than Ralph J. Bunche. Throughout an illustrious career he put his rare gifts at the service of peace, as an international civil servant, and also at the service of justice and fair play for all people, regardless of race.

#### AGENDA ITEM 22

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

53. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is this year taking up the

problem of the Middle East in a completely different political context from the soothing bath in which the debate took place last year, when everyone was more or less clinging to the illusory hope that Israel would finally give way to the bidding of our Organization or to the pressure of the Powers from which it draws its fighting strength. But we must agree that as we meet today we find ourselves back where we started, in an international climate which is overshadowed by the distressing Indo-Pakistan conflict.

54. Israel, for its part, under the convenient cloak of the generosity of others, has not ceased to advance its pawns over the whole chessboard and to request, and often obtain, financial and military reinforcements to consolidate its positions in the conquered territory and create what it is wont to call the irreversible, the non-negotiable—that is to say, *le fait accompli*—and to drive out or displace the Palestine population from one sector to another and to install in conditions of military conquest advanced kibbutzim initially run by farmer-soldiers, because it is not yet certain that there will be no problems. Later, when pacification had made some progress, classical colonization would take over.

55. I am perhaps given the impression of using polemical and tendentious language in order to plead my cause. That is why it seems to me that it would be preferable, as regards the real objectives of Israel and the spirit which inspires its leaders, to allow Mrs. Golda Meir, General Moshe Dayan and even Mr. Abba Eban to speak—the latter of whom so excels in the art of showing more than one face to the world, which sometimes listens to him but often would like to understand him.

56. Mrs. Meir stated in the Knesset in May of this year the following:

“Jerusalem must remain unified and an integral part of Israel.

“Israel will not leave the Golan Heights, which dominate the Hula valley.

“Arab troops must not recross the Jordan.

“I am opposed to the establishment of a Palestinian state on the west bank.”

57. General Moshe Dayan, who is known to everyone for his outspokenness, stated for his part:

“Our fathers obtained the frontiers, which were recognized under the partition plan of 1947. Our generation obtained the frontiers of 1949. But the generation of the six-day war reached Suez, the Jordan, and the Golan Heights in Syria. This will not be the end of the matter. After the present cease-fire lines, there will be other, new lines, but they should extend beyond the Jordan perhaps both to Lebanon and central Syria.”

58. As to Mr. Eban, who is in charge of Israeli diplomacy—in other words the man who in principle is supposed to use the most cautious language about the actual intentions of Israel, he stated on 11 November last:

“The kibbutzim established in the territories under Israeli control in Sinai, Gaza, cis-Jordan and Golan are in

\* Resumed from the 2006th meeting.

places which Israel intends to retain in the future and will never return to the Arab countries.”

59. Speaking in the En Hamifraz Labutz, Mr. Eban also stated that peace would not be restored until a change occurred in the mentality and way of speaking of the Arabs. He added that this would take time. This is well-known colonialist language.

60. This is what the highest leaders of Israel have unambiguously declared, after Security Council resolution 242 (1967), after the resolutions on Jerusalem, after the attempts of Jarring, after the meetings of the Four, and after the initiatives taken by the greater and lesser Powers, individually or in concert.

61. But there is nothing here to surprise us. My delegation has never tired of reminding the Security Council and this Assembly that Israel had never intended to accept international law, the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations as a basis for its conduct. Israel has been a constant aggressor ever since its birth. Israel was born and grew exclusively to the detriment of the Arab countries and peoples. Israel, as I have just demonstrated, does not conceal this. Mr. Moshe Dayan has stated that Israel has not yet set the limits of the territory which it has ultimately decided to obtain.

62. Israel, although created by the United Nations, no longer recognizes that this Organization has the right to demand of it respect for international frontiers or the frontiers assigned to it by the Organization.

63. I should like to pay a tribute here to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Mr. Riad, not only for the extremely well-documented and well-written statement which he made to this Assembly [1999<sup>th</sup> meeting], but for having had the idea of distributing here a series of maps which demonstrate strikingly how Israel was born, where it was a year later, and where it is after 20 years of continuous aggression, and, lastly, what will be the final picture of the greater Israel which is intended to stretch from the Nile to the Euphrates.

64. I would like to pause here for a moment to ask the members of this Assembly to have no illusions about where the ambitions of the Israelis are tending. I think we should all be aware of the facts. Israel is torn by internal dissensions, it is said. These dissensions are essentially centred around the size of the ideal State, the final State. It is an electoral theme of the highest importance, a decisive argument in internal policy. Hence, this fierce competition.

65. The idea of a national home for the Jews took shape at the end of the last century and at the beginning of this century. However, it was a question of granting the Jews a token territory somewhere in the world, and it was not even planned to be in Palestine, but in Uganda. It was only Lord Balfour's promise, at the end of the First World War, to create this home in Palestine, the population of which at that time was 95 per cent Arab, which led to the present tragedy. Immediately after the War the promise became reality on Palestinian territory, but it was still 95 per cent Arab at that time. Hence, the problem of Palestine, a

problem which at that time did not have its present dimensions and was not at that time the principal cause for the troubles affecting the Powers of the world.

66. But we were all able to witness the evolution of this problem as it assumed ever-growing proportions in 1947, 1948, 1956, and 1967, right up to the present day. The question of Palestine gradually became the Arab-Israel problem, then the Middle East problem, that is to say, a problem besetting a whole region.

67. I wish to state that this question is no longer one of the Middle East alone. We have not yet agreed on any new title for it. But the Suez Canal is closed, the problem now concerns the whole Mediterranean, the Bosphorus, the Red Sea, east and central Africa, the Arabian-Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, and so on.

68. The Organization of African Unity, which consists of 41 States, has regularly been voting resolutions of solidarity with Egypt, demanding the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied territories. The non-aligned world, which is concerned constantly with this problem, continually recalls the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and requests the withdrawal of Israeli occupation troops.

69. The United Nations and the specialized agencies, in one way or another, at each of their sessions have to face up to the many and varied consequences of the expulsion of the Palestinian people from their territory and Israeli expansionism at the expense of its neighbours.

70. The great Powers, which, on the initiative of France, have been undertaking long negotiations—unfortunately in vain—have themselves conceded that world peace is endangered by the continuation of a crisis which they consider sufficiently serious to deal with at their own State level.

71. Former President Johnson of the United States wrote in his book *The Vantage Point*: “Trouble in that area was, in my judgment, potentially far more dangerous than the war in Southeast Asia.”<sup>1</sup>

72. Ever since the Israeli aggression of June 1967 it may be considered today, in spite of some misleading appearances, that Israel has in fact closed all the doors to a peaceful and equitable solution. Indeed, Israel has no intention of resolving this crisis except by force and conquest. And Mr. Eban told us recently [2000<sup>th</sup> meeting] his position on this point is in keeping with what he called established precedents in the matter of pacification immediately after a war—which, in plain words, means the law which the conqueror imposes on the conquered.

73. As Mr. Eban has elsewhere declared that each Government has its own principles of international law—from which I deduced that he does not recognize ours, that of the United Nations—one can clearly see why Israel refuses to co-operate with our Organization and with Mr. Jarring in the search for a peaceful solution to the problem.

<sup>1</sup> Lyndon Baines Johnson, *The Vantage Point: Perspectives of the Presidency 1963-1969* (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), p. 287.

74. In spite of his denials, Mr. Eban rejects the Jarring mission both in form and in substance. He rejects the proposals of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, scornfully dismissing the aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 [A/8541, annex I], describing this as a document which should not be canonized, although this document was based primarily on a commitment by Israel to withdraw its forces from the occupied territories of Egypt up to the international frontier existing at the time of the British Mandate, in order to make possible the implementation of the other provisions of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. Israel replied without any qualification that it would not withdraw to the lines prior to 5 June 1967.

75. In order to dispel any doubts that anyone may be harbouring, Mr. Eban added in his recent statement on the evacuation of Sinai that there are vital interests affecting the security, peace and shipping of Israel which make it necessary for Israel to reserve the right to reach an agreement which would enable it to protect them.

76. Thus the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of his Special Representative [A/8541] is particularly significant where it states that the Israeli Government has not responded to the request that it make some undertaking on the subject of withdrawal to the international frontier with Egypt.

77. The Organization of African Unity, in one of its bursts of generosity and responsibility, which it has already displayed in other situations, entrusted President Moktar Ould Daddah of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania with a delicate mission in which nine other heads of African States co-operated and gave of their best. This mission visited the region and got in touch with all the leaders in order to obtain a better understanding of the problem. We consider that this was a constructive contribution to the peace-making efforts in the region and we must express our gratitude and appreciation to the mission. We, for our part, have already done so in full sincerity.

