

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



2010th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 10 December 1971,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda (<i>continued</i>)	
Sixth report of the General Committee	1
Agenda item 22:	
The situation in the Middle East (<i>continued</i>)	1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)*

SIXTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/8500/ADD.5)

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly has before it a report of the General Committee on the organization of the twenty-sixth regular session of the General Assembly. The report is contained in document A/8500/Add.5. In its report the General Committee recommends the adoption of various measures in order to enable the Assembly to complete its work on time.

2. As members are aware, with the target date of 21 December there are only 11 days left, including Saturdays and Sundays, before the closing of the session and many items on our agenda are still not completed. I am sure that none of us wishes to extend the session beyond 21 December or to hold a resumed session of a few days at the beginning of next year. Such a resumed session would involve an unjustifiable expense as well as inconvenience for all concerned.

3. I am convinced that the measures recommended by the General Committee in its report, if adopted by the Assembly and rigorously applied by all of us, will make it possible for the Assembly to complete its work on time. If I hear no objection, may I take it that the General Assembly approves the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 2 of its report?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 22

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

4. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I think it is only right and appropriate to begin our meeting this morning by

* Resumed from the 1999th meeting.

remembering a great man who passed away yesterday, Mr. Ralph Bunche, who gave his life and his dedicated efforts and vitality and dynamism to the international Organization, which he accompanied from its birth. To the Secretary-General, with whom Mr. Ralph Bunche had a very close association, and to his family and the people of the United States, my delegation addresses its most sincere condolences.

5. Of all the great historical and strategic intersections of the world, none other has witnessed as many conquests and devastations as have been witnessed, throughout its long and chequered history, by the Middle East, which is the meeting-point of Asia, Africa and Europe. For every conqueror going from one of the three continents to another had to leave a foothold, later to be subject to the sand-storms and harsh winds of time. If, let us say, 1,000 years ago a United Nations had existed and an Arab speaker had been addressing it following, let us say, the conquest of the Crusaders or, later, the conquest of Tamerlane, perhaps what he would have had to say, feeling the tragedy of his own people, would not have been much different from what an Arab speaker would have to say today at the United Nations.

6. It has seemed to me for these past few years as I have listened to and participated in the debates on the Middle East that there is a feeling that we who represent the Arab peoples here are motivated by feelings of vengeance and vindictiveness. Some, with ulterior motives in mind, have maliciously accused us of being anti-Semitic. Against these imputations we rebel. It was not our civilization which was judged and condemned at Nürnberg and our logic finds it inconsistent, even hypocritical, that protests against some of our observations come from the representatives of the United States, which flatters, encourages and indulges with privilege the sections of the World Zionist Organization operating in a unique manner as part of the Israeli Government inside the United States, when that organization is the sworn enemy, slanderer and defamer of all Arab States and peoples.

7. But despite this I wish to put all of these more parochial matters at least temporarily to one side. I wish to state my own country's case, which I believe comprises the fundamentals of the Arab case in the broad context of universal concerns. I wish to put these last four and a half years of Israeli occupation of Arab territories, of crisis and resort to warfare, in the perspective of the aggressor's record in the United Nations. This house of nations symbolizes mankind's hope for even a slow march forward towards law and order in international relations. It is certainly relevant to this United Nations itself to see what of its influence, prestige and moral power is at stake here, and we—all of us who admit to being little Powers—need

this world body. We need it if it strives for the best mortal man can do to approximate to the eternal verities of justice, truth and equity.

8. It is in this spirit and with a deep sense of the Middle East tragedy and the tragedy of my people that I approach the subject on the agenda.

9. The Arab world today is still living the nefarious consequences of the war of 5 June 1967 launched by Israel: occupation, devastation, more refugees, more tragedies, more bloodshed, more uprootings, and, with it all, a deeper and deeper sense of an injustice and a calamity which were not of our own doing. Is all the truth yet known about the devastating lightning assault on us? Have all the obscurities been probed? Did the Pentagon, for instance, ever publish what was registered in the Liberty Ship bombed by the Israelis on 9 June 1967, when 40 American sailors were killed? On 21 August 1971, the man who released the "Pentagon Papers", Daniel Ellsberg, said there are reports in the Pentagon that Defense Secretary Laird does not know about. Speaking at Fort Collins, in Colorado, Ellsberg said that studies on Cuba, Latin America, the Middle East and NATO have been completed by Pentagon staff members in recent years. According to Ellsberg, they are not as big as the Pentagon Viet-Nam war history, but he says they contain "enormous surprises" and should be released to the American public.

10. Now if some of these "enormous surprises" were to be made known to us, as they are bound to be sooner or later, how much of what has been said or claimed since 5 June 1967 by Israel and its protector, the United States Government, might suddenly become scandalous, just as so many scandals have been released since the publication of the "Pentagon Papers"?

11. But, unfortunately, we are still exposed to a certain number of speakers who come to this rostrum to propagate falsehoods and indulge in demagoguery like the address of Mr. Eban, which was given here on 6 December. In his usual pompous manner he reiterated the well-known Israeli-Zionist doctrine that the Arabs were responsible for the June war. He said: "We . . . preserve the unfading image of our ordeal in the summer of 1967." [2000th meeting, para. 67.] And it was on the basis of that deceit, promulgated throughout the world, that Israel wrung from the United Nations Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which they now refuse.

