

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

Official Records



1527th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 20 June 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 5:

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

Page

1

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAK
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will continue its consideration of the item which is before the emergency special session. The first speaker this morning is the representative of the United States of America, but before I give him the floor, I should like to call on the Secretary-General, who has asked to make a statement.

2. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: During the last five and a half years I have never had reason to comment upon a statement made to this Assembly by a representative of any Government. But I feel it necessary to reply very briefly to certain statements made by the Foreign Minister of Israel in his address to the General Assembly on the morning of 19 June [1526th meeting] with regard to my decision to comply with the request of the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force. Mr. Eban's remarks on this subject were highly critical, but it is not for that reason that I speak now. I personally welcome criticism when it is just, based on fact and does not obscure or ignore essential facts. The concern behind this intervention is that the picture which Mr. Eban gave yesterday can be very damaging to the United Nations with regard to its peace-keeping function, past and present. I seek only to restore in that picture the balance which the facts warrant.

3. I have to say at the outset that I was rather surprised at the breadth and vigour of the Foreign Minister's dissatisfaction with the withdrawal decision, since in a quite recent meeting we had discussed that issue and at that time I had given a rather full explanation of just why the decision I took had to be taken in the way it was, and I heard no such reaction as Mr. Eban projected to the General Assembly yesterday; nothing like it. I wish now to say that I do not accept as having validity Mr. Eban's strictures on this matter.

4. My position on the decision to withdraw the United Nations Emergency Force and the reasons for it have been set forth clearly in reports which I have submitted to the General Assembly [A/6730 and Add.1 and 2] and the Security Council.^{1/}

5. Beyond this, I need make only the following specific comments.

6. The Foreign Minister of Israel, I note, made no mention in his critical analysis of my decision of certain decisive facts and factors with which he is certainly very well acquainted. Mr. Eban must know, for example, that the indispensable basis for the effective buffer function exercised by the United Nations Emergency Force for more than a decade was the voluntary decision of the Government of the United Arab Republic to keep its troops away from the line, with only United Nations troops in the buffer zone, which was exclusively on the United Arab Republic side of the line. On the other hand, the Foreign Minister also knows, I am sure, that Israel extended no such co-operation on the United Nations Emergency Force to the United Nations; that, despite the intent of the General Assembly resolution that United Nations troops should be stationed on both sides of the line, Israel always and firmly refused to accept them on Israel territory on the valid grounds of national sovereignty. There was, of course, national sovereignty on the other side of the line as well. There can be no doubt that it would have been a helpful factor of considerable importance if Israel had at any time accepted the deployment of the United Nations Emergency Force also on its side of the line. I may report in this connexion that prior to receiving the United Arab Republic request for withdrawal and prior to giving my reply to it, I had raised with the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations the possibility of stationing elements of the United Nations Emergency Force on the Israel side of the line. I was told that the idea was completely unacceptable to Israel. Moreover, for all of those ten years, Israel's troops regularly patrolled alongside the line and now and again created provocations by violating it.

7. Finally, may I say that Mr. Eban cannot help but know that the Government of the United Arab Republic had never accepted any limitation or restriction with regard to the exercise of its sovereign powers concerning the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force on its territory. It can also be emphasized that there was no limitation of any kind on the right of the United Arab Republic to move its troops up to the line at any time, with the inevitable result of immediately

^{1/} *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7896 and Corr.1, and S/7906.*

making academic the question of the United Nations Emergency Force's withdrawal or its continued presence. In this regard, Mr. Eban referred to the alert order issued to the Egyptian troops on the morning of 17 May. He failed to mention, however, that it was on that same morning that Egyptian troops began to move up to the line, thus eliminating the buffer zone, as I have previously reported to this body [A/6730, para. 6].

8. I have noted Mr. Eban's picturesque simile of the "fire brigade which vanishes from the scene as soon as the first smoke and flames appear" [1526th meeting, para. 118]. Mr. Eban would agree, I am sure, that, for more than ten years, the United Nations Emergency Force had been remarkably effective in preventing clashes along the line and in extinguishing the flames of the raids across the line, the terror of the *fedayeen*. But I am sure that Mr. Eban did not mean what he seemed to imply, namely, that the United Nations Emergency Force was on Egyptian territory to stay as long as the United Nations saw fit and to fight against troops of the United Arab Republic, if necessary, to prevent them from moving up to the line in their own territory.

9. On the matter of consultation, Mr. Eban should know that I did engage in consultations before taking my decision, to the full extent required of me and even somewhat more.

10. I conclude these observations by quoting a statement on the same subject made in the Security Council on 3 June 1967 by the Permanent Representative of Israel:

"The crisis in the Middle East erupted without warning on 16 May when an Egyptian general sent an ultimatum to the Commander of UNEF. At the same time as he asked for the removal of the United Nations force, he moved his own forces into the positions held by the United Nations. The course of the events that followed is by now common knowledge and well documented in the reports of the Secretary-General.

"The Secretary-General tried to prevent the crisis from getting out of hand. He failed. It was not his fault." 2/

11. In view of the fact that important questions have been raised before the General Assembly on the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, I wish now to inform the Assembly that it is my intention to issue within a day or two a report giving a full account of my actions on this matter.

12. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The General Assembly has been convened under the resolution known as "Uniting for Peace" [resolution 377 (V)]. The choice before the Assembly is clear: we can unite for peace or we can divide in discord.

13. The text of the Uniting for Peace resolution includes a direct quotation from the United Nations Charter, setting forth the fundamental purposes of the United Nations; first, "To maintain international peace and security"; and second, "To develop friendly relations among nations". These purposes must guide

our proceedings here. The United States of America pledges its devoted efforts to this end.

14. Yesterday President Johnson spoke for the American people when he said:

"I offer assurance to all that this Government of ours—the Government of the United States—will do its part for peace in every forum, at every level, at every hour."

15. As the troubles of the Middle East are great, so also must our purposes be great. It is not enough to defuse the bomb of hostility; we must remove the explosive itself. Our ultimate aim must be nothing less than a stable and durable peace in the Middle East. Our task is far from easy. We may all "unite for peace"—in the abstract; but our real task is, for the sake of peace—to unite upon a course of action. This course must be rooted both in fidelity to the principles and purposes of the Charter and in a clear grasp of the historical events which have led to the present situation.

16. There have been more meetings of the Security Council on the recurrent crises in the Middle East than on any other issue in the history of the United Nations. The record of two decades reveals clearly that trouble and crisis have been constant because of the failure of the parties concerned to come to grips with the underlying causes of tension in the area and to seek permanent solutions.

17. Yesterday, the President of the United States stated what are, in the view of my Government, five essentials of peace in the area. First and greatest among them is that every nation in the area has a fundamental right to live, and to have that right respected by all, including its immediate neighbours.

18. The second essential for peace is the simple human requirement that there be justice for the refugees—that the nations of the area must at last address themselves, with new energy and a new determination to succeed, to the plight of those who have been rendered homeless or displaced by the wars and conflicts of the past, both distant and recent.

19. The third requirement for peace, as clearly demonstrated by the events of recent weeks, is that there be respect for international maritime rights—the right of innocent maritime passage for all nations.

20. Fourth, peace in the Middle East requires steps to avert the dangers inherent in a renewed arms race, such as has occurred during the last twelve years. The responsibility for such steps rests not only on those in the area, but also upon the larger States outside the area.

21. Fifth and finally, peace in the Middle East requires respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of all the States in the area. It is a principle which can be effective only on the basis of peace between the parties, only if the fragile and violated truce lines of twenty years are replaced by recognized boundaries and other arrangements that will provide the nations of the area security against terror, destruction, war and violence of all kinds.

22. These principles, if implemented, offer a solid basis for a durable peace in the future. If they had

2/ Ibid., Twenty-second Year, 1346th meeting.

been accepted and adhered to in the past, there could have been peace. But they were not adhered to. Instead, the world has witnessed three tragic wars. And today the Assembly is faced with the aftermath of the latest of these outbreaks.

23. The essential facts are clear. In the spring of this year the tension of many years became even greater: acts of violence became more frequent; threats and declarations became more ominous and bellicose. Then, on 17 May, President Nasser demanded the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force and immediately moved large United Arab Republic forces into the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula and Sharm el Sheikh. Within a few days thereafter, the United Arab Republic declared a blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran, which had been open to free and innocent passage by the ships of all nations under accepted principles of international law.

