



Monday, 18 September 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 5:

Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister
for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics (concluded) 1

Agenda item 2:

Minute of silent prayer or meditation 9

Closure of the session 9

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

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): On behalf of the delegations of Finland, Sweden and Austria I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the draft resolution contained in document A/L.530.

2. In the terms of that draft resolution the General Assembly, having considered the grave situation in the Middle East and expressing its utmost concern about that situation, would decide to place on the agenda of its twenty-second regular session, as a matter of high priority, the question considered by the fifth emergency special session and refer to its twenty-second regular session the records of the meetings and the documents of this session.

3. The General Assembly will recall that on 21 July [1558th meeting] the delegations of Finland, Sweden and Austria had proposed the temporary adjournment of the fifth emergency special session. As was pointed out by the representative of Sweden on that occasion, when introducing the draft resolution [A/L.529], our three delegations had come to the conclusion, after wide consultations, that it would be advisable to adjourn the session temporarily. In that connexion we made it clear that our proposal did not mean an end to nor suspension of our efforts to reach a peaceful settlement through the United Nations. On the contrary, it was our hope that in the meantime further efforts, in particular by the Security Council, would make it possible to arrive at a generally acceptable solution.

4. As the Assembly reconvenes today we must realize that these expectations have not been fulfilled. It has not been possible in the meantime to find a common basis for a solution to the crisis in the Middle East, nor has it been possible to liquidate the causes or the consequences of the outbreak of hostilities. In

the opinion of the delegations in whose name I have the honour to speak, it will therefore be necessary for the General Assembly to keep the situation in the Middle East under continued consideration and to ensure that it will receive the urgent attention it deserves.

5. It is in the light of these considerations that, after wide consultations, we have presented the draft resolution which is now before the Assembly. We sincerely hope that this proposal will receive the unanimous support of the Assembly and that it will enable the United Nations to continue its efforts to bring about a peaceful and generally acceptable solution to the problems of the Middle East.

6. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution introduced by Austria on behalf of the sponsors is contained in document A/L.530. Does any member wish to speak before the vote?

7. Since there is no speaker before the vote, I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/L.530.

The draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

8. The PRESIDENT: Does any member wish to speak at this stage?

9. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): The Assembly has just voted, by an overwhelming majority, to recommend that the item discussed during the fifth emergency special session be put on the agenda of the twenty-second regular session of the General Assembly. The representative of Austria, in introducing the draft resolution, underlined the gravity of the situation in the Middle East and expressed the concern that all Members of the United Nations should feel about that situation. It is perhaps indicative of the attitude of Israel that, with two other States, it abstained and would not vote in favour of a resolution that expresses the universal concern of the international community in this crisis.

10. It is usual on such occasions, when a session is nearing its end, to take stock of its achievements and its failures. But in doing this, I think we should remind ourselves constantly of the circumstances which led to the convening of this fifth emergency special session. A festering crisis erupted into open war—a crisis dated not from the announcement of the closing of the Strait of Tiran to Israeli shipping, but from the day the Zionist movement challenged the people of Palestine with the avowed intention of taking over their country, liquidating their national existence in their homeland and dispossessing them and denying them their birthright of freedom.