12. To refute Mr. Eban's falsehoods I shall use an American answer and an official Israeli one. Mr. John Lawrence Hargrove, in an article entitled "Abating the Middle East Crisis Through the United Nations (and Vice Versa)", published in the spring of 1971, has something of peculiar relevance to say. Let me note here that Mr. Hargrove is Director of Studies at the American Society of International Law. He was formerly Senior Adviser for International Law at the United States Mission to the United Nations. He says:

"Certainly we are entitled to ask, without any overly reverent deference to established dogma, what went wrong as the international community grappled with this old conflict's newest phase, which erupted in the spring

of 1967. . . . We are entitled to ask how, if in any way, the resources of international law and in particular the United Nations Charter might have been brought to bear in some way differently, and whether such possibilities yet exist. . . .

" . . . The issue that balked Council action was whether it should simultaneously call for the withdrawal of Israeli forces to their own territory"—together with the cease-fire. To have done so would have been in the best tradition of the United Nations—"To have done so would have been to follow the pattern of the Suez crisis in 1956. . . . The United States . . . firmly insisted on a simple cease-fire . . . the Arabs were compelled to accept the United States position, not by its intrinsic logic but by military necessity. . . . Let us look first at the legal significance of the situation that prevailed on the ground . . . and then at the action that the Council eventually took in resolution 242 on November 22, 1967.

"On the ground, Israel found itself in massive occupation of Arab territory. . . ."—And mark this sentence—"The occupation had come about by means of an invasion that Israel claimed to have been in self-defense, but which, although by no means unprovoked, did amount to a first use of force by Israel. Many words have been uttered, at both public and private expense, in arguing the correctness of Israel's claim to have been acting in self-defense, notwithstanding the explicit qualification in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which recognizes the right to use force only in self-defense 'if an armed attack occurs.' I will . . . simply state . . . that, in our primordial international community, an exception to the prohibition of violence that legitimizes such a first strike would make the world a substantially more dangerous place in which to live, and that this is not the sort of world envisaged in the United Nations Charter. So far as I am aware, Israel stands alone among governments in espousing her position on this point.

" . . . Whatever were the actions of the UAR on June 3 (the closing of Tiran? the amassing of forces in the Sinai?) on the basis of which Israel claims to have had the right to act in self-defense on June 4, by no stretch of the imagination can the invasion be said to have been less than proportionate to those injuries. . . . When this occurred, if Israel had had any right to be present on foreign territory in order to defend herself, that right ceased and she was obligated by the Charter's prohibition on the use of force against territorial integrity to withdraw. The United Nations, as a result of the position taken by the United States, was unable to assert that obligation when it called for a cease-fire. And of course Israel did not withdraw and has not done so."¹

Mr. Hargrove continues:

"In the particular case in question, in sanctioning the continued occupation of a territory as a means of exacting settlement, we have endorsed a state of affairs

¹ John Lawrence Hargrove, "Abating the Middle East Crisis through the United Nations (and Vice Versa)", *The University of Kansas Law Review*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Spring 1971), pp. 366-367.

having its own built-in tendencies toward violence and perhaps global catastrophe. This is essentially because, notwithstanding resolution 242 to the contrary, we live in a world in which the Charter standards rule out acquisition or even occupation of foreign territory simply as a means of achieving one's political objectives. . . ."²

The author concludes:

"International agreements extorted by force are illegal, as the recently concluded Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties has confirmed. More to the point, they will be regarded as illegal by the next, perhaps more radical, generation of Arab leadership if a peace settlement furnishes any reasonable ground for saying that, in order to get Israel out, the present Arab leadership was compelled by force to relinquish substantial rights possessed by the Arab States before the June war."³

13. This objective legal analysis does not require an exegesis of mine, but I do appeal to you, Mr. President, and to all the Members of this Assembly to ponder carefully over this analysis and its far-reaching results.

14. The second refutation of Mr. Eban's claim comes from no less a man than the Israeli general who led the *blitzkrieg* on 5 June 1967 for Israeli *lebensraum* in Arab territory. I mean Yitzhak Rabin, now Israeli Ambassador to Washington. The *Jerusalem Post* quoted him on 29 February 1968 as saying:

"I do not believe that Nasser wanted war. The two divisions he sent into Sinai on May 14 would not have been enough to unleash an offensive against Israel. He knew it and we knew it."

15. My second point relates to the cease-fire. Mr. Eban, in his statement to which I have referred, said:

"On 7 June 1967 the Security Council in its resolution 234 (1967) decided on a cessation of fire without adding any condition or limit of time." [2000th meeting, para. 70.]

16. But here again at least the historical facts should be ascertained in their reality. For Israel started to attack Syria on 9 June 1967, after, in Mr. Eban's own words, Israel and Syria had accepted the cease-fire resolution on 7 June [resolution 234 (1967)].

17. The Security Council met urgently on 9 June 1967 [1352nd meeting] and adopted another cease-fire resolution [235 (1967)] despite the delaying tactics of Ambassador Goldberg, the United States representative—who, unveiled, turned out to be an arch-Zionist—and a fourth resolution was adopted on 11 June [resolution 236 (1967)]. The first, on 9 June, asked Israel to stop hostilities against Syria forthwith; the second condemned the violation of the cease-fire by Israel and requested the withdrawal of troops.