24. The major insulator, the United Nations Emergency Force, by which the United Nations had for so many years protected the Middle East against full-scale war, was stripped away. Hostile forces stood in direct confrontation within plain sight of each other. Threats of war filled the air. Peace hung suspended by a thread.

25. At this point, the Secretary-General made a journey to Cairo in the interest of maintaining peace. He reported to the Security Council on 26 May that he had "called to the attention of the Government of the United Arab Republic the dangerous consequences which could ensue from restricting innocent passage of ships in the Strait of Tiran", and that he had expressed his "hope that no precipitate action would be taken".^{3/} In the same report, the Secretary-General made his plea to all the parties for a breathing spell which would allow tension to subside from its explosive level. He urged all concerned "to exercise special restraint, to forego belligerence and to avoid all other actions which could increase tension, to allow the Council to deal with the underlying causes of the present crisis and to seek solutions".^{4/}

26. In the spirit of this wise and sagacious plea, my Government and some others made strenuous efforts both inside and outside the United Nations to find ways to avert a clash. In the Security Council on 31 May, the United States delegation proposed a draft resolution^{5/} to provide the "breathing spell" which the Secretary-General had so urgently requested. It is a matter of profound regret that this proposal, aimed at preventing bloodshed and suffering, was not agreed to by others.

27. Early on 5 June, the thread of peace was broken. From that moment, the first and most urgent necessity was to stop the fighting before its dimensions were enlarged. Within hours of the outbreak of fighting—even before we had confirmation of any major movement of troops across truce lines—my Government joined with some others in the Security Council in seeking to obtain without debate a call for an im-

mediate cease-fire. If a cease-fire and a standstill had actually occurred at that point, the problems we now face would be far less formidable. But again, others resisted this effort, and it was not until thirty-six hours later, on the evening of 6 June, after prolonged discussion, that the Security Council, by its resolution 233 (1967), finally reached a unanimous decision on a simple cease-fire.

28. And when, in the following days, we sought to secure a cease-fire on the Syrian front, we encountered the same kind of obstruction. Here, too, the United States was prepared, without debate and without delay, to bring the hostilities to a halt. But others did not see the matter the same way. For hours they engaged in unseemly bickering which, to say the least, did no credit to this Organization.

29. Now, a good deal of this time was consumed in the elaboration of totally false accusations against my country. The United States was accused of having plotted, incited, encouraged and prompted Israel to conflict; and it was even charged that our armed forces had intervened in the hostilities on the side of Israel.

30. During the debates in the Security Council, and once again yesterday in the General Assembly, it was my duty to reject categorically all these charges, in whichever of their many and changing forms they appeared. Today I reaffirm, on the full authority of the United States Government, that no United States soldier, sailor, airman, ship, airplane, or military instrument of any kind—including radar jamming—pertaining to the armed forces or to any agency of the United States, intervened in this conflict. Furthermore, whatever they may say, all the Governments concerned are well aware of the true facts. We had nothing whatever to do with the fighting except to try to prevent it and, once it occurred, to use every effort at our command to bring it to a speedy end.

31. When these false and inflammatory charges were first made I offered, on behalf of the United States, our full co-operation with any United Nations or other impartial investigation of them—including the unprecedented proposal to open the logs of our aircraft carriers in the Sixth Fleet to United Nations investigators. This offer of ours, which stands, has not been answered or even referred to by the accusers.

32. It is perfectly clear why these charges have been spread. They have been spread in an attempt to find a scapegoat for what occurred—and perhaps for an even more sinister purpose: to engage the great Powers with each other. The United States will not lend itself to such purposes. Despite all this diversionary propaganda, the Security Council was able to achieve a cease-fire; and the cease-fire is holding. And now the problem of peace in the Middle East has come before the General Assembly.

33. Yesterday the Soviet Union introduced a draft resolution [A/L.519] essentially the same as that which it had also proposed in the Security Council,^{6/} and which the overwhelming majority of the Council,

^{3/} Ibid., Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7906, para. 10.

^{4/} Ibid., para. 14.

^{5/} Document S/7916/Rev.1. See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1345th meeting.

^{6/} Document S/7951/Rev.2. See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1358th meeting.

at its 1360th meeting, refused to accept. Under this Soviet proposal, Israel alone is to be condemned as an aggressor—though surely, in the light of all the events, both recent and long past, that led up to the fighting, it would be neither equitable nor constructive for this Organization to issue a one-sided condemnation. Then, second—and this is the heart of its proposal—the Soviet Union asks this Assembly to recommend, in effect, as follows: "Israel, withdraw your troops and let everything go back to exactly where it was before the fighting began on 5 June." In other words, as I said in the Security Council, the film is to be run backwards through the projector to that point in the early morning of 5 June when hostilities had not yet broken out.

34. But what would the situation then be?

35. Once again, opposing forces would stand in direct confrontation, poised for combat. Once again, no international machinery would be present to keep them apart. Once again, innocent maritime passage would be denied. Once again, there would be no bar to belligerent acts and acts of force. Once again, there would be no acceptance of Israel by its neighbours as a sovereign State, no action to solve the tragic refugee problem, no effective security against terrorism and violence. Once again, in short, nothing would be done to resolve the deep-lying grievances on both sides that have fed the fires of war in the Middle East for twenty years. And, once again, there would be no bar to an arms race in the area.

36. Surely no one in this Hall dedicated to peace and security can contemplate with equanimity the prospect of a fourth round in the Arab-Israeli struggle. Yet if ever there was a prescription for renewed hostilities, the Soviet draft resolution is that prescription. Surely it is not an acceptable approach for the United Nations.

37. What approach, then, ought to be taken? It may be well to recall that the General Armistice Agreements of 1949 state in article XII that their purpose is "to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace"; I repeat: "permanent peace".

38. We all know that there has been no transition, and there is no permanent peace in that area. All of the eighteen years of the armistice régime have witnessed virtually no progress on any of the basic issues from which the conflicts have arisen. As long as these issues are unresolved, they will continue to poison the political life of the Middle East.

39. What the Middle East needs today are new steps towards real peace: not just a cease-fire, which is what we have today; not just a fragile and perilous armistice, which is what we have had for eighteen years; not just withdrawal, which is necessary, but insufficient. Real peace must be our aim. In that conviction I now propose, on behalf of the United States, a draft resolution [A/L.520] which I shall read out:

"The General Assembly,

"Bearing in mind the achievement of a cease-fire in the Middle East, as called for by the Security Council in its resolutions 233 (1967), 234 (1967), 235 (1967) and 236 (1967) of 6, 7, 9 and 12 June 1967,

"Having regard to the purpose of the United Nations to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations,

"1. Endorses the cease-fire achieved pursuant to the resolutions of the Security Council and calls for its scrupulous respect by the parties concerned;

"2. Decides that its objective must be a stable and durable peace in the Middle East;

"3. Considers that this objective should be achieved through negotiated arrangements with appropriate third party assistance based on:

"(a) Mutual recognition of the political independence and territorial integrity of all countries in the area, encompassing recognized boundaries and other arrangements, including disengagement and withdrawal of forces, that will give them security against terror, destruction and war;

"(b) Freedom of innocent maritime passage;

"(c) A just and equitable solution of the refugee problem;

"(d) Registration and limitation of arms shipments into the area;

"(e) Recognition of the right of all sovereign nations to exist in peace and security;

"4. Requests the Security Council to keep the situation under careful review."

40. This draft resolution embodies the five principles which President Johnson yesterday identified as fundamental to a durable peace, and which I listed at the outset of this statement.

41. Our objective in offering this draft resolution is to encourage a decision by the warring parties to live together in peace and to secure international assistance to this end. It is necessary to begin to move—not some day, but now, promptly, while the memory of these tragic events is still vivid in our minds—towards a settlement of the outstanding issues; and truly "there must be progress toward all... if there is to be progress toward any".

42. There are legitimate grievances on all sides of this bitter conflict, and a full settlement should deal equitably with legitimate grievances and outstanding questions from whichever side they are raised. In short, a new foundation for peace must be built in the Middle East.

43. Agreements between the parties on these profoundly contentious matters will not come easily; but the United Nations has an urgent obligation to facilitate them and to help to rebuild an atmosphere in which fruitful discussions will be possible. That is the purpose of the draft resolution which we have submitted today.