78. Mr. Eban, on the other hand, declared that he gave an affirmative reply to the proposal of the Committee of the Organization of African Unity. Now, of the six proposals which were submitted to it, Israel replied six times in succession that it was ready to negotiate those proposals with Egypt. In what way has this made it possible for the Committee to make progress? What has it revealed besides what we already know from its negative attitude?

79. All the components of a solution remain subject to negotiation, which Israel wants to be direct and without any preconditions whereas, at the same time, it is unabashedly setting its own conditions, which it described itself as flowing from the outcome of the six-day war. These can be summed up in two points: a refusal to give back territories acquired by force and a refusal to restore to their own territory the Palestinians who wish to return there.

80. Thus, Israel refuses to give back all the territories occupied by force. As for the problem of the Palestinians, Israel wishes to consider this only from the point of view of a possible share in the compensation of the refugees and

their reinstatement in the region, without any mention of their return to their homes.

81. This Organization has several times reaffirmed the principle of the non-annexation of territory by force. The Assembly has repeatedly stated that complete respect for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is a prerequisite for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Israel unreservedly rejects these two principles, with or without negotiations.

82. The whole Middle East crisis can be summed up in these fundamental factors and international peace will be endangered more each day in this region if the United Nations and the Powers responsible do not make up their minds to confront the problems with realism, firmness and determination.

83. Israel has tried to construct its existence and its prosperity on the ruins of the Arab State of Palestine. However, the people of Palestine have been able to survive the storm. What is more, and in spite of the sufferings they have undergone and continue to undergo both in the occupied territories as well as in their countries of asylum, this people has displayed astonishing vitality and unprecedented determination not only by reaffirming its existence to the world, but also by demanding by word and deed its right to return to its homeland and to receive just reparation for the wrongs which have been done to it. It is pointless coyly to cast a veil over this injustice, which we, the Arab countries, are constantly aware of at every moment. The United Nations, too, has had ample opportunity for appreciating this during the course of the particularly animated debates on the question in the various committees, and in particular in the Special Political Committee and the Third Committee. Any solution which disregards the reality of the existence of the people of Palestine is sooner or later doomed to a resounding failure.

84. Israel must realize, and realize fully, the fact that, as long as the Palestinian people are considered to be a negligible and neglected quantity in the debates, there will be no lasting peace in the region. A lasting peace must come through the restoration of the rights of the people of Palestine, their rights to justice, to compensation, to reparations, to freedom and to self-determination. To disregard this fact is, sooner or later, to come up against great difficulties.

85. My country, which has never lost sight of this essential aspect of the problem, is sparing no effort both to grant its effective support to the people of Palestine and also to plead its cause before all possible tribunals.

86. If the members of this Assembly have lent an attentive ear to the statements of the representatives of Egypt, Syria and Jordan since the Israeli aggression of 5 June 1967 to date, they cannot possibly have any further doubt about the impossibility of obtaining from those three States the acceptance, on any conditions, of any contractual territorial concessions in favour of Israel.

87. Here again, both the Secretary-General and his representative and the Powers which have intervened at any given time between the Arab countries and Israel, in order

to find practical and practicable solutions, have all taken note of the fierce and at the same time legitimate determination of the Arab countries not to yield an inch of their territory to the adversary, regardless of the circumstances and on no matter what pretext.

88. This attitude, which may appear rigid, should not only be accepted but also supported and encouraged by the United Nations because it is enshrined in the Charter, in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and in our resolutions. No prize should be awarded for force and violence. That is a principle which each of us should be able to invoke for his own protection tomorrow, without reservation or hesitation. Otherwise, it will be the end of our Organization. How could it be otherwise? If this principle does not have the full and general support of the United Nations, the door would then be open to international anarchy and the law of the jungle.

89. The Powers which assume major responsibility in the conduct of world affairs are themselves, in the Tripartite Declaration of 1950,<sup>2</sup> committed to oppose any attempt to infringe the international frontiers of the Middle East. This commitment is merely a solemn confirmation of obvious and logical commitments of these same Powers in the Middle East and elsewhere to oppose any change of frontiers by force, in keeping with the Charter and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)].

90. As soon as this principle is openly infringed, the Powers in a position to act cannot shirk their duty and fall short of their commitments. Of course, it is natural to request and obtain additional time in order to try and exhaust the normal means of persuasion. But is it conceivable now that all normal means have been exhausted? In the view of my delegation, it is conceivable.

91. Israel has had several successful performances, including the one in which it invariably rejects all peaceful solutions, thus cutting itself off primarily from the countries of the third world, which has not been long in recognizing it for what it really is—an instrument and an organ of international colonialism. Also, and as a result of the same attitude, Israel has succeeded in alienating its best European allies by its intransigence and arrogance. Lastly, as we had an opportunity to read in the Israeli magazine *Maariv* on 25 November last, Mr. William Rogers himself is reported to have stated that “Israel is the most isolated country in the world and that the Jewish State, whose image in the eyes of the world is entirely negative, has never had such a bad reputation.”

92. I do not think that the last journey of Mrs. Golda Meir to Washington has appreciably changed this image which has driven Israel back to its last defences.

93. In order to permit the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, to resume his mission, we think that Israel is in duty bound to reply positively and as soon as possible to the aide-mémoire addressed to it on 8 February 1971. Israel must also announce clearly its

intentions with regard to the restoration of the rights of the people of Palestine without shifting this responsibility to the neighbouring countries or the international community.

94. Egypt, for its part, has displayed a patience and wisdom equal to its age-old history and to its infinite confidence in a future of dignity which no transitory incident can ever succeed in blemishing. Egypt has displayed, in the view of all, and particularly in the view of the committee of African wise men, a clear will for peace, on the condition that all the occupied Arab territories are restored and the inalienable rights of the Palestinians are respected.

95. If this turns out to be impossible again this year, in and through the United Nations, our Organization should finally make up its mind to apply the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, which are provisions for the case of failure of one of the parties to a conflict to abide by measures which the Security Council has deemed necessary. This is precisely the case before us now.

96. If our Organization were to show itself incapable of giving effect at this decisive stage to any form of action, this confession of impotence will be fraught with serious consequences, because another principle, not one enshrined in the Charter but one which is always imminent, provides that what has been taken by force can only be restored by force.

97. My delegation, devoted to the peaceful solution of disputes, shudders to contemplate such prospects. I hope with all my heart that a peaceful solution, which does exist and which is within our grasp, can be adopted here and applied immediately.

98. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to request delegations that intend to submit draft resolutions to do so as soon as possible. In view of the very limited time available, I may have to set a time-limit for the submission of draft proposals.

99. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): A debate on the situation in the Middle East is not and cannot be an ordinary debate. Every one of us is aware of the emotional content of the problems to be examined but also of the close interaction of their different components and of their ever-growing dimensions. The situation has evolved since 1947; not only does it involve the peoples of the region but also, because of the progressive involvement of the great Powers, it directly affects the world balance of power and constitutes a threat as obvious as it is immediate to international peace. Therefore it behoves us to take up this debate with the calmness it requires but also with a sincere desire to ascertain the true facts so as to assess them in complete fairness and objectivity.

100. The stakes are very important, because the problems at issue here profoundly affect the present and the future of millions of men, and it would be unworthy of our Assembly if, in considering them, it were to be governed by selfish considerations, unseemly bargaining and, even more, immoral pressures.

101. Doubtless this is not the first time that such a discussion is opened on the situation on the Middle East,

<sup>2</sup> Joint declaration by France, the United Kingdom and the United States, made in May 1950.

and it is characteristic of problems which go unsolved for a long time that they become overgrown with a plethora of new facts, which end up by distorting its beginnings and concealing fundamentals.

102. The crisis in the Middle East came into being with the creation of Israel in 1947 and since then no satisfactory or lasting solution has been found. There have been periods of recrudescence, particularly during the Israeli aggressions of 1948 and 1956. However, the attention of our Organization and that of all the countries of the world has in recent years been particularly directed towards the new dangers engendered by the Israeli aggression of June 1967. This situation is reflected in the occupation by Israel of territories which belong to three Arab countries, Members of the United Nations, and is based on a precarious cease-fire agreement, the fragility of which leaves the way open for the outbreak of new hostilities.

103. Every attempt at settlement has so far been carried out in the context of resolution 242 (1967), which was adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967. It was on the basis of the principles enunciated in that resolution that the Jarring mission was launched. United States diplomacy, for its part, has attempted to arrive at what has been called an "interim settlement", considered to be a first step in the implementation of the resolution. Finally, quite recently, a mission of African Heads of State, under a mandate from the Organization of African Unity, attempted to explore the possibilities of resuming the Jarring mission.