18. Mr. Eban tried to quote the Foreign Minister of Great Britain to the effect that Britain did not intend withdrawal

from all occupied territories. He does not need to do that; he has only to review the debates of the Security Council after the attack on Syria between 9 and 12 June, when both Ambassador Goldberg and Lord Caradon of the United Kingdom used every means at their disposal to delay the Security Council in taking immediate action against the attack by Israel and to enable the Israeli army to occupy the Golan Heights.

19. Had Israel respected the cease-fire called for in the resolution adopted on 7 June 1967, as Mr. Eban claimed, and the resolution adopted on 9 June, when the Israeli army began its attack on Syria, not one single Israeli soldier would now be on Syrian territory, and not one single inch of Syrian territory would have been occupied by Israel. This is borne out by the following quotation from the introduction to the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization:

"The Security Council's cease-fire resolutions of June 1967 and its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, if implemented simultaneously and fully, should provide the framework for achieving a peaceful and agreed settlement of the present conflict." [A/8401/Add.1, para. 222.]

Therefore, if the two cease-fire resolutions concerning Syria had really been respected and implemented by Israel, as stipulated by the Secretary-General in his report, there should have been no need to ask Syria about its acceptance or non-acceptance of resolution 242 (1967).

20. Between 6 June 1967, the date of the adoption of the first cease-fire resolution [233 (1967)], and today the United Nations, in its various organs—the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights, the World Health Organization and UNESCO—have so far adopted no less than 53 resolutions concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestine question. Specifically, of the 53 resolutions referred to above, 14 "condemn" or "strongly condemn" or "specifically condemn" Israel for "flagrant violations" of the Charter, including attacks on the Arab countries, for its refusal to apply the fourth Geneva Convention and for its violations of human rights. Nineteen of those 53 resolutions either "deplore" or "deeply deplore" or "strongly deplore" or "note with dismay" the refusal of Israel to co-operate in implementing specific resolutions, or "urgently call upon the Government of Israel" to comply with the Charter.

21. These resolutions and decisions have legislated on the international level the following Arab rights: first, the inadmissibility of the occupation of territories by force; second, the right of the old refugees to be either repatriated or compensated—incidentally, this right was legislated as far back as 1948; third, the unconditional return of the new displaced persons, including some of the old refugees after the June war of 1967, and some of the old refugees who have become refugees for the second and third time—as to the new displaced persons, let us remember that Mr. Eban, in his own statement, said that 1 million Egyptian refugees had been displaced as a result of the barbaric attacks of Israel across the Suez Canal; fourth, the rights of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied areas to live in decent conditions, as stipulated by the Geneva Conventions, the

² *Ibid.*, p. 370.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 372.

international covenants on human rights and scores of the 53 resolutions to which I referred above; fifth, the illegality of the annexation by Israel of the Arab city of Jerusalem, on which alone six resolutions have been adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly; sixth, and most important of all, in the three resolutions adopted by two thirds of its membership in 1969, 1970 and 1971 [*resolutions 2535 R (XXIV)*, *2672 C (XXV)* and *2792 D (XXVI)*] recognized the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees had arisen from the denial of their inalienable rights under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. And only last week the General Assembly adopted a resolution recommended by the Third Committee in which it reaffirmed the inalienable rights of all peoples, and in particular those of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and the Palestinian people to freedom, equality and self-determination and the legitimacy of their struggles to restore those rights [*resolution 2787 (XXVI)*] and also expressed its grave concern that Israel had not allowed the Arabs to exercise their right to self-determination in Palestine [*resolution 2792 D (XXVI)*].

22. Now, Mr. President, let us pause for a while; let us forget about the Arabs; let us take these 53 resolutions which embody the will of the international community. Let the United Nations turn to Israel and ask its militarists, "What have you done to implement these resolutions?" When these questions are put to Israel with responsibility, sincerity and objectivity, the conflict is then seen to be no longer an Arab-Israeli conflict, but a United Nations-Israel conflict. And if Israel continues to disregard the United Nations, then there are sanctions and other measures to be resorted to.

23. Further to substantiate my point, I would refer members of the Assembly, not to any Arab statements, but to the five reports—especially their legal sections—by the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [UNRWA] from the summer of 1967 until today,⁴ and the reports of the Secretary-General, during this session, on Jerusalem,⁵ on displaced persons [*A/8366*], and on what Israel did in the Gaza camps of the refugees [*A/8383*]. I refer members also to the Amnesty International report of 1 April 1970, and to the two reports of the International Committee of the Red Cross of August and September 1970⁶ and not, as I said, to any statement by any Arab representative or Arab Government.

24. What will members find there? That Israel destroyed refugee camps, forcibly deported the refugees, turned the

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 13; ibid., Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 13; ibid., Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 14; ibid., Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 13; and document A/8413.*

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971, document S/10392.*

⁶ "The Middle East Activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross—June 1967–June 1970 (I)", *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 10, No. 113 (August 1970), p. 424, and "The Middle East Activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross—June 1967–June 1970 (II)", *ibid.*, No. 114 (September 1970), p. 424.

hospitals and schools into military garrisons and prisons, expelled the Arab civilian population, resorted to collective punishment, destroyed whole villages, towns and town quarters, confiscated Arab properties and lands, established settlements in all occupied territories in the Golan Heights, on the west bank of the Jordan and in the Sinai peninsula, all of which constitute, in accordance with the Nürnberg legislation, war crimes and crimes against humanity. And Israel, in spite of all these resolutions, continues its Nazi acts without interruption. For its crimes since 1967 until now it has been rewarded by the United States, not with millions or hundreds of millions of dollars, but with billions, and the most sophisticated arms, in order to enable Israel to continue to strengthen and to entrench itself in the occupied territories.