44. The United Nations is now faced with a clear-cut issue: we can either attack the causes of the disease, which has plagued the Middle East with war three times in a generation, or we can go back to the treatment of symptoms, which has proved such a dismal failure in the past.

45. In any grave situation fraught with so many differences of opinions and attitudes, the tendency is to say that it defies solution. But we cannot accept this counsel. Let no one say that solutions are impossible. The proposal that we offer this morning is inspired

not by the despairing doctrines of perpetual enmity, but by the hopeful doctrine from which we in the United Nations have always drawn our major inspiration: the doctrine enshrined in our Charter, pledging all nations and peoples, all cultures and religions, "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

46. Sometimes that doctrine is called utopian or unrealistic. But the greatest unrealism is that which relies on hatred and enmity. The greatest realism is the doctrine of peace and conciliation and mutual forbearance. From that true realism let this Organization find the strength to make a new beginning towards peace in the Middle East. To this cause the United States pledges its most dedicated efforts.

47. Mr. AL-ATASSI (Head of State of the Syrian Arab Republic):^{2/} Mr. President, permit me to express my sincerest thanks to you and to all those who have contributed to the speedy convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly, with a view to dealing with the grave situation arising out of the Israeli-colonialist conquest of new territories of our Arab homeland, and to condemning this aggression and liquidating unconditionally all its consequences.

48. We are here to express our confidence in the international conscience that is represented in this General Assembly of the United Nations. Our Arab people, as well as all small, peace-loving countries throughout the world, look to this session as a last hope for the triumph of law, reason and justice over the law of the jungle, conquest, and the logic of force.

49. The Security Council was unable to discharge its responsibilities in condemning the Israeli aggression, ordering the withdrawal of its forces, and liquidating its consequences, due to the obstruction of the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

50. I do not wish to review the long list of Israeli aggressions scarcely interrupted since 1948; nor do I wish to dwell on the sufferings of the expelled Arab Palestinians. The neighbouring Arab countries have been ravaged, and their energies wasted, in self-defence against the moving tentacles of Israeli aggression. This state of things obstructs the progress of our homeland; it delays the consolidation of our economy and the elevation of the standard of living of our people.

51. I only wish you would review the records of this Organization in its different organs in order to realize the incredible number of aggressions to which our Arab people has been subjected by Israel, the frequent condemnations and the many resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly, and the United Nations organs in the region. Israel has not observed any of those resolutions; it has paid no attention or regard to those decisions, taken by the highest international organs, which reflect the international conscience.

52. In this connexion, it is significant that all of the major-scale Israeli aggressions have come about at the same time the Arab people and the colonial interests were in accentuated conflict. This explains

the close relations between colonialism and Zionism, and the harmonization of their planning and purposes. The best proof of this was the tripartite aggression on Egypt in 1956, which struck at our Arab people in Egypt merely because they had at that date chosen a progressive course, with a national régime committed to fulfilling the aims and needs of the masses.

53. This Organization then condemned that aggression and vindicated the confidence of the world placed in it. It thus consecrated its rejection of the logic of force and conquest. It then confirmed the right of small peoples to develop individually in freedom and in peace. This attitude then was a historic triumph for the international conscience and the forces of good, freedom and peace.

54. But the graph of the Israeli aggression has since taken an upward turn. This time it aimed specifically at the Syrian Arab region. Development works and civil projects were hit last year by Israeli napalm bombs. Roofs were destroyed from over the heads of children and old people by the Israeli bombers. That took place in 14 July 1966.

55. In spite of irrefutable proof of this deliberate aggression and the reports of the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), certain great Powers which protect Israel and encourage its aggressive policies prevented the Security Council at that time from condemning that aggression. Not long after, the Arab village of Es-Samu was subjected to a deliberate destructive raid, which the aggressors considered as just a bit of a show to exhibit their force and 'ruthlessness', at the expense of the suffering of women, children, and the aged.

56. Then came the aggression of 7 April this year on Syria. Israeli aircraft reached the skies of Damascus, destroyed peaceful villages in the frontier zone with heavy bombardment, without fear of any international censure. This provided the aggressors with encouragement to plan and execute the latest comprehensive aggression, the consequences of which this Organization is facing today.

57. In spite of the concentrated Zionist propaganda, intended to deceive world public opinion, the responsible Israeli authorities did not hide their aggressive intentions when they repeatedly declared that they were going to occupy Damascus and topple its progressive régime. They even proclaimed they were protected by the American Sixth Fleet. Immediately after each of those threats, especially after it was established that huge Israeli reinforcements were on our demarcation lines, we hastened to draw the attention of all countries with which we had diplomatic relations. We solicited the help of peace-loving countries to warn world public opinion against the aggression that was being premeditated against us. We affirmed, sincerely and honestly, our anxiety to safeguard peace and to save the world from the scourge and suffering of war. We gave pledges that we had not initiated aggression in any form, and that we would keep to our position of self-defence. This attitude on our part stemmed from our deep faith in peace, our full awareness of our historic responsibility towards our people and the peoples of the world. It reflected our limitless concern for the safety of a great civiliza-

^{2/} Mr. Al-Atassi spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

tion that had been painfully built up by generation after generation and for the gains of progress which must not be annihilated.

58. We took full cognizance of the fact that, in present international circumstances, it is very difficult to localize wars and to predict the extent of their spread and their effect on the rest of the world. Perhaps many of the representatives who are sitting with us here today, from East and West and from the countries of the Third World, can recollect how we expressed to them our anxiety at the imminence of Israeli aggression, which we could discern because of our long experience of the aggressive, expansionist character that is the essence of Israel. We put them on guard at that time against Israeli propaganda. We assured them that we would not start any military operation whatsoever. It is to be regretted that, in spite of all the good intentions toward others on our part and on the part of peace-loving countries, we could not halt those who owed their very existence to aggression.

59. We warn the General Assembly not to be deceived by the hypocritical appeals to peace which have been part and parcel of the Israeli routine. The history of Israel in the last twenty years has proved beyond any doubt that Israel makes such appeals as a preparation for a new aggression. That was the case before the 1956 aggression. That also was the case before this most recent aggression. In both cases Israel deceived world public opinion, claiming not to have any aggressive intentions or to be preparing for a war. But the world witnessed their sneak attack on 5 June 1967.

60. As a result, the Arab people have paid the price of their respect for world public opinion and the will of the world Organization. They have paid this price with the blood of their sons. They have paid the price in property destroyed, towns and villages occupied, part of the homeland seized by the aggressor. Heavy indeed was the toll as the result of our acceptance of the cease-fire resolution, which Israel violated; yet peace was not saved.

61. It is worth mentioning that, when Syria and Israel agreed to the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council, the Israeli forces of aggression had not yet occupied one iota of Syrian territory. It was after we informed Secretary-General U Thant that we had ceased fire as from 1630 hours GMT, 10 June, that the Israeli invasion of our territory began. This invasion took place at the time when the Security Council was in session and after it had already issued an additional cease-fire order. The Israeli invasion was coupled with the deliberate delaying tactics of both the United States of America and the United Kingdom representatives in the Security Council. While the invasion was progressing the Israeli representative was submitting to the Security Council false information, categorically denying the occupation of Syrian territory as well as the bombing of Damascus. These Israeli assertions were clearly contradicted by the reports of the Chairman of the Mixed Armistic Commission and by those of the Secretary-General, which pointed to the continuation of the invasion after the cease-fire order. In other words, the occupation of Syrian territory was completed after both parties had agreed to the cease-fire and while the Security Council was in session. These facts prove beyond any doubt

that the objective of both the United States and the United Kingdom was to prevent the Security Council from discharging its duties, and this in order to allow Israel to continue its invasion of Syria and its occupation of Syrian territory.