104. Now it is quite clear that all these efforts have been unsuccessful, while the situation unceasingly deteriorates. Israel is maintaining its military occupation of Arab territories, in which it takes steps to bring about final annexation. Jerusalem continues to arouse the greatest concern and this has been expressed recently by the Security Council in its resolution 298 (1971). The Palestinians are still leading a wretched life in the camps for refugees, and the international organization which is in charge of them every year launches urgent appeals for material and financial support on a larger scale. Finally, the accumulation of weapons in the region continues at an accelerated rate.

105. Thus, no progress has been made towards a settlement of the situation, either partial or complete, and, in particular, resolution 242 (1967) has not even begun to be implemented. The documents which have been made public in the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of his Special Representative in the Middle East [A/8541], enable us to assess objectively who among the various parties is responsible for this failure.

106. The laborious interpretations and dubious explanations given here by the representative of Israel cannot easily disguise the truth, which is the obvious and total responsibility of Israel for the failure of the Jarring mission and of that of other attempts at settlement. The intransigence of Israel is not new and its conduct, since its creation, has always been to create a *de facto* situation and then to demand that this situation be endorsed by the international institutions. This conduct is characterized by the aggressiveness and expansionism of Israel.

107. We are aware that Israel has always claimed not to be the aggressor. But how could it be otherwise? And when has one ever heard an aggressor admit his aggression? The aggressor is the one who strikes first, the one who is the first to resort to arms. Israel would have us believe that this is preventive aggression. But have there been any aggressions in history which have not claimed to be preventive? Need we recall the memory, which is still fresh in our minds, and which should be even fresher in the minds of the Jews, of the invasions of Hitler and the pretexts used for them?

108. This aggressiveness is a result of the very terms on which Israel was created and the justification of its existence condemns it to expansionism. Having been settled on a land which does not belong to it and having been founded on an exclusively religious criterion, it naturally had to evict the legitimate occupants and incur their hostility, as well as that of all its neighbours, because its essentially racist character does not allow it to be harmoniously integrated in the region. The intensive immigration of Jews from all corners of the world, which it encourages and whereby it wishes to justify its existence, compels it constantly to seek territorial expansion which it seeks to legitimize by alleging the need to ensure its security. And thus an endless process is started, a process which is further facilitated by the material means and the support which it has and which are guaranteed to it by the powerful Jewish minorities which are so strong and influential, particularly in Western countries. The World Zionist Organization thus gives Israel a character that is both distinctive and dangerous, which enables it to use the resources and policies of other States to serve its own purposes.

109. The image of a small country which is peace-loving and full of goodwill, lost in the morass of backward Arab hordes full of hatred for Jews, is but the invention of an expertly planned propaganda campaign. The truth which is gradually emerging is quite different and cannot be indefinitely concealed by constantly harking back to the ills which have befallen the Jews. The presence of Israel in the Middle East will always be a danger to all the countries of the region and a permanent threat to their security. The history of these last 20 years is edifying if one will but take the trouble to see things as they are with complete objectivity.

110. Our debate would certainly be quite incomplete if we were to content ourselves with apportioning responsibility for the failure in attempts at settlement which have been made. It might not be entirely useless to wonder whether the direction given to these attempts is suitable and can really arrive at the results sought. And this leads me to speak of resolution 242 (1967), which has become in a way the alpha and omega of all international action in regard to the Middle East and prompts me to wonder and ask the Assembly to think over whether, in spite of everything that has been said, that resolution was really adequate to bring about a settlement.

111. I must recall that Algeria has never endorsed that resolution and we maintain that attitude. This is because we have always doubted its realism and its effectiveness. I know that some have seen in this an excessive intransigence on our part, an extremist attitude which is more sentiment-

tal than sensible and a rigidity out of keeping with reality. But they are sorely mistaken. The people of Algeria are as devoted to peace as any other people in the world and we do not want war for the sake of war; we have proved in our conduct as a free and independent people the value which we place on the freedom of others and on sincere and trusting co-operation between all nations. But we know too that the freedom of peoples cannot be bargained for like a delivery of oil, that the dignity of man cannot be negotiated like a customs agreement. In registering the total failure of resolution 242 (1967), the delegation of Algeria does not take any pride in seeing its previous estimates confirmed; but we do not want the Organization to repeat its errors, which result in wretchedness, unhappiness and death for men who have as much right to live as others, to live fully, freely and worthily.

112. But let us go back to resolution 242 (1967). Those who supported and who still support it see its virtue first in the fact that it is based upon a hard-won compromise and then in the fact that, starting with the situation ensuing from the Israeli aggression of 1967, it was supposed to bring a final and global settlement to the problems of the Middle East.

113. That balance is so precious and so intricate that it has to be handled with the utmost caution and at all costs one should avoid reopening its discussion since that might destroy it. When the debate on the Middle East opened last year, several delegations insisted that nothing must undermine or shake this fragile edifice and it was proposed that the General Assembly should be content with reaffirming the provisions of resolution 242 (1967). Can we not see even here the inherent weakness of the resolution intended to remedy a complex situation by a series of measures, whose structure was so flimsy?

114. In fact, what was the balance? Was it a balance between the intentions, the calculations, the interests or the great Powers? True, it was necessary to arrive at a text that would win their unanimous assent and thus obtain from the Security Council a decision which would carry all the more weight since it enjoyed the widest possible support. The quest for such harmonization is certainly not easy. Perhaps an agreement reached on definite provisions might have been welcome if that agreement had not been based initially on a mistaken conception fraught with consequences as we have since seen. But it would seem that this is not what is at issue.

115. It has been affirmed that resolution 242 (1967) was impartial because it took equal account of the interests and claims of the parties to the dispute by giving them an equal share of the sacrifices necessary to bring about a situation of just and lasting peace. Although one of the most primitive forms of justice consists in dividing the apple into two, it is difficult for us to accept such reasoning or to associate ourselves with such a view since in this affair there is an aggressor and a victim of aggression. So in this case, justice cannot be equidistant from the culprit and the victim. The duty of the Security Council was clear and unmistakable, but, whereas it should not only have prevented Israel from maintaining the benefits of its aggression but have condemned it for this indescribable act, it settled matters on the basis of a *de facto* situation, and granted

Israel compensation for the withdrawal of its troops. Certainly, a novel way to apply the rules of international law and the principles of the Charter! The alleged balance of resolution 242 (1967) is therefore based primarily on a flagrant injustice and constitutes one of the most harmful and dangerous precedents for any later aggression wherever it may take place.

116. The Arab countries which are directly concerned, and rightly concerned, about the recovery of their territories occupied by Israel did nevertheless agree to abide by resolution 242 (1967) and to co-operate with Mr. Jarring in his mission. One cannot gauge the whole extent of their sacrifices and the magnitude of their concessions except by taking account of the deep-seated injustice which characterizes resolution 242 (1967). Today the entire world can observe that this has not really been very useful.

117. Resolution 242 (1967) has another shortcoming even more serious than the previous one. It was actually intended to settle the problems created by the aggression by Israel in 1967, but then went on to lay down the principles for an over-all lasting settlement of the entire situation in the Middle East. The intention, doubtless, was praiseworthy, but was there any real chance of its materializing? We claim there was not, since it starts by boldly extrapolating from a problem limited in its scope and circumstances to a problem which is larger and of an entirely different nature. By confusing cause and effect and seeking to remove the cause by dealing with the effect, the original premises were totally mistaken and so the conclusions were of necessity vitiated.

118. I am sure that it is not by affirming "the necessity... for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem" that it can be sincerely felt that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East will be achieved because that is the fundamental objective and who would not wish us to arrive at this quickly and completely? The matter is too serious for us just to play with words.

119. If we want to get to the bottom of things and face them with courage and lucidity, we must first discover the source of the evil and the origin of the crisis. It is to be found, as we all know, in the creation of Israel and in the situation of the Palestinian people, who were suddenly deprived of their homeland, became strangers in their own land and were forced to go into exile. To reduce this problem to a problem of refugees is deliberately to ignore its real dimensions. It is to commit an unforgivable injustice and to prepare for a perilous future. One cannot envisage a final settlement of the situation in the Middle East without taking into account this essential element or without considering it with the seriousness and gravity which it deserves.

120. Perhaps for some time it was possible to imagine that the Palestinians would be resigned to their fate and end up by becoming integrated in the neighbouring countries or in their turn become a diaspora scattering to the four corners of the earth, but that would underestimate the strength of the ties which unite these people to their land and the vitality of the national feeling which sooner or later had to come out into the open. This can be already observed in the flourishing Palestinian liberation movement which despite

the inherent weaknesses of any movement of this kind and the difficulties which it is encountering in its action, will develop and become stronger. A people which is determined to redress an injustice which it has suffered to free its country, to win back its name and its dignity always finds within itself the resources for its struggle and reasons for hope which nothing can quench.