25. And yet these two States and their representatives have the courage to come to this rostrum and say, "We accepted resolution 242 (1967)." When the Foreign Minister of Israel comes here to lecture us about international morality, conduct and law, and we hear scores of statements that Israel will not relinquish one inch of occupied territory, when the official report of the Secretary-General affirms that reality, how can we believe the pious protestation of Mr. Eban about peace? It is sheer hypocrisy.

26. In view of all this, and especially in view of the three resolutions affirming and reaffirming the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to self-determination, and when only last Tuesday night [*2033rd meeting*] the General Assembly by a vote of 104 to 11, with 10 abstentions, called upon India and Pakistan for a cease-fire coupled with the withdrawal of troops to the India-Pakistan border and the return of the refugees, we rightly claim that the United Nations should be consistent in what it does. For it is a fact that, when a right is ignored, no matter how weak the possessor of that right is, and when it is brutally treated and crucified, the matter always ends by the taking of revenge.

27. We firmly believe that justice is not an abstraction, that truth is not a mere formula devised by scholars and philosophers. We believe that justice and truth are at the very heart of the dialectics of history.

28. We have been lectured also by Israel's Foreign Minister on the elementary role of negotiations in any transition from war to peace. He appeared to be conducting an academic freshman class in international relations rather than to be illuminating these debates with some insights into his Government's thinking on the substance of the problem. Israel's insistence upon direct negotiations as the only way to any settlement must be judged as another of those diversions typical of Israel and world Zionism, which try to substitute form for substance. It may sound plausible, but it is not constructive. It may sound like generosity, but it is really arbitrary and authoritarian.

29. Again I revert to the Charter. Article 33 lists eight recognized and accepted methods of seeking solutions to international problems. Negotiations are only one of the eight. The authors of the Charter must have had reasons for adding the other seven. Certainly they were aware that they were not putting together a book of synonyms. The peoples of the world need to know that in rejecting direct

negotiations, the Arabs have neither selected war in preference to peace nor have they asked for anything that is not within the letter of the Charter. Again form must not be confused with substance, and rigidity about form should be examined carefully to be sure it is not a pretext for more fait accompli diplomacy. Is Israel to be allowed to dictate what the Charter means? Is Israel entitled to play the role of the judge and the jury at the same time?

30. In any discussion of the Middle East crisis, to deal with the results of the Israeli conquest of 1967 would indeed be inadequate, for the 1967 conquest, like the 1956 tripartite aggression and international war against Egypt, and the 1948-49 war against the United Nations itself—and I wish I had time to prove this point—and the Arabs, were but stages in the implementation of the Israeli master plan of conquest of the Middle East. It is appropriate here to recall very briefly—and this is intimately related to the heart of the crisis we are discussing; and let us remember the set of maps that were distributed by the Foreign Minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt when he made his statement [*1999th meeting*]*—that in 1919, as one of the maps showed, when the World Zionist Organization submitted its official plan for the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine to the Paris Peace Conference—and at that time in the whole area of Palestine there were only 70,000 Jews compared to 700,000 Arabs, Christians and Moslems—the minimum it would accept for its State included—and here I would beg members to pay attention to the Golan Heights—the headwaters of the Jordan River in Syria and Lebanon, specifically the Golan Heights in Syria. Now the Golan Heights are occupied by Israel, but the claim to them was made in 1919. Included was the Haourâne plain in Syria, part of which is now under Israeli occupation, and control over the Gulf of Aqaba.*

31. Let us recall that when the State of Israel was finally established in 1948 in defiance of Arab rights and beyond the frontiers granted to it by the United Nations vote of partition [*resolution 181 (II)*], it refused to adopt a constitution. Instead, it adopted only a basic law giving, among other things, to every person of the Jewish faith the world over the right to become an Israeli citizen as soon as he set foot in Israel. It acted in that way because even the extended frontiers of 1948 were by no means considered as the final frontiers of the State of Israel. The situation is exactly the same today, when the cease-fire lines are not considered by Israel to be its frontiers. For, like a viper shedding its skin as it grows bigger, Israel was to shed one set of boundaries after another and with it one name after another. When part of the Palestine of the British Mandate was metamorphosed into Israel, the Palestine defined by the document of the World Zionist Organization in 1919 naturally became “greater Israel”, which in the fulness of time will again outgrow even this enlarged Palestine that Israel now is, to become the ultimate Israel yet to be. If anyone has ever been puzzled by the numerous Zionist definitions of Israel, this is the explanation. The wildest among them are neither exaggerations nor nebulous dreams. They are ultimate objectives to be reached when the viper, having shed so many skins, assumes its ultimate size. The stage through which we are now passing is the stage of the Palestine of the World Zionist Organization document of 1919, or only the intermediate stage of the “greater Israel” yet to be.