62. Many countries have been subjected in the past, and many others are now being subjected, to colonialist interference in both its old and new forms. Many of you here represent countries which struggled for their independence. The peoples of the Third World who engaged in this struggle had no cause for guilt; they merely rejected colonialist domination and were determined to direct their own lives and forge their own destinies in completely free conditions. Many of the peoples of the Third World have had to struggle inside their own countries against external colonialist forces of aggression. Likewise, our struggle against imperialist forces has been imposed upon us. We have had to face this with all determination and faith, because we firmly believe in freedom and self-determination. If many small countries have in the past experienced, and today also experience, colonialist aggression, as in Viet-Nam, where a heroic people, small in number, is fighting against ruthless forces, the Arab people assuredly has the distinction of experiencing subjection to the domination of a most peculiar alliance, in unprecedented fashion and degree. This is the full alliance between traditional colonialism and international Zionism as incarnated in Israel. As a matter of fact, this Israeli neo-colonialism is based in its essence on the total extermination of the Arab people and the introduction, in their place, of other conquering elements, as happened in occupied Palestine and as is happening in the Arab territories recently occupied. Youth are assembled in public places, their eyes are bandaged and then they are shot. Other Arab inhabitants are driven out of the occupied territory to wander as refugees without home or shelter. In Syria after the most recent events, the number of human beings in this category has reached a total of 40,000 refugees.

63. The Arabs fought in both world wars and contributed to the liberation of Europe from Nazism and the realization of the victory of the Allies. Their reward was the unnatural division of their homeland, the allotment of its parts to various zones of influence, and the creation of Israel to the detriment of the Palestinian Arab people. The Arab people sustained huge losses during the two world wars. Instead of being compensated by assistance in liberating and unifying their homeland, they were made to pay for the Nazi crimes in Europe.

64. The Arab homeland is the cradle of three religions. It is the source of tolerance, love and humanity. Throughout history it has fostered many minorities, national and religious, which in other countries were subjugated and oppressed. These minorities collaborated with our people to enrich and dignify the human heritage. Our good treatment of those elements living in our midst does not merit that our people should be uprooted so that others may take their place. I wonder—no doubt you all do—what would be the attitude of any one of you if you were suddenly faced with the expulsion of a great number of your citizens from their homeland to yield place to another people. Would Americans, for instance, submit to being expelled from

one of their states into the desert, so that foreigners might live in their place? If not, why should we be asked to acquiesce in what others would categorically reject? Is it the fate of our people to be sacrificed for a sin that it has not committed?

65. The mention in the Israeli Yearbook that the State of Israel should extend from the Nile to the Euphrates demonstrates incontestably why the Zionist conquerors now sit at a distance of fifty kilometres from Damascus and a hundred kilometres from Cairo, why the original inhabitants have been expelled from the occupied territory to wander as refugees, and why youth are shot in cold blood.

66. The Arab people are indeed being subjected today to an operation of extermination, surpassing in dimensions what the Nazis did. It is in truth experiencing a dual colonialist operation aimed at eradicating its very existence and at subjecting the surviving part to direct colonialist domination.

67. The gains the Arab masses have made through struggle, the constructive achievements made at the price of numberless years of toil, suffering and bitter sacrifices—all are objects of merciless nullification. The Arab homeland, with its important strategic location, its petroleum resources and huge potential wealth, is considered by the colonial Powers—and, first and foremost, by the United States of America and Britain—as a zone of influence and a domain of vast vested interests. In order to safeguard these interests, the colonial States use all means, without discrimination. They intrigue against the Arab people, they exert political and economic pressure; but when these are of no avail they resort to direct conquest, as happened in 1956 and as is happening now, in a deceitful manner, through the mediacy of Israel. Colonialism wishes to seize the raw material of our homeland and that of most of the countries of the Third World, to take it at the cheapest cost, manufacture and then re-export it to the Third World market at the highest price. This is a formidable equation. To maintain it constantly in its favour, colonialism uses every means.

68. The struggle now taking place in the Arab homeland is part and parcel of this noble struggle, increasing in intensity, that the peoples of the Third World are waging against imperialism and against colonialism in all its forms and phases.

69. It is a struggle between the will to live, to enjoy freedom and dignity, the right of our Arab people to build its modern unified State, on the one hand, and the interests of imperialism and Zionism, wanting to preserve backwardness and internal divisions for the longest possible time, on the other.

70. We stand in the first line of the battle of the peoples of the Third World. We suffered the fiercest imperialist-Zionist onslaught. We wanted to build a sovereign homeland, free, happy, and to raise the standard of living of our masses, to co-operate with other peoples in building a world of love, peace and prosperity.

71. We are fighting a battle that has been imposed upon us inside our own homeland. But, it is a part of the battle of all peace-loving peoples who look to a future free of threats. We struggle so that our own Arab homeland can be built into a wall between the

imperialist conquerors and the countries of Asia and Africa. We will not permit our homeland to be a base from which imperialism can jump anew against these two great continents, or to be used against the socialist countries and other peace-loving nations.

72. It is against this background that we want the struggle of our people to be understood. That is why we have the firm hope that, by their concerted determination, the Members of this body will be able to condemn the aggressor and liquidate the traces of aggression.

73. American, British and West German imperialism have made of Israel a stronghold equipped with the most destructive arms, to be the guardian for their oil monopolies in our area and their tool to exploit our Arab people and obstruct its progress. If our people had agreed to bow to the imperialists and to give in to their designs, we would not have now witnessed a battle between us, on the one hand, and imperialism and colonialism, on the other. But our people does not accept humiliation and a life devoid of all meaning of dignity and independence. We wish to affirm to those who understand the facts of history that the struggle of peoples does not end by cutting off some heads or by striking at some leadership. It is rather a continuous struggle which is welded to the very existence of the nation. A lively nation is not sterile in talents and leadership.

74. We heard the other day and we hear today official statements by the United States Government. They seek to impose solutions that accommodate aggression and justify the logic of force. This fact in itself is decisive proof of the United States' blessing of aggression. Should we acquiesce in such a prescription, we would be digging the grave of this Organization and we would be burying the hopes of all nations. And we would be forgetting the sufferings and calamities of the Second World War. We would be forsaking the noble intention which inspired us in building this Organization, to save mankind from the law of the jungle and to have the family of nations live in accordance with the great human values and lofty ideals and principles.

75. If we accepted that logic, it would mean that we admit the right of the stronger to conquer the lands of the weaker and retain them by force. That would be a devastating conclusion which cannot be accepted by anyone.

76. In this respect, we wish to draw attention to the fact that this alarming international precedent, if accepted, would mean the destruction of the Charter of the United Nations and all the lofty principles contained therein. Not only that, but it would carry in its wake the destruction of the independence of every nation in the world, as their safety would be exposed to invasion at any time.

77. Hitler, before and during the Second World War, conquered most of the European countries. Before him, other ruthless conquerors did the same. But the peoples of the world never submitted to the dictate of the usurpers and conquerors. Their will to fight and die for their freedom always prevailed. Today, we are facing a similar invasion by Zionist colonialists of parts of our homeland through a sneak and aggress-

sive war inflicted upon us. All unlawful and forbidden methods have been used during this aggression. To say the least, I would mention, in particular, the napalm bombs which were used on a large scale against the civilian population. The diplomatic representatives of over forty countries accredited in Damascus have been acquainted with this criminal bombing and with the untold human suffering it caused.

78. Representatives will see for themselves photographs of the victims of Israeli napalm bombs.

79. We shall reject any conditions or discussions based on an invasion. We ask you to firmly condemn aggression and to immediately liquidate its traces. We, therefore, welcome the draft resolution [A/L.519] submitted by the Prime Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Kosygin, which indicates a deep understanding of the crisis, an objective assessment, which emanates from a feeling of responsibility and a desire for peace. Any other approach or solution which is to be sought through the occupation of our homeland will be firmly rejected, for we consider such a solution to mean one thing, that is, to give in to the logic of force and conquest, a thing which we utterly refuse. Indeed, the mere suggestion of such solutions would be an insult to the human conscience and a surrender to the logic of aggression.

80. The United Nations faces an historic and fateful situation. The problem does not belong to the Arabs alone, but to every individual in the international community whose country may one day be the victim of an invasion. To condemn, therefore, the aggression, to liquidate its fruit and to punish the aggressors not only is a victory for the Arab people, who are the direct victims, but it is a victory for the international Organization, for the principles of the United Nations and for all great and noble human values. Representatives may have read the challenge issued by the Foreign Minister of Israel when he declared that his Government would not give any weight to any resolution adopted by this Organization, even: "If the General Assembly were to vote by 121 to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the armistice lines ... Israel would refuse to comply with that decision." This was reported in The New York Times on Monday, 19 June.

81. The approval of the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will lead to the safeguarding of peace. It will prevent a new explosion, because the Arab people will never accept foreign occupation, and because it is capable with its great potentialities, both apparent and hidden, political, economic, and other, to put an end to aggression. So far, the Arab nation has used only part of those potentialities.