121. The situation in the Middle East cannot be settled over the dead bodies of the Palestinian people. Already, the simple truth is beginning to be recognized, one which our Organization has already reaffirmed on more than one occasion: the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

122. Throughout the world, little by little, awareness of this undeniable factor is gaining ground. I would simply mention a statement made by President Nixon who said in a speech on 3 March 1971:

“A lasting peace is not possible in the Middle East unless the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people are taken into account. During more than two decades the Palestinians have been the unfortunate victims of circumstances. Peace must ensure a fruitful life for them and for their children and a just settlement of their claims.”

123. But then, if any settlement of the situation in the Middle East must take account of the Palestinian people, their legitimate aspirations, their claims, how can one envisage such a settlement unless the Palestinians themselves express their opinion, unless justice is done them, unless a future of freedom and dignity is assured for them? No one can claim to speak for them in the quest for a solution which concerns them above all and it is up to them to state their views and defend their rights. They will do this with their own resources, by struggle, by war, borne onward by the deep feeling of the rightness of their cause and moved by the hatred which is born of despair, if the international community continues, as it has done up to the present, to ignore their existence and scorn their claims.

124. Resolution 242 (1967) does not mention this at all and, as I have said earlier, is limited to the settlement of a problem of the refugees. Perhaps then it will be understood why Algeria cannot and can never approve such a resolution. Were this not sufficient to condemn that resolution forever, the total failure of its implementation should give a striking demonstration of its insufficiency and its lack of realism.

125. Like others here, we have no miracle remedy which would make it possible to attain the goal of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East at once. If we have succeeded in shedding a little more light on a problem, whose complexity is growing from day to day, we shall feel that we have been amply rewarded for our efforts.

126. Perhaps it would be wise, in seeking a sound course to separate the various aspects of the situation and to adopt a gradual procedure in preparing a settlement. There is an immediate problem which has been with us since 1967 and which concerns the occupation of Arab territories by force. Let us settle this problem, but without claiming to arrive at the same time at a final settlement of the situation as a

whole. This final settlement will represent another phase in our proceedings; it must necessarily be carried out with the accord of the Palestinian people and taking into account their rights, their wishes and the imperative need to repair the injustice they have suffered since 1947.

127. It is perhaps because one wishes to attack the entire problem frontally that resolution 242 (1967) has proved to be an instrument incapable of serving the objectives assigned to it, which were both too complex and too bold. At a time when in other regions of the world new elements of disquiet for mankind have appeared and ominous dangers for international peace, it is high time to prove to our peoples that the concepts of justice and equity can still find their manifestation within our Organization.

128. Mr. ARIKPO (Nigeria): Permit me once again, Mr. President, to reiterate my delegation's determination to give you every possible assistance and co-operation in the performance of your onerous duties. In these dangerous days of mounting anguish and anxiety, your office has become the focal point of world attention.

129. It is a cruel irony that, at a time when the problems of the Middle East are being discussed, one of the greatest architects of the efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East should have passed away. My delegation wishes to join in the tributes paid to Dr. Ralph Bunche this afternoon and to remind members of the Assembly that we all hope that the efforts of Dr. Ralph Bunche to contribute to the peace of the Middle East will not be in vain.

130. Last June the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] adopted an historic resolution, AHG/Res.66 (VIII),<sup>3</sup> on the Middle East situation. It resolved to lend its full support to the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). It therefore set up a committee of 10 Heads of State. As I mentioned in my statement of 1 October 1971 [1948th meeting] and as confirmed by my friend and colleague, the Foreign Minister of Senegal, yesterday [2002nd meeting], my Head of State, His Excellency General Yakubu Gowon, and his august colleagues from Cameroon, Ethiopia, The Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Mauritania, Senegal, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire, deeply aware that the peace in the Middle East would not only directly serve the cause of international peace and security, but also, above all, would lead to the recovery of the occupied territories of an African country, the Arab Republic of Egypt, took great pains to deliberate on the matter.

131. As a result, the OAU Committee appointed a subcommittee of four, which went twice on a peace mission to the Arab Republic of Egypt, as well as to the State of Israel, and held discussions with the leaders of both countries. The main purpose of those discussions was to reactivate the Jarring mission, which had been deadlocked since last February. Incidental to that objective was the subcommittee's desire to defuse the prevailing explosive situation in that area.

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1971*, document S/10272.

132. In spite of the obvious obstacles yet to be overcome, the OAU subcommittee sensed a common desire on the part of both Egypt and Israel to resume negotiations under the auspices of Mr. Jarring in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). This impression, coupled with the fact that the great Powers say that they remain willing to meet and discuss how best to resolve the Middle East situation, is, in my view, an important point in favour of peace in the area. This situation, we feel, must not be overlooked.

133. The facts of the situation are too well known to require further recounting. The geographic, military and strategic realities of the Middle East have been the subject of innumerable debates in the United Nations. They now need only to be looked squarely in the face. The arguments as to whether a peace agreement should be concluded only after the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories or contemporaneously with the initialling of a peace agreement may be important—and is indeed important. But the most immediate issue is not the technical exercise of questions and answers, important though they may be. The most immediate issue, I suggest, given the present disposition to resume indirect negotiations under Dr. Jarring, is whether this Assembly will take appropriate steps to promote the movement from belligerency to peace.

134. In this connexion, it is pertinent therefore to recall President Anwar El-Sadat's repeated affirmation of his readiness to sign a permanent peace agreement with Israel. The Foreign Minister of Egypt, in his statement of 3 December 1971, again defined his Government's position as follows:

“If Israel considers itself bound by the Charter of the United Nations; bound by Security Council resolution 242 (1967); bound by the principle of inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force; bound by the rules and norms of international legal order; then there are no pre-conditions whatsoever in the Jarring aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971.” [1999th meeting, para. 82.]

135. Parallel to the above Egyptian statements, one must also emphasize those of the Israeli leaders when they assured the African Heads of State that their preoccupation was not the annexation of territories but security. In his statement of 6 December, the Israeli Foreign Minister repeated that:

“Israel's policy is not annexation, but peace within secure and recognized boundaries . . .” [2000th meeting, para. 116].

136. In sum, then, Israel wants the security of its frontiers and its freedom of navigation. Egypt also wants security and, naturally, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from its territory, occupied since June 1967. I am convinced that the spirit and text of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) provide all the elements necessary for concluding a peace agreement between the parties concerned, taking into account their expressed intentions and interests. Therefore, one is entitled to expect that future peace frontiers, as distinguished from present military lines, must not, and should not, find expression in territorial annexation. They can only be conceived in mutual goodwill, confidence and

hope—confidence that the bitter memories of war will gradually fade away, and hope that in a just, honourable and lasting peace, every State in the area can live in security.

137. I believe that a primary concern of this Assembly should be to prevent another outbreak of warfare in a world already full of ignited fuses. If Member States—particularly the great Powers—stop their duality of policy towards the Middle East; if they and all of us continue to cultivate their individual relations with the parties concerned and continue to work hard with equal zeal to implement resolution 242 (1967), unanimously adopted by the Security Council and accepted by Egypt and Israel, this Assembly would pave the way to peace and security in the Middle East.

138. I do not underestimate the task ahead. But we must make a start—a determined start. After all the tragic events that we have seen in recent days, we cannot afford to wait. Nigeria's objective in accepting membership in the Committee of African Heads of State was not merely to restore the *status quo* of impermanent cease-fires, armistices and conciliations. Nigeria and, indeed, Africa want to create a climate in which all the States of the Middle East can live together in peace and security. Hence, we support Ambassador Jarring's initiative. In response to the will for peace reaffirmed to the OAU Committee by both Egypt and Israel, this Assembly should uphold without qualification all the principles embodied in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), particularly as they concern the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security. Thus will Ambassador Jarring be enabled to resume his mission without delay.

139. Mr. MALJLE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): Four and a half years have passed since Israel's imperialist aggression of 1967 against the Arab countries, and despite the successive debates which have taken place in this Assembly nothing has been resolved. Israel continues to maintain its occupation of large parts of the territory of Egypt, Syria and Jordan.

140. The United Nations was in duty bound to attach a full measure of importance to this problem and to take effective measures in accordance with the Charter, the sovereign rights of the Arab States, and the interests of maintaining peace and international security. But the debates which have taken place so far have been fruitless and have yielded no results, because of Israel's aggressive policy and because of the imperialist policy of the two great Powers. Israel brandishes its weapons and systematically utilizes the time that passes in order to consolidate its position in the occupied territories by every possible means.

141. Now the Israeli aggressors, with the encouragement and powerful support of the United States, have openly proclaimed their annexationist plans and are now stubbornly engaged in realizing their ambition in order to create “Great Israel” at the expense of the Arab countries. The arrogant statements made by high Israeli officials on many occasions to the effect that Israel will not return to the frontiers of 5 June 1967 and its fallacious theory of “secure boundaries” needs no comment.