32. This analysis should also explain to the Assembly the Arab determination not to accommodate Israeli expansion, but rather to invoke the lawful right of self-defence in the face of conquest and continual faits accomplis. As long as Israel is conceived in terms of boundaries, ever advancing, never stopping, there is no hope of peace for this area, or for the Israelis, or for the Arabs, or even for the world at large. If this process continues, it draws behind it, by a natural sequence, all the other distortions which we have witnessed and are witnessing: the desire to expel the Arabs, to expropriate their lands, to discriminate against them and to persecute and uproot the original Arab population.

33. That is why there is a liberation movement among the Palestinian Arabs. The simple, inescapable, unavoidable fact, which no amount of sophistry or casuistry can erase, is that for more than two decades, in defiance of every principle of the Charter and of all the rights of the Arabs legislated by this body, Zionist aggression has driven Palestinian people from their homes and kept them in exile. All the legislation of this body legalizes their right to return if they elect to do so. And if they have lost patience and faith in the ability of the United Nations to bring the aggressor to comply with this legislation, then nothing is accomplished here by the former terrorists—the former members of the Stern Gang, the Irgun Z'vai Leumi, the Palmach, the Haganah—who call the Arabs “terrorists” if they are now forced to resort to their own devices in an effort to achieve these confirmed, internationally legislated rights.

34. This Arab resistance movement of the Palestinian people is but a continuation and a resurrection of the soul of a people which has, since the Balfour Declaration and the British Mandate, consistently refused to accept a systematic invasion backed by technology, resources and military power so superior that there has been no semblance of any proportion between them and the forces brought from the outside by the imperialist Powers against them. Zionist-Israeli propaganda has continued up to today to claim that there was no Arab resistance to the Zionist invasion of Palestine. But we know too well of the rewriting of history by Fascists. Real history knows that the Arab people of Palestine resisted in organized political action and in all visible forms of resistance ranging from peaceful demonstration to outbursts of violence against the Mandatory Power and lastly to open full-scale revolution, guerrilla action and liberation movements, which continued for three years, from 1936 to 1939, during which at least 15,000 Arabs were killed in Palestine. That period 1936 to 1939 was significant, for it preceded by one decade the national rising of India, Indonesia and Indo-China, it preceded by more than a decade and a half the national risings of Arab North Africa, and by two decades the national rising of the rest of Africa. It was the pioneering model of a popular twentieth-century revolution, and that fact alone is a tribute to the Palestinian Arabs. Their rising, however, was as tragic and as premature as that of Spartacus against Rome. It was cruelly crushed twice—first in 1939 and then barbarically in 1948 by the Serbai Zionist terrorist organization. The resurgence of this struggle in 1965, after the most drastic and fatal expulsion of the people from their land, is a modern form of the miracle of resurrection. But unfortunately the tragedy of the Arabs of Palestine did not end there. Their night is long. The

butchery and cold-bloodedness did not end then. Yet they never relinquished their legal title or their sovereignty over their homeland, Palestine. And now, more than 15 years later, first the Arabs of Palestine, and now the Arabs of the neighbouring countries—Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon—must face a special brand of colonialism, Zionist colonialism. For a while classical settler colonialism imposed and progressively developed the objective conditions for the exploitation of the masses, zionism, with its built-in racism and Jewish exclusivism, negated the very physical presence of the original inhabitants, whether Arabs or non-Arabs, white or black. It was precisely in that sense that the problems of the Arab refugees—now numbering more than 3.5 million—from Palestine and the occupied Arab territories differ from any other refugee problem, for they followed from the negation of the very existence of Arab rights in favour of exclusivist, racist and neurotic zionism aiming to fulfil a so-called biblical prophecy.

35. It is strange indeed that, in the middle of the twentieth century, supporters of zionism such as the United States, which is pressing napalm into the service of its interpretation of biblical prophecy, should so relentlessly devote themselves to the extension of a State that runs against the norms of law and morality and the course of history. At least the argument of biblical prophecy is not invoked or exploited to justify the use of napalm, fragmentation bombs and other chemical and biological warfare in Viet-Nam and war crimes in that country.

36. On 14 May 1948 the British High Commissioner called a press conference in his office in the King David Hotel in Jerusalem. This was the last day of the British Mandate over Palestine, although the Mandate was supposed to end in October 1948. But the Zionists were pressing for the establishment of their State without fixed boundaries and its quick recognition without fixed boundaries by other States. And that is very meaningful.

37. After a statement on the achievements of His Majesty's Government in the country and the unhappy circumstances of the termination of the Mandate, one of the assembled journalists asked the British High Commissioner, "And to whom, Sir, do you intend to give the keys of your office?" Blushing and valiantly forcing a smile, he replied, "I shall put them under the mat"—a fitting epitaph to perhaps the shabbiest régime in British colonial history. Israel was proclaimed, and States hurried to recognize this amorphous, undefined and strange creature soon to become, *de facto* if not *de jure*, the fifty-first state of the Union, one of the corner-stones of the post-Second World War American empire and, like Viet-Nam, a symbol of *Pax Americana*.

38. Mr. CARDOSO (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): I have asked the representative of Guinea to let me speak first because I have to leave for home this afternoon. Since all the other representatives who went to the Middle East have already spoken on the question, I wish to express my delegation's point of view on this problem which is crucial to world peace.