82. Allow me, finally, Mr. President, to thank on this occasion all free nations in all the continents of the world which understand our just cause and have stood with us in our ordeal. Foremost among them are the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the socialist and the non-aligned countries. All of them exerted their most sincere efforts with all other peace-loving nations to condemn aggression, to liquidate its traces, and to uphold the high human and international ideals.

83. Mr. LENART (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): The Czechoslovak Government welcomed the

initiative taken by the Government of the Soviet Union in proposing to convene an emergency special session of the General Assembly in order to discuss the situation which has arisen as a result of the aggression of Israel against the Arab States. We welcomed the fact the great majority of Member States supported that proposal and rejected the attempt by certain countries to prevent the General Assembly from meeting. The nature of the session and the presence of leading representatives from many Member States show the exceptional importance of the problem we are called upon to discuss.

84. In recent weeks, events in the Middle East have caused serious concern throughout the world. From the very first, the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic supported all measures aimed at reaching a just solution to the problems of the region by peaceful means. On 25 May, ten days before the beginning of the Israeli aggression, it expressed its serious concern at the heightening of tension, which it stated to be a result of the intrigues of imperialist circles directly linked to oil monopolies which value the interests of the great Powers and exploiters more than they do the peace and security of peoples.

85. The Czechoslovak Government firmly condemned the intrigue and military threats directed against the Arab States, and at the same time stressed the exceptional interest taken by the Czechoslovak people in the maintenance of peace and security.

86. However, the Government of Israel paid no attention to these serious warnings. At a time when the attention of peace-loving nations was concentrated on the peaceful solution of undecided questions, the militarist forces of Israel launched a premeditated, sudden and perfidious attack and, relying on widespread external support from well-known imperialist forces, invaded the Sinai peninsula, seized a part of Jordan and, in defiance of an urgent appeal from the Security Council to cease their military operations, attacked the territory of Syria.

87. The disregard by these Israeli circles of the peace appeal of the Security Council and their frenzied urge to capture as much foreign territory as possible clearly contradict the statement of Prime Minister Eshkol, who, in a letter to the representatives of Czechoslovakia dated 5 June, stated that the Israelis wanted nothing more than to live in peace on their own territory.

88. These words are also markedly at variance with the fact that the militarist ruling circles of Israel sent their aircraft to drop bombs on Cairo, Damascus and a number of other towns in the territory of the UAR, Syria and Jordan, where they sowed death and destruction. The world press has produced much striking proof of the barbaric bombing of defenceless inhabitants with napalm, of inhuman tortures, of prisoners suffering from hunger and thirst, and of other forms of blatant violation of existing international conventions.

89. In addition, tens of thousands of Arab citizens were driven by force from their homes to swell the ranks of the Palestine refugees. The Security Council was compelled to deal with these outrageous facts and to adopt a resolution earnestly calling for respect

for the principles of humanity in the treatment of prisoners of war and the civilian population.

90. The Czechoslovak Government, which on 8 June 1967 again made an earnest appeal to the Government of Israel for the immediate cessation of military activity against the Arab countries and for compliance with the Security Council resolution, had in the situation which developed no alternative but to break off diplomatic relations with a country whose ruling circles showed such cynical disregard for the United Nations Charter and Security Council resolutions.

91. For the third time in the past twenty years, militarist circles in Israel have resorted to war as a means of extending their territory. They have thus confirmed that they have no intention of facilitating the efforts to solve the problem of the Middle East by peaceful means. By their policy of conquest, which ties in with the interests of imperialism, that common enemy of all peace-loving States, they have at the same time placed the people of Israel in serious danger.

92. The true interests of peace and security for Israel and its people require respect for the rights of the Arab people, with whom they should be joining in the fight against the imperialist forces which strive to sow enmity between the peoples of the Middle East in an effort to enslave them, exploit them and deprive them of all their natural resources and national wealth.

93. We have listened with indignation here in the General Assembly to the clumsy efforts of the Foreign Minister of Israel to crown with glory the aggression committed by his country and to draw a parallel between that aggression and the valiant struggle of peoples against Hitlerite fascism and the defence of Stalingrad against the Nazi hordes. One cannot even imagine the catastrophic consequences which would ensue, especially in an age of rockets and nuclear weapons, from his conclusion that there is no need to argue about who fired the first shot.

94. The law of the jungle that the advantage lies with him who attacks his opponent suddenly and deals the first blow would give rise to a chain reaction of threats, tension and conflicts among nations. The representative of Israel has in effect confirmed the already proved fact that it is precisely this principle which actuates the Israeli militarist forces. Their military and political representatives, intoxicated with temporary military successes, have boasted as much.

95. However, the General Assembly of the United Nations cannot and dare not recognize to anyone the right to aggression, just as it cannot fail to make a distinction between the aggressor and the victim.

96. The dangerous situation caused by Israeli aggression must be viewed in a wider context. From the balance of strength, it is clear that the leading circles in Israel could never have permitted themselves to unleash such wide and premeditated aggression against their Arab neighbours if they had not been sure of outside support, of the support of those forces which watch with unconcealed hostility and concern the process of the strengthening of independence and of independent economic development of the Arab countries.

97. It follows that the violation of peace by Israel is merely another link in the general dangerous trend in the policy of certain imperialist circles which has led to aggression by the United States against the Viet-Nameese people and to forcible intervention in internal affairs, especially in those parts of the world where people use their right to self-determination and throw off the yoke of the old and new colonial domination.

98. In this light, the Israel aggression is an integral part of the attempts by these imperialist forces to halt the independent development of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America and to hold back the development of the national liberation movement and progress in the world.

99. The influence of a policy which leads to continuing tension and the growth of hotbeds of unrest may also be seen in Europe, which twice already in this century has been the scene of devastating world wars. Czechoslovakia, which gained bitter experience as a victim of aggression by fascist Germany, is following with particular watchfulness the collaboration between the militarists of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, who are supported by revanchist forces.

100. The revanchists in the Federal Republic of Germany openly proclaim plans for reviewing the post-war *status quo* and are attempting to change existing borders and to gain access to nuclear weapons. It is not by chance that it was precisely these forces which supported Israeli reactionaries during the preparation for hostile action against the Arab countries.

101. The Middle East is one of the key areas of the world, in which the political, military and economic interests of the imperialists are in direct, sharp conflict with the interests of the peoples of the Arab countries. The oil monopolies, for whom Arab oil deposits are a source of illegitimate profit, are particularly odious opponents of the national liberation movements.

102. The monopolist circles regard, as especially dangerous to their profits and their plans for power the progressive development of those countries which have openly declared that they do not intend to sell themselves for promises of economic or other so-called aid, and that they see the guarantee of their development above all in economic independence, in the development and strengthening of their economy, in industrialization and in their desire that the raw materials wealth of the Arab countries should be used above all for the benefit of the Arab people.

103. We wish to recall again that the United Arab Republic, as a result of its anti-imperialist attitude, has already once been the victim of aggression and is constantly being subjected to pressure by imperialist forces.

104. We should also remember the confusion caused among the oil monopolies in the autumn of last year by the just claims of the Government of Syria on the Iraq Petroleum Company for fair compensation for services rendered to the Company. It was precisely at that time that efforts to bring down the progressive régime in Syria were intensified, and the militarist circles in Israel played their part by provoking border incidents.

105. By their recent aggression against the Arab countries, the ruling circles in Israel have again revealed themselves as the henchmen of imperialist and colonialist forces and as the instrument of the latter's policy in the Middle East.

106. We express our solidarity with the Arab people, with whom we have bonds of true friendship, and consider it our duty to support the Arab States in their efforts to consolidate their sovereignty and independence. On 11 June 1967 the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Antonin Novotny, stated that we were firmly on the side of the Arab people in their defence of their freedom and independence, and he noted that the events now occurring in Viet-Nam and the Middle East were an integral part of the general policy of the forces of reaction in the world, which, with the help of various military cliques, is being carried out in various countries with a view to halting social progress in the world and preventing peoples from enjoying their rights to free and independent development.

107. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is convinced that the peoples of the Arab countries are defending a just cause in their struggle against imperialism. In that struggle, the solidarity of the Arab countries is an important factor in their defence. The danger threatening the free and independent development of the Arab States constitutes a threat to all the peoples of the world. For that reason, all those who hold dear the cause of peace and independence must join in the struggle against that threat.