142. This attitude is not a coincidence because Israel is an instrument of imperialism in the Middle East and serves first and foremost the colonialist and oppressive policy of the United States of America which seeks to subjugate the Arab countries, to pillage their petroleum wealth and to consolidate itself in the key strategic position that that part of the world occupies. In particular, Israel has been given a special role in combating the anti-imperialist and liberation struggle of the Arab peoples and other freedom-loving peoples.

143. That is why the United States has created and consolidated Israel, subsidized it, militarized it, and transformed it into a fortress for aggression by supplying it with a steady flow of assistance and multifaceted moral, political, economic and military support on an ever-increasing scale. That is the source of the arrogant attitude and the defiance Israel has shown towards the peoples of the world, and the United Nations itself.

144. The aggressive action of Israel has also been supported and encouraged to a large extent by the unprincipled policy pursued by the Soviet Union because of its aims at hegemony designed to establish its influence in this part of the world.

145. The Middle East has been transformed into an area of tension, where international peace and security are endangered. My delegation considers that the United States and the Soviet Union bear a very great responsibility in this situation. In their approach to this problem the two great Powers are seeking, not to safeguard either the sovereign rights of the Arab peoples or international peace and security but only to defend their own interests. In the last analysis they wish to take the destinies of the Middle East into their own hands and to play the role of arbitrator. They want to dictate conditions, which will ensure to them strategic positions in accordance with their policy of dividing zones of influence.

146. The two great Powers do not want a just, complete solution to this problem, because a tense, unstable situation is better suited to their plans aimed at ensuring their military, political and economic presence in that area. They are trying to divide the Arab countries and set them in opposition to each other so that they can penetrate more easily into this area.

147. Time has shown that if we leave this problem to the two Powers then it is certain that no true solution to it will be found which will satisfy the sovereign rights of the Arab peoples and the Palestinian people. The intensification of their efforts to reach a so-called "peaceful solution", and in particular the negotiations in Washington, Moscow or New York, just like the constant journeys by envoys from the White House and the Kremlin in order to apply the sadly renowned Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, the "Rogers plan" and the other plans are all fallacious in character and are aimed at forcing the Arab peoples to accept the diktat of the great powers, to satisfy the greed of the aggressors and to crush the struggle carried on by the Palestinian people.

148. The price of the so-called "peaceful settlement" which the two super-Powers are offering to the Arab

peoples is very high. It affects the vital interests of those peoples, their national dignity as Arabs and their freedom and independence.

149. The imperialist Powers are plotting to crush the Palestinian revolution, which is in the vanguard of the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples and an obstacle to the implementation of the expansionist policies of the Israeli aggressors. Recently new efforts have been undertaken to crush the heroic struggle of the Palestine people. In addition to the unprecedented terrorism carried out by the Zionists, the Jordanian reactionaries, incited by and with the open or covert assistance of the great imperialist Powers, have made criminal attacks against the Palestinian fighters, in order to crush their just liberation struggle. These horrible crimes have provoked the deep indignation in the Arab peoples and in peaceful, freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. The Palestine people will never accept the manoeuvres of its enemies, who are seeking to create a mutilated Palestinian State which would be under the control of the Tel Aviv Zionists. The Palestine people is fighting for a just cause, and it has the support and the backing of all progressive peoples throughout the world.

150. Behind the façade of safeguarding peace in the Middle East and in the Mediterranean area the United States and the Soviet Union are continuously enlarging their fleets in the Mediterranean. The presence and the demonstrations of force by the United States and the Soviet Union in this area add to the crisis in the Middle East, constitute a serious danger for the peoples of that area and the entire Mediterranean basin and are a threat to international peace and security.

151. The Albanian delegation considers that it is the duty of all Mediterranean countries, including the Middle Eastern countries, to struggle for the withdrawal of the fleets of the two great Powers from the Mediterranean, so that it may be a zone of peace and fruitful collaboration among peoples.

152. Unquestionably, the United Nations has failed in its efforts to condemn the Israeli imperialist aggression and to force Israel to withdraw its troops from the occupied territories, to restore the rights of the Arab peoples who are victims of aggression, and to ensure peace in the Middle East. The very same thing is occurring now with respect to the aggression committed by India against Pakistan. All this has demonstrated the full weakness of the United Nations, all the inability it has shown—and which it continues to display even now—to defend the interests of peoples and States, to halt aggression, to defend the principles of the Charter and to ensure peace. It is understandable that this situation has seriously jeopardized the prestige of the United Nations in the eyes of the peoples of the world.

153. Problems can never be solved by concessions and compromises to the detriment of the sovereign rights of the people. History has shown that the policy of compromise at the expense of people's rights not only has failed to yield any results, but has served to complicate the problems still further by encouraging aggressors to be more arrogant in their attitude. Justice, which is on the side of the Arab peoples, should be restored. The aggressors must be condemned and forced unconditionally to withdraw their troops from all the occupied Arab territories. We must

recognize the legitimate rights of the martyred Palestine people.

154. The imperialist Powers, which are the principal factors in the continued complication of the situation in the Middle East, should put an end to their brutal interference in the internal affairs of this region.

155. The Arab peoples have drawn their conclusions from the four-year period that has passed. They have rejected—and they will reject—plots against their sovereign rights. They have made it quite clear that they will never accept manoeuvres or plans which strike at their territorial integrity in the slightest degree. The firmness they show in not accepting any compromise at the expense of their interests, as well as their determination to free every inch of their native soil, is a position of principle and a legitimate right.

156. The Albanian people and its Government have supported, and will always support, the struggle of our brother Arab peoples against imperialist Israeli aggression. The leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, stated on 1 November 1971:

“Our people considers the Arab peoples as traditional friends and as brothers, and our people is on the side of their just cause, and it has been and always will be at their side. We are convinced that the Arab peoples will soon hold high the banner of the liberation struggle against the imperialists and the Zionists, against the interference of the Soviet revisionists and against the tricks of all those who pretend to be their friends but who are trying to stab them in the back. The Arab lands belong to the Arabs. The cause for which the Palestine people is struggling is invincible.”

157. The Albanian delegation will support any draft resolution which would meet the true sovereign interests of the Arab peoples and the inalienable rights of the Palestine people to return to its homeland, as well as its right to self-determination.

158. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): More than four years have passed since the Security Council adopted its historic resolution 242 (1967) on the settlement of the Middle East situation created by the military aggression of Israel against three neighbouring Arab States in June 1967. During these four years all major organs of the United Nations have had to discuss aspects of the Middle East situation. That situation has gone from bad to worse. The occupation of large areas of Egypt, Syria and Jordan by the armed forces of Israel continues. Some of these areas have been formally annexed by Israel—such as east Jerusalem—in utter disregard of numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Others are being annexed for practical purposes. These illegal acts have been accompanied by statements to the effect that the fate of these Arab territories—such as the Gaza strip and the Golan heights—is not negotiable. Let me remark in passing that such statements are made by official Israeli representatives, usually by a Cabinet minister. According to a carefully arranged division of labour, the Foreign Minister of Israel is instructed to keep stating here that no problem is excluded from negotiations.

159. The *de facto* annexation of Arab territories is further compounded by the forcible expulsion of the Arab population of these territories from their homes. When these people resist, their homes are razed by the occupying power and the owners are forcibly resettled elsewhere to make room for Jewish immigrants. This policy of driving out the legitimate owners of these lands and replacing them with Israeli settlers calls for a continuous influx of immigrants to justify the frenzied campaign of pressure and hatred orchestrated by Zionist circles in Israel and elsewhere. In a word, the map of the Middle East is being redrawn by violent means before our very eyes by Israel and its supporters.

160. All these measures taken by the Israeli invaders absolutely contradict the principles of our Charter and tend to replace them by the laws of the jungle. It is obvious that this is a direct and brutal challenge to the United Nations, a threat to international peace and security. If Israel and its mentors can succeed in violating the basic tenets of international law and morality, the United Nations will prove unable to raise a barrier against aggression and will even reward the aggressor for his misdeeds.

161. How can we explain that four years after the unanimous adoption of the resolution of the Security Council, the world is still awaiting its implementation? Is it because Israel represents such an overwhelming force that the United Nations is unable to face its challenge? Obviously not, since not even the most hardened proponents of the fashionable theory of super-Powers, as the speaker preceding me tried hard to do, can claim that Israel is such a super-State. This country of 3 million people, left to its own resources, would find it hard to provide even for the normal existence of its statehood, let alone to invade its neighbours, occupy their lands, drive out their citizens, and replace them with newly-arrived immigrants. All this at a time when this tiny State spends billions of dollars on arms.