11. All the problems that we face today flow from this cardinal fact. The fanatical determination of the Zionist movement to conquer Palestine and, I may add, as much Arab territory as is possible, could only be opposed and resisted by the Arab people.
12. Last May a new crisis erupted as a result of the threats directed against Member States of the region by the State of Israel, which for two weeks before the war made clear its intention to resort to arms at a time when the Arab States repeatedly assured the Secretary-General and the international community at large that they would not be the ones to initiate offensive action. It may be of interest that General Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Defence Minister, nearly two months ago, in discussing the mistakes that were committed by the Arab side, said that perhaps the greatest mistake that they committed was that they did not strike first. A very useful lesson, is it not, to be learned by the international community in the situation of lawlessness and international anarchy that the leaders of Israel would like the world to be engulfed in.
13. Having thus upheld the principle of surprise pre-emptive attack and put it into operation in accordance with a plan that must have been prepared for some time, Israeli forces were able to occupy large territories belonging to the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. Faced with this situation, the Security Council, in ordering a cease-fire, should have, as it has done on many occasions in the past, ordered also the withdrawal of troops behind their original positions. For the first time in the history of this Organization that was not done—with the tragic and disastrous consequences that we see today.
14. In fact, all the Syrian territory that was occupied was occupied after the cease-fire resolutions had been adopted by the Security Council. The failure of the Security Council led to the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly at the request of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [see A/6717], to whose initiative we have paid a tribute, as we pay it again today.
15. This emergency special session may go down in history as a failure, as an abdication of responsibility, as a sacrifice of important principles for the sake of expediency. But we maintain that, in spite of its failure on the principal and basic issue, it has to its credit certain positive achievements. It has helped to focus world attention on an issue which far transcends the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It gave an opportunity to the overwhelming majority of Member States of this Organization to express their views on fundamental questions which are closely related to the international order which the Charter of the United Nations is designed to construct and establish. It has also set the stage for what we hope will be serious and expeditious handling of that crisis by the forthcoming twenty-second session of the General Assembly.
16. We have already taken an important step in that direction by adopting the resolution sponsored by Austria, Finland and Sweden [A/L.530], to which we pay our tribute for their timely and useful initiative.
17. Also, but not least, the Assembly took forthright decisions, which, of course, have been flouted and disregarded openly by Israel. But they are decisions of momentous significance, because they reflect the near unanimity of this Organization—I mean, the rejection by this Assembly of Israel's attempts to annex Jerusalem, and also its reaffirmation of the right of the refugees to return to their homes. During the twenty-second regular session I am sure Members will want to address themselves to these two aspects of the problem, in addition to the basic question of foreign military occupation.
18. The fact that the Assembly has failed to reach a decision to adopt a resolution giving expression to the principles which, as I have said, a vast majority of the Members of this Organization have adhered to is perhaps due to the efforts and pressures exerted by certain Powers.
19. What are those basic principles which should be embodied in any resolution adopted by this Assembly at its forthcoming session? They are, first and foremost, the inadmissibility of territorial expansion brought about by war; secondly, the inadmissibility of using that temporary occupation to exact political concessions and achieve territorial and other advantages. There was also the universal desire to deal seriously and effectively with the underlying problems, especially that which touches the interests of more than a million human beings, namely, the question of the refugees.
20. It is quite clear that Israel does not wish any action to be taken in this or any other Assembly on this issue. Its reasons are very clear, and I am sure they are known to all Members of this Organization. Israel hopes that through the silence of this Assembly, through its inaction, it may be able to consolidate its occupation of Arab territory and reap the fruit of its aggression. But for any other Member State to be party to those aims is, in our view, the surest way to lay the ground for a new conflict and to weaken beyond remedy this Organization and all it stands for.
21. There can be no international order if a State is allowed, on one pretext or another, to launch an attack against another Member State, to occupy its territory, and then to maintain that occupation, using it as a means of obtaining political and territorial advantages.
22. The Israeli authorities never tire of speaking about the necessity of direct negotiations. At the same time, their leaders say: "Yes, negotiations, but there are certain things which are not negotiable; Jerusalem is not negotiable; our occupation of certain areas on the western bank is not negotiable". But surely no Member State in this hall can possibly be fooled by those declarations of peaceful intent.
23. What kind of negotiations can be held when territories of Member States are under military occupation? It must be very clear that the United Nations itself has to play the major role in this crisis. And, as the Secretary-General very rightly said in his press conference on Saturday, 16 September, it would not be realistic to do otherwise, and the United Nations indeed has an important and necessary role. It is our hope that that role will be played in a way consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and with the principles of equity and justice.

24. Many speeches have been made on this issue and, I imagine, many more will be made in the forthcoming session. But surely the time for action has come—the time for action that will not only uphold the principles of the Charter but remove the basic cause of friction and the threat of war in the area at present, namely, the prolonged Israeli occupation of Arab land.

25. Before I end this brief statement let me express on behalf of my delegation and, I am sure, of many other Arab delegations, our profound gratitude for the support which the cause of the United Nations, and not ours, has received at the hands of so many Member States from Asia and Africa and, of course, from the socialist countries. It is our hope that that firm stand in the defence of the principles of the United Nations will be emulated by the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization when we reconvene at our regular session tomorrow.

26. Now that I have the floor, Mr. President, may I also express our admiration for the way in which you conducted the affairs of this session and assure you of our understanding and appreciation of all that has been done by you in the way of consultations in order to bring about a successful conclusion of the fifth emergency special session. And I leave this rostrum appealing to my colleagues in this hall not to allow themselves to be discouraged, not to heed the advice of inaction that is being given by certain quarters, but to try again and again, during this coming session, to reach a decision that will be consistent with the Charter and will defend the rights of those who have been victims of this aggression.

27. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): At this stage my delegation wishes, on a point of order, to make a short technical announcement and to state that in the voting which just took place my delegation had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution. As soon as we noticed the error we tried to correct it but the voting machine was already locked. We notified the Secretariat, but you, Mr. President, were announcing the result of the vote and it was not possible for you to incorporate this correction in your announcement. We hope that it will be made clear in the record of this meeting.

28. I wish to reserve the right of my delegation to exercise its right of reply later should that be necessary.

29. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): It is obvious that the situation in the Middle East and in other parts of the world—the international situation as a whole—remains extremely tense. The aggression committed by Israel against the Arab States as a result of the criminal conspiracy of the most reactionary forces of world imperialism has set the world a new and difficult test. Now, as before, it is quite clear that this was a carefully planned provocation designed to ensure political changes in the Middle East favourable to the imperialists, to subvert the national liberation movements of the Arab peoples and to weaken the progressive régimes in the United Arab Republic, Syria and other countries of the Arab East.

30. Israel acted as a tool in the hands of more powerful imperialist States whose ruling circles

are filled with intense hatred of everything that is progressive. In various parts of the world they strive to halt by means of armed force the historical progress of the peoples towards national independence, democracy and socialism.

31. The struggle in the Security Council for the condemnation of the criminal action of Tel Aviv and the termination of aggression laid bare before the world the imperialist policy of Washington, London and Bonn, which are backing the extremist forces of Israel against the Arab States, and unmasked their far-reaching plans of aggression. The cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East, in conformity with the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, constituted a definite success for the forces of peace. However, this did not mean the end of aggression, since the armed forces of Israel have continued to occupy territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

32. The discussion of the Middle East situation at the special emergency session of the General Assembly, which was convoked on the initiative of the Soviet Union, made it possible to focus world attention on the need for effective and urgent measures to eliminate the consequences of aggression and, in the first place, to secure the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territory of Arab States.

33. At this session the Soviet Union, as is well known, energetically pursued a policy based on Leninist foreign policy principles and aimed at putting an end to aggression in the Middle East, protecting the legitimate rights of the United Arab Republic, Syria and other Arab peoples and defending the cause of world peace.

34. Not only the socialist States, the Arab countries and the progressive non-aligned States, but also many Latin American countries gave pride of place in their statements and draft resolutions to the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops. The exception was a very small group of countries, headed by the United States, which continued to abet the forces of Israeli aggression.

35. At present the attention of States Members of the United Nations has been drawn to the intolerable situation created as a result of the continuing occupation of Arab lands by Israel troops and Tel Aviv's refusal to heed the views of the overwhelming majority of countries in the world and the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly.

36. The position held by Israel thus far in no way indicates that its leaders heed to the voice of reason or realize that nothing so undermines the very foundations of the existence of the State of Israel in the Middle East as their policy of aggression against neighbouring Arab nations.

37. The General Assembly has before it a report of the Secretary-General [A/6793] on the implementation, or rather the non-implementation, by Israel, of the Assembly resolution relative to Jerusalem. That report is fresh proof of the shocking off-handedness with which the Israel authorities reject the legitimate demands of the General Assembly and the requirements of our Organization's Charter. It is a damning document, which shows with the utmost clarity that

the ruling circles in Tel Aviv again confirmed to the representatives of the United Nations what they have already stated publicly on several occasions, namely, that they do not intend to accede to the unequivocal demands of the General Assembly, which has opposed Israel's attempts to enjoy the fruits of its aggression by perpetuating its hold over the conquered Arab territories.

38. Disregarding the General Assembly resolution on the question of Jerusalem, adopted by 100 States Members of the United Nations, Tel Aviv, in its reply to the Secretary-General [see A/6793, para. 155], cynically asserts that "A salient fact of Jerusalem's life today is the intrinsic necessity of ... extending" to all its residents "the same ... facilities" of Israel administration or, in other words, the annexation of the eastern sector of Jerusalem by the Israeli aggressors.

39. That reply, signed by the Head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Israel, shows open contempt for the United Nations and its resolutions; it makes a mockery of the fundamental principles of contemporary international law, the United Nations Charter, and the most elementary concepts of justice in international relations.

40. There can be no shadow of doubt that without its powerful supporters and patrons Tel Aviv would never have dared to pursue its policy of aggression and challenge the neighbouring Arab peoples as well as all peace-loving States and the United Nations itself. It is thanks to the encouragement of the United States of America and certain other NATO Powers interested in weakening the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples that Israel has twice within the last ten years engaged in military escapades.