108. The socialist countries which signed a joint declaration, adopted at Moscow on 9 June 1967, have made it quite clear to all aggressive forces that they will take the necessary measures to help the peoples of Arab countries defend their legitimate rights, to put out the fires of war in the Middle East and to restore peace in that area.

109. In the past, peoples have paid dearly for want of decisive collective resistance to aggressive acts. We remember that the appeasement of aggression led to the collapse of the League of Nations. The Czechoslovak people have had a bitter experience of the short-sighted policy of making concessions to the aggressive forces of Hitlerite fascism, a policy which led to the Munich Agreement and the Second World War.

110. As a result of experience for which it paid too high a price, mankind has resolved not to permit any repetition of this tragic course of events. The United Nations has become the expression of the common will to resist future threats to peace and aggressive acts. Israel, too, which owes its very existence to this Organization and many of whose citizens themselves experienced the horrors of the Second World War, has assumed the solemn obligation of supporting the purposes of the United Nations and strictly observing its principles.

111. Now the ruling circles of Israel have resorted to aggression, flagrantly violating the Charter, the basic principles of international law and the obligations imposed upon Israel by the General Armistice Agreement of 1949, which was concluded through the mediation of the United Nations. This fact threatens

the common interests of all States Members of the United Nations. It is a blow against the very foundations of the Organization and a direct challenge to its authority.

112. Israel, whose forces are still occupying part of the territories of sovereign States Members of the United Nations, must not be allowed to gain any advantages, however temporary, from the situation that has resulted from its violation of the Charter. It must not be allowed to use the fruits of aggression for purposes of blackmail. Any acceptance of illegality would be tantamount to condoning a blatant violation of the principles on which the United Nations is based.

113. The General Assembly must draw the appropriate conclusions from this situation. Above all, the consequences of aggression must be eliminated and international legality restored. The flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, and particularly of its principle forbidding the threat or use of force, by the ruling circles of Israel, demands the adoption of appropriate measures against the aggressor. Indifference or indecisiveness in face of the continued presence of Israel troops on the territory of Arab countries which they have occupied by force would, in practice, mean support of the aggression. This would be a dangerous precedent which might be used by forces encroaching upon the territorial integrity and political independence of other countries. It is well known that toleration of any violation of the law leads to its repetition. The flouting of the principles of the Charter and international law becomes a threat to the vital interests of the whole international community, and for this reason cannot remain unanswered.

114. During the past twenty years, great efforts have been made in the United Nations to increase its prestige and to stress the inviolability of the principles of the Charter. As a founder Member of this Organization, Czechoslovakia has always considered it a duty consistently to defend the peaceful mission of the United Nations and to oppose the solution of international questions by the use of force. This position of principle continues to determine our position today, when we speak out against the flagrant act of force to which one Member State has resorted in violation of the territorial inviolability, sovereignty and independence of other Member States.

115. The Israel extremists set out to use armed force six months after the General Assembly had, on the initiative of Czechoslovakia, made an urgent appeal at its twenty-first session in resolution 2160 (XXI), for which Israel, too, voted. In that resolution, the General Assembly reaffirmed that:

"States shall strictly observe, in their international relations, the prohibition of the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations..."

and that

"Accordingly, armed attack by one State against another or the use of force in any other form contrary to the Charter of the United Nations constitutes a violation of international law giving rise to international responsibility..."

116. Every word of that resolution is, as it were, an exclamation mark placed after the actions of the Israel militarists, who have thus found themselves in sharp conflict with the conscience of peoples, the interests of peace and the principles of humanity and international law.

117. In an era of nuclear weapons and inter-continental ballistic missiles, to commit acts of aggression is to play an extremely dangerous game with the fate of world peace. It must be clear to everyone that under present world conditions there is no impassable borderline between local conflicts and a world thermonuclear catastrophe.

118. The fact that Israel did not stop before the unpredictable risk of unleashing such a conflict in the Middle East proves only that its policies are similar to the so-called "limited wars" concepts which prevail among the militarist circles of certain Western Powers, and upon which the strategists of the United States and the military NATO bloc also base their considerations.

119. The Czechoslovak delegation condemns the Israel attacks most strongly and rejects the attempts of the Israel Government to cite as justification for its actions the measures taken by the United Arab Republic in the Strait of Tiran or any other sovereign acts of Arab States taken to ensure their security. The movement of United States and United Kingdom warships towards the shores of Arab countries and the threats against the United Arab Republic on the eve of the Israel attack were regarded as instigation on the part of the Israel ruling circles to embark on a military adventure. The attempt by the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs to blacken the Soviet Union and other socialist countries from this rostrum cannot divert attention from the real culprit in the present events. Everyone knows that in recent weeks the socialist countries have once again unmasked the aggressive intentions of the Israel militarist circles and have demonstrated their profound concern for the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

120. We also reject the criticism of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in connexion with the demand of the Government of the United Arab Republic that United Nations forces should be withdrawn from its territory. His decision in that matter was fully in accordance with the Charter and respected the sovereignty of a Member State of the United Nations.

121. This Organization must draw the appropriate conclusions from the position taken by Israel with respect to the appeals and resolutions of the Security Council, and from its disregard for the fundamental obligations of a Member State of the United Nations. It is intolerable that any State should speculate on what it may gain by its aggressive actions and thus present the world with a fait accompli before the United Nations is able to take effective steps. What is at stake is not only the peaceful future of the Middle East but also the prospects of world peace.

122. The Czechoslovak delegation has noted with concern the attempts of certain Western States to grant Israel the fruits of its aggression. By making the withdrawal of Israeli forces conditional

upon preliminary demands in his statement of 19 June, President Johnson of the United States merely confirmed that the United States will continue to act in complicity with Israel, with the aim of protecting the aggressor and helping him to retain everything he has seized. We may well ask: Since when has it been permitted, and what political morality makes it possible, to demand the annexation of territories seized by an aggressor as a result of armed incursion?

123. The United Nations has proclaimed the maintenance of international peace and security as its main aim. To achieve this aim, the peoples of the world must unite their forces. If we are to have real peace and real law and the Organization is to be the real guardian of security, then aggression must be called aggression and the necessary measures must be taken against the aggressor.

124. The Czechoslovak delegation expects that the United Nations will take all necessary steps required by the serious situation that has arisen as a result of the aggression against Arab States. The cessation of military activities at the demand of the Security Council was merely a first step in that direction. However, the Israel aggression continues through the occupation by its armed forces of extensive areas of the territory of Arab States.

125. Basing its views on the Charter of the United Nations, under which the Organization is bound to react to violations of the peace by taking appropriate measures, the Czechoslovak delegation believes that the General Assembly must vigorously condemn Israel's aggressive activities and the continuing occupation by the aggressor's forces of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. The General Assembly must act decisively to ensure that Israel withdraws all its forces immediately and unconditionally from the territory of those States to positions behind the demarcation line laid down in the General Armistice Agreement, and respects the status of the demilitarized zones established by that Agreement.

126. Israel's responsibility for the damage inflicted on the States against whom the aggression was committed and their nationals must be stressed with the utmost insistence and, in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, the Israel Government must be compelled to make good all damage in full and in the shortest possible time and to return all seized property and other material assets.

127. The Security Council must be reminded of its fundamental responsibility, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter. The General Assembly must appeal to the Security Council to take the necessary measures to eliminate all consequences of the aggression committed by Israel.

128. This session of the General Assembly, which reflects the justified concern of an overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations with regard to the dangerous situation that has arisen through a violation of the peace, must achieve specific results. The gravity of the situation in which the world finds itself requires decisive action.

129. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore expresses its full support for the draft resolution [A/L.519] submitted at yesterday's [526th] meeting of the General Assembly on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers.

130. This draft resolution expresses a resolve to maintain peace, to eliminate aggression and to defend the sovereignty and independence of the Arab States which have been unjustly attacked. The Czechoslovak delegation is convinced that immediate implementation of the measures envisaged in the USSR draft resolution is the only way to prevent irrevocable consequences. We therefore call on delegations, in the name of peace and in the interest of their people's future, to support unhesitatingly these just demands, upon the fulfilment of which depends the maintenance of the Organization's ability to withstand threats to international security.