162. The answer is not hard to give. It is no secret to anyone that Israel has been and is still a client state of the United States and a favourite of all imperialists. No other State in history has received a larger *per capita* assistance in money, goods and arms. This country of 3 million regularly receive hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of modern arms from the United States. It was only recently that the Congress of the United States generously voted \$500 million for arms to Israel, a State which continues to occupy foreign territories in violation of the Charter. And at the same time, the United States Government is seriously considering a cut in its United Nations contributions. It is being argued that these contributions represent too much of a burden on the United States treasury. A very strange concept of priorities, to say the least.

163. Generosity is not, however, confined to providing arms and economic aid to Israel. The United States has made it a cardinal point of its Middle East policy to prevent the meaningful implementation of the Security Council resolution. There was a futile attempt by the delegation of Albania and others to try to invoke the responsibility of the Soviet Union, which has always staunchly supported the cause of freedom of all Arab peoples in the face of Zionist aggression. In the Security Council it was the United States which systematically prevented the adoption of any resolu-

tion that would have envisaged effective measures against Israel's continued violation of Charter principles. The United States has frustrated all efforts whereby the four permanent members of the Security Council, acting under the special responsibility conferred upon them by the Charter for the maintenance of peace and security could have assisted Ambassador Gunnar Jarring in the discharge of his duties. Lately it has gone even further, declaring that Ambassador Jarring's mission has reached deadlock; it has attempted to take over his duties and to act on its own as a self-appointed mediator between Israel and Egypt.

164. This strange conduct comes as no surprise. As soon as the Government of Israel peremptorily declared that Ambassador Jarring had gone beyond his mandate by asking Israel and Egypt to commit themselves to abide by the terms of the Security Council resolution, the United States Government hastened to state that the Jarring mission could make no useful contribution to a settlement under the prevailing circumstances. The representative of the Secretary-General has become *persona non grata* to Israel for raising the following question, "Would Israel give a commitment to withdraw its forces from occupied United Arab Republic territory to the former international boundary between Egypt and the British Mandate of Palestine?" Not only has Israel not given such a commitment, but it has informed Ambassador Jarring that "Israel will not withdraw to the pre-5 June 1967 lines". This is a quotation from annex III of document A/8541, the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of his Special Representative to the Middle East.

165. Here we find the key issue that has so far determined and doomed to failure every effort to find a political solution to the Middle East crisis. This key issue is Israel's overriding endeavour to annex territories that belong to its neighbours. That Israel's brief history is closely linked to territorial expansion needs no detailed proof. Suffice it to cast a glance at the maps showing Israel's advancing borders in the course of the last 23 years. Through all these years the leaders of Israel have never tired of repeating that it is security and recognition alone, and not territory, that they are seeking. Since 1967 the slogans have changed: now it is security through territory that is being sought. Security is being sought by a State that has constantly threatened its neighbours, regularly invaded them, annexed, and is trying to annex, their territories. And yet it is Israel that is in need of security, not its neighbours, as some propagandists in Israel and elsewhere would like to make us believe.

166. As the Security Council resolution specifically underlines the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and provides for the acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area, it is understandable that Israel has never really accepted the resolution. Rather it has tried to use it as a tool to exact territorial concessions from the Arab States. Thus we have often been treated to discourses tending to prove that the provisions of the resolution represent a licence for expansion, that all wars are followed by territorial changes and the like.

167. The Foreign Minister of Israel in his statement earlier in this debate [2000th meeting] again confirmed that his country is determined to force territorial concessions from

its Arab neighbours. He has again called for direct negotiations where, using the illegal occupation of Arab lands as a lever for territorial expansion, Israel intends to obtain the signature of Arab representatives on the dotted line.

168. It is obvious to all that whatever verbal acrobatics Mr. Eban has used in his statement, the territorial ambitions of Israel are in direct contradiction with the recommendations of the Organization of African Unity. As lucidly stated by the Foreign Minister of Senegal [2002nd meeting], the OAU mission deems it essential that Israel clearly and unambiguously renounce its expansionist schemes. Israel's answer is as negative as all its answers have been on this matter since 1967.

169. Israel's lack of sincerity in seeking a political settlement is nowhere as clear as in its obsession with the acquisition of new arms to strengthen further its hold over occupied Arab lands. Israel has no cause to complain; the United States has been a most understanding supplier of weapons to the aggressor. All this has been done under the guise of maintaining the balance of forces in the area. This imperialist concept which shamelessly equates the military superiority of the aggressor State with the concept of the balance of forces belongs to the arsenal of similar gimmicks such as protective counter-strikes and the like. These are invented to provide a smoke-screen behind which aggression and occupation can be justified. We reject this concept of the balance of forces as just another false argument in favour of the aggressor.

170. The Hungarian Government from the very beginning has declared that it supports the implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We have always underlined that the territorial integrity of all States in the area should be protected, and the resolution cannot be interpreted to mean that the territorial integrity of the Arab States can be violated. My country has always emphasized that the existence of Israel is endangered by the blind expansionist policies of its leaders and that the chances for the recognition of its sovereignty and political independence will not be enhanced by such policies. We have always rejected the arbitrary notion that it is for Israel and Israel alone to choose from among the seven different means of settling disputes listed in Article 33 of the Charter. Moreover, we have had to point out that the direct negotiations between invader and occupied, so strongly advocated by Israel to the exclusion of all other avenues of settlement, are not even mentioned in the Security Council resolution. The Israeli Government, aided and abetted all these years by the United States, has maintained that the only way of settling the Middle East crisis is one that it knows in advance to be unacceptable to the Arab States. This has been a deliberate policy of frustrating the chances of a settlement; it is also the latest demand for dropping so-called pre-conditions. Israel has now chosen to label the acceptance of the provisions of the Security Council resolution as a pre-condition. In point of fact the opposite is true; it is Israel that imposes a pre-condition: either Egypt accepts that the Security Council resolution does not exclude territorial expansion or Israel will refuse to resume contacts with Ambassador Jarring. Since, as I have already demonstrated, the Council resolution rules out the acquisition of territory by war, Israel's position in opposing so-called pre-conditions is no more than an attempt to rewrite the resolution into an annexationist instrument.

171. My delegation feels that the time has come for the General Assembly to put an end to Israel's sabotage of a political settlement. The General Assembly is in duty bound to demand that Israel match the positive reply of Egypt to Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 [A/8541, annex I]; Egypt has declared that it is ready to enter into a peace agreement with Israel when Israel gives a commitment to comply with the provisions of the Council resolution [A/8541, annex II]. This is what the leaders of Israel have been demanding for years, stating that should such a commitment be given by Egypt, Israel's requirements for its security would be satisfied. Now that the Egyptian Government has made such a commitment, Israel, guided by its expansionist ambitions, pretends that only a commitment to enter into a peace agreement accompanied by territorial concessions would be acceptable to it. My delegation shares the view of the speakers preceding me in this debate, who have emphasized that the General Assembly should demand a categorical and positive answer from Israel to Ambassador Jarring regarding complete withdrawal of its forces from occupied Egyptian territories. We have a right to expect that the United States delegation will support such an approach in view of its insistence a few days ago in the Security Council and in the General Assembly on the withdrawal of forces in another military conflict in Asia.

172. To achieve progress in the Middle East situation after years of continuous aggression as manifested in the occupation of foreign territories and the systematic violation of the human rights of the population of these Arab territories it is essential for the forces of peace and progress to unite. We should never forget that nothing can render better assistance to the aggressors and their supporters than a division among the friends of the Arab peoples. It is imperative that this simple truth be understood by all, especially by those who, for their own peculiar reasons, insist on blurring the line between friends and foes of the Arab peoples. Verbal extremism coupled with divisive tactics have more than once provided ammunition for the Israeli expansionists in the past. The lessons of this past should not be forgotten. That is demanded by the interests of the Arab peoples, including the people of Palestine, whose inalienable rights will best be served by the unity of the anti-imperialist forces.

173. To conclude, the Hungarian delegation is convinced that the time is ripe for new initiatives. The General Assembly cannot remain inactive in the face of continued Israeli sabotage of the provisions contained in the Security Council resolution. The Assembly should demand that Israel comply with these provisions by giving a positive reply to Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire, including a commitment to full withdrawal from occupied Arab territories. This is not a formalistic or tactical consideration on our part. We are deeply convinced that peace and security in the Middle East, and not only in that region, will be seriously threatened if the General Assembly refuses to adopt meaningful steps to contribute to the implementation of the Security Council resolution. We have the impression that some do not realize the dangers involved in further foot-dragging. The oft-repeated assertion that the most important thing is to maintain the fragile cease-fire in the region is the best proof of this strange incomprehension. But can one tolerate occupation, annexation, the

expulsion of people from their homes, in the name of maintaining a cease-fire? Do those who never tire of underlining the primacy of the cease-fire realize that, by shutting their eyes to the continuous violation of Charter principles and persisting in their indirect support of Israeli aggression, they are irresponsibly fanning the flames of a larger conflict? In another region of the world these very same forces have closed their eyes to the most serious violations of Charter principles and of human rights. In recent days they have had occasion to witness the tragic consequences of their unprincipled temporizing. It will be instructive to watch whether they have learned their lesson or will continue to perpetuate conditions in which the Arab peoples will have no alternative but to take up arms to liberate their lands.