41. In view of the armed provocations of Israel that continue in the Suez Canal zone and around the River Jordan, and the intolerable situation that has been brought about by Israel's refusal to implement the General Assembly resolutions relating to Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], the United Nations must take measures to secure the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from the conquered Arab territories and to eliminate the other consequences of Tel Aviv's criminal aggression against the neighbouring Arab States.

42. The Soviet Union considers that the maintenance of peace in the Middle East and the restoration of the lawful rights of the Arab States, violated by the aggression, are in the interests of all peace-loving States. Since the twenty-second regular session of the General Assembly begins tomorrow, the USSR delegation considers that the question of the termination of Israel's aggression against the Arab States must be examined at that session as a matter of the utmost importance and urgency. That is why we supported the resolution providing for such treatment of this question at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly. We resolutely support the Arab States in their just struggle for freedom, territorial integrity and the elimination of the aftermath of Israel's aggression. Only Israel and two of its odious allies, South Africa and Portugal, which are the embodiment of racism and colonialism, the three together forming a Trinity that is far from holy, chose to abstain today

in the vote on the draft resolution [A/L.530] which was unanimously supported by all other Members of the United Nations. Thus Israel has again publicly opposed the General Assembly and the overwhelming majority of the States of the world. The hasty attempt of the Israel representative at this rostrum to explain away Israel's position in the vote by technical reasons could hardly have misled anyone. Rather, the fact that the Assembly has decisively supported that decision has compelled the Israel representatives to lay the blame on the electronic voting machinery.

43. It is the duty of the United Nations to put an end once and for all to Israel's aggression, to obtain the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces from the occupied territories, to ensure respect for the fundamental principles of the United Nations and the resolutions of the General Assembly and to restore peace in the Middle East.

44. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (translated from French): It is already two months since this emergency special session suspended its work after the painful failure that we all remember. This Assembly was unable to assemble a majority on any constructive proposal for a settlement of the situation arising from Israel's attack on the Arab countries. In the face of a situation which could not have been more clear-cut, the Assembly refused to recognize aggression and to denounce the aggressor, thus enormously disappointing not only the Arab peoples but also opinion throughout the world which realized how dangerous such an attitude is for the future.

45. I do not think we need abandon ourselves to lamentations or to useless recriminations. We prefer to look to the future, but we cannot but draw a lesson from this first setback. Two months will have allowed both sides to reflect on the tragic situation that prevails in the Middle East; these two months will have helped to give us a little historical perspective and will, we hope, have opened the eyes of all men of good faith, all men of good will, to the realities of the Middle East as they exist at this moment.

46. It is easy today, perhaps, to assign responsibility and to see, beyond the propaganda, on which side there is fanaticism, on which side belligerence, from which side the challenge comes.

47. Unfortunately, our Assembly was not able to assume its responsibilities in the face of this grave conflict, but it had at least the merit, in a burst of energy, of twice stating its opinion, almost unanimously, on the question of occupied Jerusalem, the primary target of Israel's expansionism.

48. Because of this, quite obviously, the matter has become a test question for the United Nations, for the Arabs and for Israel. We know today where we stand: a high international authority has given us the results of that test. It emerges quite clearly from the report of the Secretary-General and his representative that a series of violations of international law have been committed against the Moslem and Christian populations of the Old City: the profanation of the Holy Places, the confiscation of land belonging to the churches, the takeover by the Israel Army of certain property "for its own use" [A/6793 and Corr.1, para. 65], gratuitous harassment of a provocative

character such as the installation of the High Rabbinical Court in East Jerusalem, the dynamiting of houses in the Arab quarter, the complete destruction of the Catholic parish church and presbytery, and so on. It also emerges clearly from the report that a series of typically colonial measures have been taken, called by the typical euphemisms of the colonial vocabulary, such as the famous "economic shock" [ibid., para. 68], and the "pedagogic control" [ibid., para. 104] exercised over the schools, which led the representative of the Secretary-General to note himself "the pronounced aversion", to use his own words, of the indigenous inhabitants to these measures [ibid., para. 128].

49. And when the representative of the Secretary-General of our Organization turns to Israel, a Member of this same Organization, to ask for an explanation of these things and to inform it of the feelings of this Assembly, he is given a categorical reply in the shape of a formula which will go down in history at the United Nations, a formula which has one merit, that of being perfectly clear: the situation, he is told, is irreversible and not negotiable. Few such examples of arrogance have been recorded by our Organization.