39. First, may I associate myself with all previous speakers in paying heartfelt tribute to the memory of Mr. Ralph Bunche, who has just left us. He rendered outstanding service to the world and to my country in particular. He

was the first United Nations representative in Zaire in 1960 to organize all the assistance we were given by Member States in defending the territorial integrity of our country and our independence. Our whole nation will always be grateful to him. May his family take these words as the expression of our deepest condolences.

40. I shall be brief about the question of the Middle East. My colleagues from Nigeria [*2008th meeting*] and Senegal [*2002nd meeting*] have already stated the essential. The concern of our heads of State, and particularly the President of the Republic of Zaire, Lieutenant-General Joseph-Désiré Mobutu, is to restore peace in the Middle East. If they went to the area, it was above all in order to go beyond the usual framework of resolutions buried in the archives of our international organizations, to get off the beaten track and to break away from texts and working documents, such as the aide-mémoire by Mr. Jarring [*A/8541, annex I*], in order to make a positive, albeit modest contribution. Much has been said about that aide-mémoire, about the positive response to it from one side, and the lack of response or the negative response from the other.

41. The truth is that we are losing time and drawing closer to the sad and fateful moment when the response to the aide-mémoire by Mr. Jarring will no longer come from a negotiating table, but from the battlefields. The military escalation which is developing in the Middle East makes it imperative that Mr. Jarring return to the region without further delay. There is good will! We have seen that it is so.

42. Our heads of State, meeting as a committee of wise men of the Organization of African Unity, submitted suggestions to Egypt and Israel. The replies to these suggestions are available to the Secretary-General and to Mr. Jarring. They are not negative. I should like to touch on at least two of them.

43. President El-Sadat is the only Arab head of State who wants a peace treaty with Israel. He has told us so. Is this not a chance for peace? Mrs. Meir, Prime Minister of Israel, has told us that secure and recognized borders can be crossed in a spirit of peace. Hence, they are not closed borders. Is this not also a chance for peace? So let us not make the fate of mankind contingent on the so-called favourable or unfavourable replies to the Jarring aide-mémoire.

44. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): May I be permitted, first of all, on behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Guinea, to take advantage of this opportunity to associate ourselves with all those who have paid a sincere tribute to the memory of our brother and friend, Mr. Ralph Bunche, whose death will leave a tremendous void in the international community and more particularly in our Organization.

45. Mr. President, we ask you to be good enough to convey to the family of the deceased, to the Secretary-General, to his colleagues, and to the Government and people of the United States the sincere condolences of the people and Government of Guinea.

46. At a time when the General Assembly is taking up once again the question of the Middle East, my delegation

would like here to set forth briefly a few considerations that come to mind in view of the persistence of the serious situation in the region.

47. A little over four years ago, the armed forces of Israel unleashed a premeditated attack against sovereign States Members of the United Nations, the latest in a long and implacable series of aggressive acts committed by the world Zionist movement in order to conquer territory at the expense of the Arab peoples of the region. Since then, every year, the General Assembly, international conferences, and regional and international organizations have debated the question and tried to find a solution in accord with the principles proclaimed in the United Nations Charter and governing international relations.

48. Every attempt at meditation, every effort made towards a just and lasting peace, has met with the intransigence of Israel. Not only have the territories occupied in June 1967 not have been evacuated, but intolerable steps have been taken by the Zionist authorities to worsen the situation. Thus, Jerusalem and the Holy Places have been annexed, the inhabitants of the occupied territories have been compelled to flee their homes dynamited by a bloodthirsty soldiery, and Jewish immigrants have been settled in the occupied territories.

49. Some may be surprised at the ease with which Israel toys with world opinion, with impunity flouting all United Nations resolutions and meeting all peace initiatives with insolent intransigence. To understand this, one must first understand the realities of Zionism, its deep meaning, the purposes pursued and the means applied by the world Zionist movement, to realize how far Zionism has today become a danger and a serious threat to the security of all nations that harbour large settlements of Jews in their midst. It may seem paradoxical that Israel, as a creature of international imperialism, dares to defy its masters and protectors. Yet, that is reality. Whereas people ask for pressure to be exerted on Israel, it is Israel which is bringing pressure to bear on a number of States, and in particular on the United States of America, its principal ally and supporter.

50. It is not the intention of my delegation to go over the whole train of events which have made the Middle East problem a new and painful trial for the Arab peoples. However, we believe a brief survey is called for.

51. On 5 June 1967, Israel launched a surprise attack on three Arab States and, despite the cease-fire proclaimed on 7 June, its armed forces continued their advance to ensure control of further territory. In June and July of 1967, the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session stressed the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force and called for the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from all the occupied territories. On 22 November 1967, the Security Council unanimously adopted its famous resolution 242 (1967), which reaffirmed the same principles, adding, however, that it was necessary to work for a just and lasting peace enabling each State to live in safety within secure and recognized boundaries.

52. I shall not dwell on the fantastic interpretations Israel has placed on the terms of this resolution. The error, or

more precisely the masterstroke, of the authors of this resolution, was to have used a language—English—that opened the way to all sorts of possible interpretation of a word or a phrase. We must credit the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, Mr. Abba Eban, with having denounced here in his speech of 6 December 1971 [2000th meeting], the bad faith of the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who had claimed that the omission of the word “all” before “territories” was deliberate.

53. Unfortunately, this is one more foul blow we must put to the account of the United Kingdom, perfidious Albion, whose crimes throughout the world have engendered problems such as those of the Middle East, Rhodesia, South Africa, Namibia, the India-Pakistan conflict, and so forth, to mention only those.