174. Now there is still time to create a proper climate and the necessary conditions for a political settlement. In doing so, however, one has to choose between aggressor and victim. This means that all talk about being even-handed should cease, and meaningful measures should be taken to curb the aggressor. Any other approach represents only a prescription for disaster.

175. The Hungarian delegation sincerely hopes that our Assembly will learn from the tragic mistakes of the past and take a resolute stand in defence of the territorial integrity of all Middle Eastern States, of peace and security for all in that region. I pledge the full support of my delegation for all moves to achieve that noble goal.

176. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that Mr. Eban in his statement last Monday [2000th meeting] gave the erroneous impression that the whole situation in the Middle East can be settled by the concluding of peace between Egypt and Israel. Mr. Eban dwelt at length on the indirect negotiations that were carried out through the good offices of Ambassador Jarring, but he ignored the primary factors that had contributed to the tragic situation obtaining in the Middle East. In other words, Mr. Eban dealt with the husk of the problem and thrust entirely into oblivion the kernel, or what I might call the root of the trouble which, since the days when the United Kingdom assumed its Mandate over Palestine, has caused continuous turmoil and untold suffering both to the indigenous population of Palestine, whose homeland was usurped, and—to be fair—also to many Jews who were indoctrinated and misled to believe that God had given Palestine to the Jews 3,000 or so years ago when Joshua fought the Canaanite inhabitants of the land. I shall refrain in this Assembly from once again unfolding the history of the ancient Jews, because my presentation of what happened from 3,000 years ago to the present time is available in the records of the General Assembly and the Security Council from the time when I began to address myself to this question in 1947. Suffice it to say that political Zionism was a central European movement initiated, elaborated and nurtured by the Khazar Jews, whose ancestors had been converted to Judaism in the eighth and ninth centuries A.D. Although Theodore Herzl, the author of political Zionism, was a dreamer, the majority of those who embraced his ideology have used Judaism as a motivation for a political and economic end, as has been evident ever since Israel was created in contravention of the principle of self-determina-

tion enshrined in the Charter, which, to put it mildly, was flagrantly violated by the pressures that were brought to bear on the States Members of the United Nations since its inception.

177. Mr. Eban began and finished his statement on the premise that Israel was a *fait accompli* and the whole issue now revolved around how much of the Egyptian and Jordanian territories occupied since 1967 should be returned to those two States, provided their Governments signed an iron-clad peace agreement with Israel. The Syrian Golan heights had been forcibly annexed by Israel. Mr. Eban's Government stated time and again that for security purposes this territory has become part and parcel of Israel by sheer necessity.

178. As I mentioned in my last statement a couple of days ago [2001st meeting], I repeat that if, by a miracle, the three Arab States whose territories were occupied by Israel in 1967, concluded peace with Israel, the core of the problem remains and will eventually cause an interminable series of conflicts on account of the presence of an alien people in the midst of the Arab world.

179. Israel, as I have stated on many occasions, is a foreign element in the body politic and body social of the Arab world and as such it has caused an abscess in that body that will continue to afflict it with a pathological high fever. Israel, comprising a conglomeration of people with various cultures and traditions, has, since the day it was artificially created, disrupted the normal development of the Arab East. Even before Israel was created as a State, the Palestinian people as a whole reacted vehemently to the Zionist immigration allowed by the United Kingdom under the provisions of the infamous Balfour Declaration.

180. The Covenant of the League of Nations, in Article 22, allotted various Mandates to both the United Kingdom and France in the Middle East, inasmuch as the Mandatories pledged to prepare the people of those Mandates for self-determination and independence as stipulated by the said Covenant, but these Mandates were, in effect, a new form of colonialism.

181. As was stated time and again, the indigenous population of Palestine then constituted 94 per cent of the population and there were only 50,000 Jews in Palestine. This is from the official British records of 1919.

182. The British Government set itself as the arbiter of the ingress of Zionists after it set up the Mandate over Palestine. The Palestinians immediately and as early as 1919 to 1920 rejected the secret Balfour Declaration, whose provisions became known to the world. But Britain had to pay the price to the Zionists, who railroaded—where are the Americans?—the isolationist United States into the First World War in 1917. Furthermore, the perfidious Balfour thought that the Declaration which henceforth bore his name would serve the British interests since Palestine lies astride the trade routes of the British Empire.

183. Everything that is based on an unjust foundation is ultimately bound to totter and fall down, as the British Empire, over which Balfour and his ilk had thought the sun could never set, has subsequently done. Where is the British

Empire now? Swept away by the wind of retribution. It was not only the Palestinians that rebelled against the British when it dawned upon them that the British had intended to serve the Zionist cause and make good their promises to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine; all the Arab world decried the British deceit and deception.

184. I, for one, as a 15-year old student in the year 1920—until I was compelled for political reasons to leave the Middle East in 1929 at the age of 24—participated with thousands of demonstrators in the streets of Beirut and Damascus. There were similar demonstrations in the streets of other Arab capitals. We not only demonstrated against foreign mandate rule, but we also protested against the dastardly British policy which allowed European Zionists to flock into Palestine and build a national home there.

185. And what do we find today? Zionist politicians and representatives once in a while declare to the world that no such geographical or ethnological entity as Palestine has ever existed, and they called Palestine a part of Syria. They indeed seem to have a short memory. They forget that the French had a Mandate over Syria and that the British were granted a Mandate over Palestine. They would rather tear out the pages of the encyclopaedias, including the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, on that ancient land of Palestine that derived its name from the Philistines of Cretan origin, who had first settled in the region of Gaza many centuries before Hebrew tribes hailing from western Mesopotamia invaded the land of Canaan. These Zionists have the temerity to tamper with history as it is recorded even in their own books, distorting the truth for their ulterior motives.

186. In spite of the existence of nearly 3 million Palestinians, the Zionists have repeatedly claimed that these Palestinians were merely Arabs. But they forget that the indigenous people of Palestine were Arabized about 14 centuries ago. They had existed in Palestine before they were Arabized. Like the people of Lebanon, the people of Syria, the people of Iraq and Egypt and many other people in the Middle East for that matter, these indigenous people were Palestinians before they were Arabized. Having been Arabized should not make them victims of European Zionists, who are nothing but usurping colonialists. Since time immemorial the Palestinians have had their own identity and distinct personality as a people, and all the mass media of information which the Zionists control cannot refute that fact.

187. The Palestinians should have shaped, and one day will shape, their political destiny, no matter how protracted their struggle to regain their usurped homeland may be and no matter how long it will take them to enjoy their lost freedom and exercise their inalienable right to self-determination. We reaffirmed this only a couple of days ago here in this very same hall of the General Assembly. You Zionists, or any Powers which unjustly support you, will totter and fall down and crumble into dust as other empires have crumbled and fallen. The Palestinians shall be the masters of their fate no matter how powerful Israel might appear to be by virtue of the continuous military aid and financial assistance which have been proffered to it from certain quarters.

188. "The Palestinians are a figment of Arab imagination"—that is what the Zionist propaganda disseminates derisively all over the world. If Mr. Eban thought otherwise, he would have alluded to the core of the problem, which is none other than that the Palestinian people were robbed of their homeland with the connivance of major Powers, States Members of the United Nations, when, submitting to world Zionist pressures, they partitioned Palestine in 1947.

189. Many of us, including myself, were not only demonstrating in the streets of Arab cities then, but as far back as the early 1920s, we were involved in the Palestine issue. In 1923, for instance, when I was only 18, many of us were in touch with the editors of Palestinian and other Arab newspapers exhorting them to support the cause of the indigenous people of Palestine.

190. I have brought with me the envelope of a letter addressed to me in Beirut by the editor of a Palestine newspaper which was published in Jaffa in 1923. Like many of the youth who were active in Arab affairs, I corresponded with many editors about the Palestine imbroglio created by the British Mandate. The significant point about that envelope is that it was mailed with what was known as an "EEF" postage stamp. What is EEF? It is Egyptian Expeditionary Force. The British troops, led by General Allenby in 1918, launched their campaign from Egypt with the tremendous help of Egyptian workmen and personnel. Egypt, as you may know from history, Egypt of the Pharaohs, which goes back to 4,000 years before Christ, was made a British protectorate. It needed the protection of the British.