131. The Czechoslovak delegation, guided by the principles of its Government's peaceful policies, will do all in its power to ensure that the United Nations fulfils its obligation and, in the interest of international peace and security, helps to eliminate the dangerous hotbed of war in the Middle East resulting from Israel's aggression against Arab States.

132. The PRESIDENT: The Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia was the last speaker in the general debate this morning.

133. As representatives are aware, I have always tried to acquaint the membership at the earliest possible moment with any intentions which I may have with regard to the organization of our work. Therefore, I should like, at this stage, to inform the Assembly of my intention that the list of speakers in the general debate on this item should be closed at 11 o'clock on Friday morning, 23 June. However, I should like to consult Members on this point, and I shall be very happy to be at their disposal between now and the beginning of the afternoon meeting, if any representative wishes to express different views. If there are no different views, it is my intention to declare, with the consent of the Assembly, that the list will be closed on Friday, at 11 o'clock in the morning.

134. I have one other point to make that is of some importance to the organization of our work. Most of the delegations that have inscribed their names on the list of speakers in the general debate have inscribed them in more than one place, as they are aware. It will help us a great deal if they will be so kind as to decide definitely at which stage they wish to speak. In that way, when we close the list, other representatives will have an opportunity, at the time when they inscribe their names, to know when they will be given the floor. If that request is acceptable to representatives, it will be a great help to me. In anticipation of your co-operation, I thank you.

135. The meeting is adjourned until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

136. I see that the representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to speak. May I request representatives kindly to follow the practice of this Assembly and to send a note to the Secretariat if they wish to speak, so that I may have a list before me. If I had had such a list

before me, I would have called on the representative of Saudi Arabia. I did not know he wished to speak. That is why I announced that the last speaker in the general debate was the representative of Czechoslovakia. I call now on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

137. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I do apologize for not having sent you a personal note requesting you to give me the floor in exercise of my right of reply. But I believe that I notified the Secretariat and it must have been a mistake or an omission on the part of the Secretariat that you were not apprised of my wish to speak in exercise of my right of reply.

138. I must at the outset state that Saudi Arabia is not a remote region of the Arab world. We are as much involved in this question as any other Arab States, including the host countries of the refugees. Therefore, we cannot let certain statements be made on this question without replying to some distortions which we from time to time discover in the pronouncements of certain representatives. I would say that they may not be intended to be distortions, but because of a lack of sensibility or a lack of knowledge of our problem, or for some other reason, certain things are said that should be straightened out.

139. Before I came to this meeting of the Assembly I had my radio on, and every quarter of an hour or so, on different stations, we were told that none other than our illustrious colleague, Ambassador Goldberg, wished "to set the record straight". The American people at large were listening to Mr. Goldberg, who, no doubt upon instructions from his Government, wished "to set the record straight". On our part, we would like to familiarize the international community with our own record, especially since I personally, as an Arab, have lived with this question since the year 1920—in other words, for forty-seven years. I think that I am entitled as an Arab "to set the record straight".

140. My good friend Mr. Goldberg is the representative of a country that lies in the new hemisphere, which is 6,000 miles distant from the Arab homeland. And, in fairness to his Government, I must say that there are many other Governments which are not as far distant as the United States from the Arab homeland, which are situated in Europe, but which still wish "to set the record straight". For whom do they wish "to set the record straight"? I ask humbly, for whom do they wish "to set the record straight"?

141. Lest you think, Sir, that I am engaging in oratory, I shall be technical and, if my memory does not falter—because I could not take all the notes which I wished to take, not knowing when I would be called upon to speak—I heard our good friend Ambassador Goldberg quote from the Charter, quote in fact Article 1 of Chapter I. And I quote what he said: "To develop friendly relations among nations"—and he stopped there. All of us can quote any part of the Charter that suits us and omit the part that does not suit us, but if Ambassador Goldberg had been indulgent enough, he could have continued and said: "... based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace". I wonder

why the representative of a friendly Power—none other than the United States, with which we have friendly relations and common economic interests—did not see fit to finish that paragraph.

142. This brings me, in my reply, to the genesis of this question. Historically, as many of you know, and to my sorrow, this question was created by none other than an erstwhile imperialist Power in order to save the interests of its possessions; and both the Jews and the Arabs—to be more specific, the Zionists and the Arabs—became the victims of that policy. You will remember this from your history books, but I also remember, to my sorrow, that a secret agreement evolved into the so-called Balfour Declaration. That goes back to 1917. But before the Balfour Declaration there had been a promise made to the Arabs by the British that they could exercise their right to self-determination, and the whole Middle East was subsequently gerrymandered into Mandates, which was only colonization in disguise. Amongst those Mandates was Palestine. And none other than a friendly Power was given the Mandate over Palestine.

143. I am not going to give you a panorama of the history of those days; it is accessible to any representative. The record of what happened is no longer buried in the secret archives of States, for more than fifty years have elapsed, and many memoirs and books have been written, and anyone who wants to know the facts can certainly have access to them. However, President Wilson of the United States, when he went to Versailles—and I was in my mid-teens then—fought for the principle of self-determination of peoples and nations. Such were the ideals of the great United States when it was not as yet a world Power. I would like my good friend Mr. Goldberg to consult the statements that were made by Mr. Wilson. No doubt, they are available in the archives in Washington.

144. Why is it that the people of Lebanon, the people of Iraq, the people of Syria, who were placed under a Mandate, like the people of Palestine, are now enjoying full sovereignty, whereas 80 per cent of the people of Palestine are scattered, whilst the big Powers have flouted the Charter? I was in San Francisco when the Charter was adopted in 1945. The Major Powers have flouted the principle of self-determination enshrined in the Charter. Are the people of Palestine, the indigenous people of Palestine, another breed of Arabs? No, they are not another breed of Arabs. "The Zionists have suffered in Central Europe; we must make room for them." At whose expense? At the expense of the indigenous people of Palestine, who happen to be Arabs. Forget that they are Arabs.

145. And here you do not have to go to the archives; you will know who wrote what. The book is entitled Years of Trial and Hope, and it is by none other than the former President, Mr. Harry S. Truman. I wish my good friend Mr. Goldberg was here, but he will read the verbatim record of what I am saying. It seems we are playing hide-and-seek here: when the socialist countries speak, some people vacate the Assembly hall; and when the other countries speak, they come back into the hall. We stay here all the time, even when the Israeli representatives speak. I remember that I once told an African friend of mine: "You should not have

walked out when Mr. Wilson"—the British Prime Minister—"was speaking from this rostrum." We are here to listen to one another. But never mind; the record speaks for itself.

146. Since Saudi Arabia is a part of the Arab homeland, I should like to quote from the memoirs of Mr. Harry Truman. I am glad he is still alive. May God prolong his life so that he may see the suffering he has visited on our people. I am quoting:

"Two weeks later, Joseph C. Grew"—and I shall not quote everything, but do not think I take things out of context—"sent me a . . . memorandum . . ."—that is, to the then President Truman—"informing me that . . . 'in his meeting with King Ibn Saud early in 1945, Mr. Roosevelt promised the King that as regards Palestine he would make no move hostile to the Arab people and would not assist the Jews as against the Arabs.'"^{8/}

Further on, the memo states:

"'The Arabs, not only in Palestine'"—mark my words here—"but throughout the whole Near East, have made no secret of their hostility to Zionism, and their Governments say that it would be impossible to restrain them from rallying with arms, in defense of what they consider to be an Arab country. We know that President Roosevelt'"—may God rest his soul in peace—"understood this clearly, for as recently as March 3, after his trip to the Near East, he told an officer of the Department that, in his opinion, a Jewish state in Palestine (the ultimate Zionist aim) could be established and maintained only by military force.'"^{9/}

That is part of the memo. The memoirs of Mr. Truman speak for themselves.

147. I quote Mr. Truman again. He said this:

"The Zionists, on the other hand, were impatiently making my immediate objective more difficult to obtain. They wanted more than just easier immigration practices. They wanted the American Government to support their aim of a Jewish state in Palestine."^{10/}

These memoirs are more eloquent than poor Baroody's words.

148. We are not engaging here in oratory; we are dealing with a tragedy which has been visited on the indigenous people of Palestine. And here again, allow me to quote from Mr. Truman's memoirs. I wish my good friend Ambassador Goldberg were here. Of course, he is busy doing something else. We are all busy every now and then. But as I say, let me quote from Mr. Truman's memoirs:

"Meanwhile, the Jewish extremists in Palestine were continuing their terrorist activities. And top Jewish leaders in the United States were putting all sorts of pressure on me to commit American power"—which, parenthetically, they are still doing

^{8/} Harry S. Truman, Memoirs, vol. II, Years of Trial and Hope (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Co., 1956), p. 133.