54. Resolution 242 (1967), which was ambiguous only for Israel and its friends, the British Foreign Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of State of the United States, nevertheless spelt out the framework for a partial settlement of the crisis. Israel could have used it to obtain what it has sought ever since 1947, namely recognition of its existence by its neighbours and its right to live in the region.

55. Given the failure of all these efforts, from the Jarring mission to the two-Power talks, the four-Power talks, and the African initiative, we must face the obvious fact: Israel does not want peace, or rather Israel prefers the *status quo* which gives it territories while it waits to acquire others.

56. In the view of my delegation, we must together seek out the causes for these various failures, and also the deep-rooted motives for Israel's unreasonable attitude. My delegation believes that one of the primary causes of the present impasse is the fact that we have voluntarily sacrificed substance to form. Although there is no longer any question whether Israel should or should not exist as a State, we say sincerely that the creation by imperialism of a Zionist State on another people's land was a grave historical error. If Europe wanted to give asylum to Jews who had escaped from the Nazi concentration camps, it could have done so in Europe itself, where everyone was living peacefully. Why therefore did they choose the land of another people, Palestine, knowing full well the unfortunate consequences that such an action would engender? How could the United Kingdom and its allies imagine that a people could be expelled from their homeland with impunity and not then experience an overwhelming urge to regain their usurped land by every available means?

57. If we add the artificial creation of the State of Israel on the soil of Palestine to the fact that originally there were plans to install Israel either in Uganda or in what is now the Republic of Guinea, in the very heart of Africa, then we are compelled to recognize and admit that from the very outset Israel was a colonial fact and, as such, had to be opposed. And Israel has conducted itself in the region as a veritable colonial Power. By successive military aggressions it has enlarged its territory at the cost of its neighbours. By a massive and selective immigration of Jews and Zionists from Europe, America and South Africa, it has created a racial State, filled with hatred and eager for revenge. Little by little it has gathered around itself all of the Jews living throughout the world so as to make of them Zionist States within our respective States.

58. It is indeed no secret to anyone that Israel is an expansionist State. Ever since the plan for the partition of Palestine that the General Assembly adopted on 29 November 1947 [resolution 181 (II)], every war between Israel and the Arabs has been used by Israel to expand at the expense of the Arab nations. And since every time crime paid, Israel sees no reason why it should stop when things are going so well. Judging from the documents circulated by the Egyptian delegation and, above all, from the numerous statements by Israeli leaders such as Moshe Dayan, Mrs. Golda Meir, Yigal Allon, and the Foreign Minister himself, Abba Eban, the secure frontiers of Israel could very well run from the Nile to the Euphrates provided other Zionists do not extend them from Morocco to the Persian Gulf.

59. We have said that Israel represented a potential danger not only for the Middle East region, but equally and particularly for the great majority of Member States present here whose populations include large numbers of Jews. If one thing is clear it is the fact that a Jew, and above all a Zionist, wherever he may be and whatever his position in the nation that shelters him, is first and foremost a citizen of Israel. As such, his dual nationality enables him to exert pressure on the circles he frequents for purposes of advancing the interests of the Zionist Diaspora or the State of Israel. And since everyone knows that the Jews in the United States of America and in Europe occupy and control almost all the key posts in society—finance, the armaments industry, commerce, the audio-visual information media, special services, legislatures, public administration, and so forth—it is easy to see to what degree Israel can threaten the internal and external security of so many States throughout the world.

60. There is no need to cite examples of cases where the Israel lobby has succeeded in either changing or completely nullifying the official attitude of a government, or frustrating a blockade or an embargo decreed against it. The United States Secretary of State, William Rogers, and his Assistant Secretary, Joseph Sisco, can give eloquent testimony to the power of Israel, just as the French Government was made to realize the narrow limits of its action against Israel by the affair of the gunboats at Cherbourg.

61. This capacity of Israel to interfere in the affairs of other States has reached the point where it would be more logical today to inquire, concerning the pressures that the United States is being asked to exert on Israel to bring it to a more flexible attitude, how far Israel authorizes the United States of America to go in applying resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council.

62. This Zionist imperialism extends even to the army, where Jews of various nationalities who have served or are serving in the ranks of the American or European armies come together, as if by magic, under the Star of David to fight the Arabs. I have said it, and I say it again, loud and clear: we can never overestimate the danger Israel represents to the security of our States.

63. The Zionist grip extends even to the heart of Africa, which, thank God, does not include any genuinely African Jews. Israel has got round this difficulty by taking to neo-colonialism, which is now rampant and which allows

this Assembly to hear certain African statements on the Middle East which Israel itself would not dare make here.

64. Since we know the range of the arsenal at the service of Israel throughout the world for the purpose of perpetuating and justifying before public opinion Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy, it is indeed high time for our Organization to refuse to lend itself any longer to this infamous farce that presents the Zionists as lambs persecuted by wicked Arab wolves.

65. Israel must put an end to its policy of playing for time and of trickery. Israel must state clearly to our Organization not only its desire to live in peace and to see peace restored in the area, but also its will to contribute fully and effectively to that peace. And in so doing, Israel must give a positive answer to Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 [A/8541, annex I]. It must officially and publicly announce, here and in Tel Aviv, that it will withdraw all its forces and all of its colonies of settlers from all territories occupied in June 1967. Israel must understand that the final settlement of its dispute with the Arab States can be achieved only through the inevitable return to their homes of the Palestinian people.