191. As I said, the date of the postmark on that envelope is 1923. What is more significant is that the envelope, which I have saved for 48 years together with letters which I did not bring with me lest I should encumber the General Assembly with too many details and digress into history again, bears a large seal on it with a picture of the Dome of the Rock and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre bearing both the Cross and the Crescent and the inscription, in Arabic and in English, "Palestine for the Arabs". It was sold for one-tenth of a piastre in an uninflated currency, sold to the public as such seals are sold in this host country and other countries to help certain causes.

192. Mrs. Meir and other Israeli leaders still exclaim, "Who are these Palestinians? They never existed." Lest someone doubt what I am saying, may I lend you, Mr. President, that envelope on which you will see the stamp with the letters "EEF", Egyptian Expeditionary Force, and the Arabic and English words for Palestine. Of course they had to put the Hebrew at the bottom because the Jews then were an insignificant minority. Now Palestine "does not exist". Here is the envelope with the seal. Will you kindly look at it, Mr. President, and return it to me after I have finished my speech. It is addressed to me in Arabic with the word "Beirut" in French.

193. "Who are those Palestinians? They never existed," Mrs. Meir and other leaders say. Let me assure you that the Palestinians as a people are not dead. Let me assure you that they do not live only in refugee camps. Let me assure you that thousands upon thousands of them are dispersed in the Arab world, not dreaming but incessantly active,

from the shores of the Atlantic in Morocco across North Africa down to the coast of the Red Sea and also in the region which reaches the confines of Turkey and Iraq. Wherever you go in the Arab world you find Palestinians active for their cause. They are militant, non-refugee Palestinians, determined to regain their homeland and see to it that Palestinians will be repatriated and given back their property and the assets which they left behind when the Zionists massacred many of their forebears, as they did in Deir Yasin and many other communities in Palestine. "The Palestinians do not exist," Mrs. Meir and other leaders say.

194. But this is not all. As I told you time and time again in this Assembly and in the Security Council in past interventions, those Palestinians are ever ready to make short shrift of any Arab leader who betrays their cause. He that has ears to hear, let him hear; he that has eyes to see, let him see. The whole Arab world has been galvanized by the sacrifices which the Palestinians are prepared to make in order to regain their homeland.

195. No wonder if, even by a miracle peace is concluded between Israel and Egypt and the other two States contiguous to Israel, the Arab people of 17 States will rise as one people to support their Palestinian brothers. Arab nationalism? Call it by whatever name you choose. Zionism is also nationalism. Let us assume that it is; nationalism can become a psychosis and, when a psychosis takes hold of a people, rightly or wrongly, there is no force in the world which can cure it except perhaps a conflict that will bring down many States and will possibly cause a world war, because the Zionists have made such a case in which they believe, having committed themselves. It is indeed a world problem. Great Powers are involved and we are one of the checkerboards where the great Powers may play their game, not with wooden pieces, but with guns, missiles and planes.

196. Is this the fate of the Holy Land of Palestine? Should this be the destiny of three world religions: to allow a political group from Eastern Europe to use force to establish themselves in Palestine, which had an indigenous population? Where is the morality of religion? Where is the philosophy of the sages of that area? They are ignored. No one heeds their teachings. Jerusalem is a city holy to three monotheistic religions, to Judaism, Christianity and Islam. If we follow democratic procedures in this world, why should 16 million Jews usurp that Holy City and consider it their own, when there are 1 billion Christians, who consider it as holy, if not more holy, and 600 million Moslems, whose first prayer in Islam, their *qiblah*, as we call it, was towards that city. One billion 600 million people should bow their heads to political Zionism and accept the role of a usurping State which this Organization immorally created for political reasons, not taking into account the high religious ideas of the area.

197. And the Assembly sits here year in year out adopting resolutions condemning Israel for having incorporated Jerusalem into the territory it usurped. Declare that you are no longer Christians, a billion of you, surrendering the city to the representatives, not of 16 million Jews, but of a minority of Jews who have made a nationality out of a religion, without regard to many Jews who are loyal citizens of their countries of birth or adoption.

198. The United Nations has been disunited on this issue for too long. If the Security Council and the General Assembly do not act, then let us fold up and leave this hall and the chamber of the Council.

199. To prove to the Assembly that this is a foreign colonial incursion into our midst, I have obtained here accurate statistics about the members of the Israeli Cabinet. Nine of them were born in Poland, six in Russia, only three in Palestine—but most likely from Polish or Russian parents—one was born in Germany, one in South Africa, one in Yemen—thank God for having a Sephardic Jew amongst all those Khazars—one in Iraq—there is another Sephardic, oriental Jew—they have to have somebody from the area.

200. I will give you some more details. Zalman Shazar, the President, was born in Russia; he came to Palestine in 1924. Mrs. Golda Meir was born in Russia, came to Palestine in 1921 by way of Wisconsin, United States of America. Mr. Abba Eban was born in South Africa and came to Palestine in 1948. Menahem Egin was born in Byelorussia and came to Palestine in 1942—did the Soviet Union give him a visa in 1942? That was during the war. He probably got away without a visa during the war. Israel Galili was born in Poland and came to Palestine in 1914. Pinhas Sapir was born in Poland and came to Palestine in 1928. Mr. Moshe Dayan was born in Palestine, of Polish origin. Yigal Allon was also born in Palestine of Polish origin. Let us see who the Chiefs of Staff are: Haim Barlev was born in Yugoslavia. The new Chief of Staff, David Elazar was born in Yugoslavia too.

201. May I not talk in abstract terms only, but give the Assembly some statistics. I am going to show you how the land of Palestine was usurped. This is the Jewish immigration into Palestine statistically. This is from the *Statistical Abstract of Israel* put out by the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics in 1967 in Jerusalem, pp. 88 and 89. Immigrants to occupied Palestine from 1919 to 1948: 482,857; 89.6 per cent of them came from Europe and America. The American Jews know on which side their bread is buttered. They love America—very few from America. And 10.4 per cent of the immigrants came from Asia and Africa. From 1948 to 1964, 45 per cent came from Europe and 54 per cent from Asia and Africa—these were oriental Jews. If this is not neo-colonialism, I wonder what is.

202. I will conclude by mentioning to you that zionism is an expansionist movement; it will not stop until it fulfills its dream that wherever there was an oriental Jew in ancient times the modern Khazars should hoist their flag.

203. Uri Avnery, a member of the Israeli Knesset, discussing General Dayan's credo—and remember that Mr. Moshe Dayan is a hero in Israel and is still the Minister of Defence—wrote:

“Dayan's speech aroused anger in the Knesset because it correctly defined the Government's intentions and made

them public.”—As long as they are secret they are all right; the speech made them public—“A careful analysis of Dayan's speech reveals that Dayan believes that the green line is a thing of the past; the occupied territories should be regarded as an integral part of Israel without officially annexing them”—without officially annexing them! —“Israel is not interested in the peace suggestions of the Arab countries, because any peace would serve as a lever to remove Israel from the territories, and the territories are more important to Israel than peace.”

204. I shall not encumber this Assembly with more quotations.

205. Any one of my colleagues might pose the question to me: *Quo vadis?*—where do we go from here? It is true there are a million and a quarter or more Jews—I do not have the latest count—who have been indoctrinated and misled by having been huddled in a fortress surrounded by Arab lands. What is going to happen?

206. There will be no peace in the Holy Land as long as the flag of Israel flies on the mast over Palestine. Would it not be a human tragedy if the Arab States became so strong that they were to get rid of the Jewish people in Palestine? It seems that the Western world does not understand our tradition of magnanimity and of generosity towards the stranger. If the Israelis bring down that flag, which is the symbol of domination, then there will be peace with them, and possibly a democratic State, when the Zionists become citizens of Palestine, neither Arabs nor Israelis, but brothers living side by side—in cantons, possibly, with municipal arrangements—but not as dominators.

207. The Arabs and non-Arab peoples of Asia had always welcomed the stranger. The Jews could have been living at peace with their Arab brothers—brothers in humanity. If they fail to do so, wars and conflicts will continue in Palestine, and the checkerboard on which the big Powers play may be broken and people will suffer. And what will be the consequence? Innocent people will be sacrificed, whether Jew or Arab.

208. Therefore, I hope that the Israelis will be cured of that political psychosis, see reason and have some common sense pumped into their heads, because there is no future for a couple of million Jews—or even 5 million, if there were ever to be that many in Palestine—when they are surrounded by an ocean of Arabs, which in time will number 125 million people, and eventually, perhaps within 30 years, 300-400 million people. How can they survive? They will be assimilated. If they choose this path of suffering and tribulation until they are assimilated, we will have acquitted our conscience by having offered them a way out; for in the end nothing survives, and anything that is built on an unsound foundation is sooner or later bound to totter and fall.

*The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.*