50. Those who believed in the willingness of the small, innocent State of Israel to negotiate know now where they stand. Now we are all enlightened on the conciliatory spirit of the Zionist leaders and the sincerity of their pacific statements. It is clear that Israel now intends to impose its will not only on the Arab countries but also on the international community.

51. We cannot of course place all the responsibility for this attitude on the Assembly, but there can be no doubt that the leaders in Tel Aviv saw in the refusal of the emergency special session to condemn their aggression and to call for the withdrawal of their troops an encouragement to persist in their irredentist attitude.

52. It now rests with the Organization to disabuse them. If, through the test question of Jerusalem, this session has enabled Member States to convince themselves of the realities of the situation and to assess its dangers, our meeting will not have been altogether in vain.

53. The resolution adopted before the suspension of our work [2256 (ES-V)], to which the Arab delegations could not subscribe, contained the idea of an emergency meeting of the Security Council, but the Council has not seen fit to give effect to the resolution. Today, the same countries which submitted that proposal have submitted to us a new draft resolution (A/L.530) referring the matter to the twenty-second regular session with a request for priority.

54. Tunisia, like the other Arab delegations, is grateful to these countries for the interest and the spirit of initiative they have shown throughout. It voted in favour of their proposal in the hope that the matter would be taken up in the spirit of a sincere quest for a just solution, in other words a solution which, taking into account all the aspects of the problem, in no way accepts the de facto situation created by force.

55. We were all the more willing to vote in favour of the draft resolution because it takes into account the

time factor and stresses that the matter must be given priority. There is no need to dwell on the question of whose side time favours. The farsighted know full well that time is not necessarily on the side of him who today is the strongest. One thing, however, is sure: time does not work on behalf of peace.

56. Now more than ever our Organization is forced to face its responsibilities. The problem has perhaps become more acute, but it has also become clearer: can the Members of the Assembly act in such a way as to ensure that never again shall we hear, in connexion with an international problem, that formula compounded of intransigence and fanaticism which consists in stating that the situation created by force is not negotiable.

57. I should like, at the close of this emergency special session, to express the gratitude and appreciation of the Arab delegations to the countries which have spoken on behalf of our just cause, to all the countries of Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and even Western Europe, where there have been found such countries as France and Spain to say "No" to aggression and injustice.

58. The Arab countries have heard many appeals for moderation and realism. These appeals, particularly those from friendly countries, have been felt profoundly throughout the Arab world. It is not paradoxical that today we in our turn should ask the Members of this Organization, those which are conscious of the responsibility entrusted to them by the Charter, that they too should be moderate and realistic. Does not true moderation consist in refuting and condemning fanaticism and arrogance wherever they arise? And does not realism consist in understanding that no country can indefinitely and with impunity defy a people and hold it in subjection, no matter what powerful weapons that country may possess?

59. The PRESIDENT: I have no more speakers on my list for explanations of vote. Some delegations have asked to be allowed to exercise their right of reply. In his statement the representative of Israel reserved his right to exercise his right of reply if he found it necessary. If he wishes to do so, I will call on him now. Does the representative of Israel wish to exercise his right of reply?

60. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) (from the floor): I would prefer to speak later.

61. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): We regret exceedingly that this emergency special session should near its end with a new show of invective and harshness such as we have just heard from the representative of the Soviet Union. It is ironic that the Soviet representative belatedly refers favourably to the Latin American initiative at this Assembly. But the history of the United Nations cannot be rewritten. It shows that the United States supported and voted in favour of the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1] and that the Soviet Union worked against that resolution and voted against it and, in the concluding speech of the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, castigated its Latin American sponsors.

62. We had hoped for a different tone and a different approach from the Soviet representative to this concluding meeting and to the new session of the General Assembly which will commence tomorrow.

63. For the time is overdue for healing, not harshness, and for all nations to work together to harmonize their views, as the Charter enjoins, to help bring about conditions essential to peace in the Middle East. Other approaches will not and cannot contribute to a solution of this problem.

64. Our own considered views as to how the United Nations can best contribute to bringing about peace in the Middle East with honour and dignity and justice for all will be expressed, and expressed constructively, in our speech in the general debate on Thursday.

65. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): During the course of his statement before the Assembly this morning, the representative of the Soviet Union took it upon himself to misinterpret the vote of my delegation when it abstained on the resolution adopted by the Assembly this morning. I just wish to remind the Assembly that during the debate on this item in the emergency special session—on 5 July in fact [1549th meeting]—my delegation had the opportunity to place on record its motives for abstaining on the resolutions on the item. That position still persists and guided us this morning in abstaining on the resolution adopted here.

66. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): This is the closing meeting of the emergency special session which has decided to transfer the debate on the situation in the Middle East to the twenty-second regular session of the General Assembly, a decision which my delegation supported.

67. This emergency special session was convened upon the initiative of the Soviet Union. The representative of the Soviet Union in his intervention today presented us with the same fare with which his delegation had opened its propaganda assault on my country. He offered the same remedies for the solution of the situation for which the Soviet Union itself shares a very great measure of responsibility. That remedy was first put to a test in the Security Council and was rejected. It was then served to the General Assembly and again was not acceptable to the United Nations.

68. No matter the vehemence and the obstinacy with which the Soviet delegation prosecuted its charges, the tribunal of world opinion has dismissed them as false. It makes no difference how these charges are dressed up. Their lack of substance is transparent. It is therefore no wonder that the Soviet solutions, based on false allegations in which unbridled defamation takes the place of evidence, have not commended themselves to unbiased opinion which constitutes the majority of this Assembly.

69. The representative of the Soviet Union has again tried to libel Israel as the aggressor, oblivious of the fact that his delegation has put that false charge twice to the test of the United Nations. It was rejected by the Security Council and it was rejected by the General Assembly. The opinion of the United Nations has been determined in formal votes in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. That is the authoritative view of the world community, and not

the charges which the representative of the Soviet Union is advancing again.

70. It is a well-established Soviet practice to glean from the United Nations record what suits its purpose, turning a blind eye to anything, however authoritative it might be, which does not fit its ends. Do I have to remind the representative of the Soviet Union that repetition does not convert falsehood into truth? This technique was practised in the not too distant past with initial success and ultimate disaster. It was practised on the Soviet Union where it caused untold suffering. Enlightened opinion had reason to believe and to hope that trends were developing in the Soviet Union which would caution it against this relapse into the past.

71. The only explanation we have for this—and I hope it is not too charitable a one—is that the Soviet Government is aware of the tremendous responsibility which it bears for the course events have taken since it first intervened in the affairs of the Middle East in 1955. The Soviet Union has given its unreserved diplomatic and political support to countries whose openly avowed aim has been to destroy, to eliminate, to extinguish a Member State of the United Nations. Its spokesmen have never publicly taken exception to Arab threats, belligerency, hostility and preparations for war against my country. Soviet spokesmen were sounding the call for peaceful coexistence all over the world, but were ominously silent about applying it in the Middle East. On the contrary, their propaganda did everything to inflame Arab passions and their political guidance deliberately misinformed the Arab Governments on alleged intentions of Israel.

72. The Soviet veto in the Security Council, freely available to the Arabs on request, provided them with a shield to pursue with impunity their hostility against Israel, while an incessant flow of Soviet arms equipped the Arab States with the means to pursue it.

73. But this policy collapsed when Israel refused to be wiped off the map and driven into the sea. The Soviet Government, instead of reappraising its policy in the light of its failure, is turning its wrath against Israel, instead of placing the blame where it squarely lies—on its own policies and on that of its Arab allies. Just as these policies have led to disasters in the past, their sterile continuation can only lead to new calamities.

74. The Assembly has been treated again to the customary presentation of the Arab position. The question of Jerusalem was mentioned and an attempt was made to exploit legitimate and widely held religious and spiritual interests in Jerusalem for the pursuit of warfare against Israel. The nineteen years of Jordanian occupation of Jerusalem shows the hollowness of the present Arab preoccupations. In violent defiance of United Nations resolutions, they occupied one half of Jerusalem, enforced its division on its inhabitants; they turned it into a front line position, mined the approaches to the Holy City, destroyed nearly all the places of Jewish worship and desecrated those which remained. They expelled the entire Jewish population from the Old City and repopulated the Jewish quarter with Arabs. They prevented all access to the Jewish holy places.

75. The Jordanian occupation régime distinguished itself by having been the first Jerusalem administration in history to deny Jews access to the Western Wall and to the Mount of Olives—places consecrated in Jewish faith and history for over 3,000 years. Venerated tombstones were used to pave Jordanian roads and build their military camps; and from the Old City, and from the walls of the Old City, the guns of their soldiers were trained on the streets teeming with men, women and children, opening fire at random.

76. This was the situation which lasted for nineteen years, until that fateful morning of 5 June 1967. Then, in an outburst of military exuberance, Jordan's youthful King ordered his guns to open fire, shelling indiscriminately the residential quarters of Jewish Jerusalem. They repeated what they had done in 1947 and 1948, when they subjected the city to the rigours of siege and bombardment. In 1948, for months, they held the defenceless city in the grip of their armies. Nevertheless, a starving population, cut off from food and water, tenaciously held on, sustained by ageless faith in the eternal link of the Jewish people and Jerusalem.