66. Together, in a multinational and multiracial State, Israelis and Palestinians will build an even stronger nation and, with the co-operation of all their neighbours and of the whole Middle East region, will establish an area of prosperity, civilization and culture.

67. Is that too much to ask of the Tel Aviv authorities? We think quite sincerely that Israel can and must understand this language before it is too late.

68. While we understand perfectly the right of every people to ensure its own security, we do find it difficult to conceive at the same time why the quest for security must of necessity entail violating the security of one's neighbours—for example, through the occupation by force of part of their national territory.

Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar (Peru), Vice-President, took the Chair.

69. Africa has had, and still has, deep sympathy for the Jewish people, who were persecuted and humiliated by Europe, for the very reason that the African, too, has paid a bitter tribute to the history of colonialism. And having in large measure regained its right to freedom and dignity, Africa considered and still considers the Jews as brothers, to be defended against our common oppressors from Europe. The Africans, Arabs and Asians, those three peoples who have suffered the weight of European domination, were thus joined by the Jews. Imagine, then, how great were our disappointment and indignation when this Jewish people, under the leadership of revanchist and embittered Zionists from Europe and America turned its spleen and its weapons against the Arabs, using and extending the Nazi methods that horrified the world.

70. How is such behaviour to be explained? If Israel had been set up in Uganda or Guinea, the Zionists in power would then have behaved like the present Fascists of South Africa! This explains why the Republic of Guinea, which

previously maintained with the State of Israel excellent diplomatic, economic and cultural relations, completely broke off all those relations as of 5 June 1967, when it became clear that Israel was an aggressor.

71. Israel must realize that Africa will never forgive it unless it changes its attitude. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel saw for himself, in Africa, the devious results of his trip to Africa shortly before the summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity at Addis Ababa.⁷ The summit resolution, resolution AHG/Res.66 (VIII),⁸ voted unanimously by the member States, which so irritated Tel Aviv, clearly expressed the aspirations and the thinking of our continent in the face of Israel's persistent refusal to evacuate the occupied territories. It was in order to explain that to the Israeli leaders and to invite them, sincerely, immediately and concretely, to take the path which leads to peace that Africa appointed a Committee to help reactivate the Jarring mission. Though a party to the conflict, since Egypt is a member of its regional organization, Africa has never tried to be a mediator or an arbitrator. My delegation will therefore not comment here on the results of that explanatory mission, reserving our right to do that in Africa, in the OAU, when the time comes to draw the necessary conclusions.

72. None the less, we hope that Israel will not lose this opportunity to renew contacts with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in order to find a peaceful solution to this conflict, a solution for which everyone is hoping. We say this with all the more conviction because we think that the present leaders of Israel ought to be able to go beyond themselves and look farther into the future. History is full of examples of peoples and nations imbued with a sense of their racial, religious or military superiority which finally perished by fire and sword and sank into the nothingness from which they should never have emerged. The authorities of Tel Aviv are not unaware that their own people are tired of these warlike adventures which, sooner or later, will end in catastrophe. Israel must surely know that if it does not now immediately take the road that leads to peace, the Arab peoples will be left with only one way to solve this problem: to take back by force what was conquered by force.

⁷ Eighth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held from 21 to 23 June 1971.

⁸ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1971*, document S/10272.

73. Moshe Dayan and his centurions are not unaware that in the case of a resumption of hostilities Israel also will suffer very severe trials, pending the not very distant day when the fortunes of war could turn against them. Is that really what Israel wants? Is that really what the international community hopes for?

74. The United Nations—and in particular the Security Council—cannot fail to be aware of the seriousness of the situation created by the persistent refusal of Israel, which is in defiance of world public opinion, a refusal whose corollary is the legitimate desire of the Arab States to settle the problem by the only means after all open to them.

75. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Security Council is not going to wait for the explosion that is smouldering before taking the necessary measures. The present conflict between India and Pakistan is too fresh in our minds for us not to hope that the United Nations will no longer commit the tragic error of temporizing, when there is every indication that the Middle East is heading towards a resumption of hostilities, whose consequences in all logic no one here can foresee. It is because we wish at all costs to spare the Arab and Israeli peoples new sufferings and sacrifices that we invite Israel, once again, to think about what it could ask of the United Nations and of the international community the day when the fortunes of war turn against it and the Arab armies make their entry into Tel Aviv.

76. It is in terms of such a future that we ask the leaders of Israel to understand that the securest and most recognized boundaries which would ensure the best security for Israel are, in the last analysis, no more than Israel's capacity to create around it, between it and its Arab neighbours, a climate of tolerance, peace, friendship and fruitful collaboration. Perhaps it is still not too late for them to understand this point! Perhaps Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan will remember the words of their leader Ben-Gurion, who said that he would give back all the territories in exchange for peace alone.

77. That is why I have the honour, on behalf of the Republic of Guinea and of 17 other Member States, to submit to the General Assembly draft resolution A/L.650. In view of the time allocated to us, this draft resolution, on which my delegation proposes to comment on another occasion, broadly recapitulates the principles of the Charter and the decisions taken by our Organization. I reserve the right to introduce this draft resolution at a later stage, in greater detail.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