77. This time, despite the fact that we felt strong enough to throw back any onslaught, the Government of Israel, even after the Jordanian bombardment had lasted for several hours, made a supreme and last-minute effort to dissuade King Hussein from continuing his aggression. But he pursued his disastrous course. Israel repulsed the attack and drove the aggressors out of Jerusalem. The fight was heavy and we paid a high toll: the best of our youth. They shunned no sacrifice because they knew this was the hour of destiny for Jerusalem. A city divided against itself has been made one again, and a city embattled has become again a city of peace.

78. Jerusalem regained its true significance. Yerushalayim means the city of peace, and since the word *Shalom*, in Hebrew, means peace as well as oneness, the peace of Jerusalem is indivisible. Only an undivided and peaceful Jerusalem assures the real safeguarding of legitimate universal and religious interests. The Government of Israel is solemnly pledged to ensure this objective, and, as recently as 11 September it reiterated its undertaking in the letter of the Foreign Minister to the Secretary-General [see A/6793, para. 155]. That letter constitutes the only authoritative statement of policy of the Government of Israel, and not any unauthorized actions of individuals, which, moreover, have been promptly disavowed by the Government of Israel.

79. Reference has been made by speakers in this debate to views expressed in the report on Jerusalem presented by the Secretary-General [A/6793]. This is not the time for me to detain the Assembly with a detailed statement on these views. It is enough for me to say at this stage that the free expression of these views by Arab personalities in Jerusalem is ample evidence of the liberal attitude of the Government of Israel.

80. On the other hand, the Arab spokesmen, as well as the representative of the Soviet Union, have passed in silence over those parts of Ambassador Thalmann's report which speak about the beneficial co-operation between all parts of the population, Arabs and Jews,

which speak about the peaceful aspect which life in Jerusalem now has assumed, and which point to a better future of peaceful co-operation.

81. Arab spokesmen have engaged again in this Assembly in their tales about the conduct of the Israeli authorities in the areas under Israel's control. I can explain those presentations only as a reflection of what the Arab Governments had in store for the population of Israel had they succeeded in their aggression. Had they been successful in their openly avowed aim of destroying the State of Israel and its population, Israel would today be a mass graveyard, and the United Nations representative would be left with nothing to do but to stand there and pay his respects in a minute of silent prayer.

82. Unabashed and unrepentant, those same representatives who, as recently as last May, in the Security Council were threatening Israel with total war and complete extinction are now returning to this rostrum to hurl their accusations against Israel, their own aggression having failed.

83. In the Security Council I counselled caution when the Foreign Minister of Iraq, and now Permanent Representative of his country to the United Nations, threatened Israel with total war, saying, on 31 May [1345th meeting] that this time "there will be no retreat". May I remind him of what I replied on 3 June [1346th meeting]: "You need not retreat if you do not advance".

84. Listening to Mr. Pachachi today, a passage from the prophet Ezekiel comes to my mind: "Thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness"—words uttered on the bank of the Euphrates by the prophet who sustained our people during its exile in Babylon with his vision of its return to Jerusalem.

85. When we were consulted by the Secretary-General in early June on the opportuneness of convening the General Assembly in emergency special session, it was the view of my Government that that initiative was not designed to achieve the constructive objective of bringing peace and security to the Middle East but was prompted by a desire to rescue what could be salvaged from the wreckage of a disastrous policy. That, too, has failed. This emergency special session has not taken us a single step nearer the goal of restoration of peaceful relations in the Middle East, a goal which the international community impatiently wishes to see attained as soon as possible.

86. That objective will be reached neither by a massive propaganda campaign nor by proposing programmes which are designed only to perpetuate and disguise the existing state of affairs. Only if the United Nations is prepared to face the true issue can it play a useful role in the present situation in the Middle East. Peace will not be secured by foreign guarantees or by outside and unsolicited diplomatic initiatives; nor will ingenuous formulations intended to permit the Arab side to continue its policy as formulated recently in Khartoum—the policy of no peace, no negotiations, no recognition of Israel—lead to any constructive solution of the situation. Those are only a means of preserving the existing Arab belligerence and to keep it in storage until the opportunity comes to reactivate it.

87. It cannot be the task of the United Nations to serve that purpose; nor can it be the intention of any of its peace-loving Members to support such a course of action.

88. As it has now been proposed and decided that the emergency special session of the General Assembly should be concluded, we sincerely hope that this will be the end of a chapter and that when the twenty-second session decides to discuss the situation in the Middle East it will open a new page which will encourage the only practical and safe policy: to lead the peoples of the Middle East towards a new pattern of relationships, to bring about reconciliation between Israel and the Arab States. There is no substitute for peace, and no substitute for negotiations as the way to attain it.

89. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq.

90. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): Mr. President, I have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of my right of reply, and this was made necessary by the personal reference to me made by the representative of Israel.

91. Before I reply to that particular point, however, I should like to say that I was listening to what he said, and in the course of his reference to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union he said that only the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly constitute the "authoritative view of the world community".

92. I am very glad to hear that, because need I remind the representative of Israel that two resolutions on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] were adopted by this Assembly, by an overwhelming majority. If anything represents the authoritative view of the world community it is those two resolutions. But instead of being consistent with himself and informing us that his Government is prepared to go along with the "authoritative view of the world community" on Jerusalem, Mr. Rafael has given us a lecture on the Hebrew language in order to justify the claim that Yerushalayim should be part of Israel. I am certain there are many Hebrew names for many cities in the area, far away from the areas occupied by Israel. In fact, the Israeli representative mentioned the river Euphrates, in my own country. I do not know whether that was laying the ground for a future claim on the valley of the Euphrates; I am sure it has a name in Hebrew, too.

93. The representative of Israel spoke about the unity of Jerusalem as though the issue before the Assembly were whether Jerusalem shall be united or divided. That is not the issue. The issue is Israeli occupation; the issue is Israel's attempt to annex the city of Jerusalem. The resolutions of the General Assembly were clear on that point; they decided that the measures taken by Israel were invalid, and called upon that State to rescind them. The question of unity or division is irrelevant and is only an attempt to confuse the issue in order to justify the refusal of Israel to abide by those resolutions.

94. Even if unity were the issue, why unity under Israel? Even assuming unity were the main issue and the main interest of the international community,

why should that unity be under Israel? The point is, the General Assembly rejected the attempt of an occupying Power to annex territory through the use of military force, and called upon it, by an overwhelming majority, to rescind those measures. And that was the authoritative view of the world community, Mr. Rafael.

95. Finally, in his personal reference to me, Mr. Rafael mentioned what I said in the Security Council last May. Then he made the following comment: "You need not retreat if you do not advance". Who was it who advanced on the Arab States? Who was it who attacked first? Who was it who sent its aircraft and bombarded airports in the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria? Who was it who sent its armies across the Sinai Desert? Who was it who sent its armies to occupy the West Bank of the Jordan?

96. What I said in the Security Council was that the Arab States had informed the Secretary-General repeatedly and had stated on more than one occasion that they would not initiate offensive action. And I said that although we gave these assurances, no such assurances came from Israel. On the contrary, Israel made very clear its intention to resort to war in order to attain its objectives regarding, as they said at the time, the question of navigation in the Strait of Tiran. So I think that Mr. Rafael was not very felicitous in invoking that particular statement because while we assured the international community that we would not fire the first shot and would not initiate offensive action, the Israelis did nothing of the kind, and it was only when they initiated offensive action that the Arab States were obliged to resort to self-defence. Therefore, it was not we who advanced; it was they who advanced. And now they want the international community, through its inaction, to give them the fruits of that aggression. That, we hope, is something that the General Assembly will never do because, if it does, then we can forget about this Organization and start looking for something else.

97. The PRESIDENT: We are now approaching the conclusion of the fifth emergency special session. Before we bring these proceedings to an end I believe that it would be appropriate for me, as Presiding Officer, to record very briefly two impressions resulting from our deliberations.

98. In the first place, I consider that there has been remarkably strong emphasis given to the great importance of the problem which it has been our task to consider, and to the urgency of finding a proper and just solution.

99. Secondly, the Assembly has agreed that the solution to the grave situation in the Middle East which occasioned this emergency special session must belong in the United Nations. I hope that the continuing efforts of the United Nations to achieve a peaceful outcome will be marked by success.

100. It remains for me now only to express my gratitude to all Members for all the understanding and co-operation they have so generously extended to me at every stage of our work during this emergency session.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Minute of silent prayer or meditation

101. The PRESIDENT: I invite representatives to stand and observe a minute of silent prayer or meditation.

The representatives, standing, observed a minute's silence.

Closure of the session

102. The PRESIDENT: I declare closed the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.