^{9/} Ibid.

^{10/} Ibid., p. 140.

now—"to commit American power and forces on behalf of the Jewish aspirations in Palestine."^{11/}

149. I am getting to the end of the quotations. These quotations are very explicit and they throw light on how the artificial state of Israel was foisted onto the indigenous people of Palestine and, how those European colonialists used a noble religion, none other than Judaism, as a motivation for their political ends.

150. Again, may I quote from Mr. Truman's memoirs:

"The facts were that not only were there pressure movements around the United Nations"—

if Baroody were to tell you, "I was there, and there were pressures", it would be said, "Oh, he is an Arab. He has to say that." But this is Mr. Truman:

"The facts were that not only were there pressure movements around the United Nations unlike anything that had been seen there before, but that the White House, too,"—the White House—"was subjected to a constant barrage. I do not think I ever had as much pressure and propaganda aimed at the White House as I had in this instance. The persistence of a few of the extreme Zionist leaders—actuated by political motives and engaging in political threats"—threats—"disturbed and annoyed me."—Poor Mr. Truman, how annoyed he was—"Some were even suggesting that we pressure sovereign nations into favourable votes in the General Assembly."^{12/}

Which finally he did. And we Arabs are supposed to stay quiet, to come here and act out a play, to play a game of legal niceties and quibblings. But here it is, in this book.

151. This is all? I think I lost a mark, but good enough, it is getting late.

152. So this is how the State of Israel was created, was foisted onto the Arabs' homeland.

153. Governments are not abstractions; they are made up of politicians and statesmen. Politicians and statesmen make mistakes. But as we say in Arabic, the better part of judgement is to correct a mistake. After the lapse of twenty years, have certain Western Powers corrected their mistake? No, I am not going to embarrass anyone, because I would like to respect everyone's dignity, but we know here that in a certain country—and you do not have to stretch your imagination too much to be sure which one it is—that in a certain Western country—and I am quoting from certain information I have—both of the candidates for the office of President stated in their election appeals that if elected, they would use the armed forces of their country to protect the political independence and the territorial integrity of Israel.

154. After twenty years of injustice, in the wake of the dissolution of the British Empire, somebody, we are told, had to fill the vacuum, and with the result that armed forces are now used against the Arabs.

155. I have been accosted outside in the corridors and they have said to me, "Baroody, you are a monarchist. How can you salute Mr. Kosygin?" I said, "What is wrong with Mr. Kosygin? He is a gentleman."

And I have known Mr. Gromyko since 1945, and he is another gentleman. His ideology is his and my ideology is mine. We are human beings. We are sitting here and we have been working together. Sometimes we have not seen eye to eye, but we do co-operate once in a while with one another. The communists have done nothing wrong to Saudi Arabia. We may have different outlooks. They still ask me, "How can you speak with Mr. Kosygin? He is a communist, a socialist, and you are a monarchist." But the interrogators forget how the great Winston Churchill allied himself with the communists—and he, Churchill, was quite an imperialist. And when he was asked, "How is it that we, a colonial Power, ally ourselves with the communists?", he replied, "I will ally myself with the devil in order to beat the Nazis." With the devil himself. I do not know whether the devil can be seen anywhere here.

156. But even if the Soviet Union sees the injustice that was perpetrated on the Arabs, then we are told, "Oh, Communism should be like cholera to the Arabs; Communism is like the plague. Keep away from the Soviet Union."

157. Well, the trouble stems not from Communism but from power politics.

158. Another great Western Power and its satellites—I do not like to use that word, "satellite", because I do not think any great Power has satellites, but that is the terminology that has been used, erroneously—another great Western Power and its satellites support the artificial state of Israel in the face of a hundred million Arabs, in the face of six hundred million Muslims. Muslims? What have the Muslims to do with this issue? Well, the Israelis hoisted a flag on the minaret of a mosque. I have read Schlumberger. I have read many authors on the Crusades, Western authors, and according to them, even the Crusaders respected the places of worship of Islam, even though they were pushed to fight, for three centuries, wars against the so-called infidels. We are the infidels. Things have not changed. Sartorially they have changed, but inside people are still the same.

159. I am exercising my right of reply to our good friend and my colleague, Ambassador Goldberg, because, after all, Saudi Arabia is part and parcel of the Arab homeland; you cannot rule us out because we are a peninsula. The leader of Saudi Arabia made certain declarations only three or four weeks ago when he was in Europe. I happened to be with him part of the time. He said: "We have nothing against our Jewish brethren. We are here contending with a colonial movement"—I am paraphrasing of course—"that is trying to subdue us and make incursions in our midst."

160. I think it was the correspondent of the Washington Post who, last summer, asked the King at the Waldorf Astoria: "When do you think, Your Majesty, that there will be peace with Israel?" He replied, "When Israel as a State"—not as Mr. Eban tried to say, that we are trying to destroy the Jews—"ceases to exist; then there will be peace in the Holy Land".

161. The keynote of Ambassador Goldberg's speech was peace and the mutual recognition of the political independence and the territorial integrity of all coun-

^{11/} Ibid., p. 153.

^{12/} Ibid., p. 158.

tries. How can peace be achieved? There is a genuine peace and there is a bogus peace; there is an artificial peace and there is an imposed peace. There are all kinds of peace: the peace of the grave for the indigenous people of Palestine, the peace of exiling them from their homeland, forgetting that the United Nations flouted the Charter in 1947 because of the pressures that were brought by Mr. Truman on a number of sovereign States sitting in Lake Success.

162. I attended the 1947 session when Mr. Truman called the President of a sovereign State and told him, "You will not receive further aid if you do not vote for the partition of Palestine". That was in 1947 in a special session—this does not augur well for the Arabs as this is 1967. Mr. Truman called the President of another sovereign State and told him, "If you want to be on good terms with my country, you have to vote for partition". There was another representative whose name I do not wish to mention; he is dead now, but he was the Foreign Minister of his country. We were having lunch in the Wedgewood Room at the Waldorf Astoria in 1947, and I just can picture him before me. He said, "Mr. Truman has the power; his country has emerged as a great Power. If we do not do what he wants, he makes us pay a heavy price."

163. This is how self-determination was flouted in the United Nations in 1947. We are talking today only about a link in a long chain of incidents. What kind of peace do our friends want us to have in the Arab homeland: peace by compulsion or the shaky peace of an armistice? The Palestinian Arabs say: "How can we make peace if we are outside of our homeland"—I am talking of the indigenous people of Palestine. You know that in the Koran it says that even in religion there is no compulsion. Is peace to be imposed on the Arab world by the successors of Mr. Truman? If there are a few Governments here and there which find themselves so subdued, then, by Jove, they will not last long, they will be liquidated by the Arab people.

Mr. Rossides (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

164. Do you think that I would be happy if Arab Governments were toppled? All the Arabs are my brothers, and I happen to be a member of an Arab Government. Do you think that this is easy for me, one who has been committed to the United Nations for twenty years and who has worked for peace in my humble way, like any one of you here? No, I would not be very happy. I would not want to tread on an ant if I saw one. But Baroody reflects the tenor, the feelings and the sentiments of the people of Saudi Arabia and, with the permission of my brothers here, the people of the Arab nation at large. There would be lulls of false tranquility, whilst might would be wielded by those who could exercise it. When this happened, there would be a new eruption and a new explosion.

165. Sometimes diplomats here—including my good friend Mr. Goldberg—try not to see the picture in all its perspective. This question has lived with me for forty-seven years. In another organ of the United Nations I once said that I was not a Palestinian when a suggestion had been made that I was. But every Arab is a Palestinian when it comes to robbing the indigenous people of Palestine of their homeland. If

he does not feel like a Palestinian, he is considered a traitor and is spat upon; nobody likes to be spat upon. Those are the facts: take them or leave them.

166. When my Deputy Foreign Minister comes—and he is due here tonight—I have no doubt that in his intervention he will make a study of the whole problem. I am only giving you a little dressing now. Some have falsely claimed that the Arabs are Jew-baiters. Are they? Who protected the Jews throughout their history? The Mediterranean people who are human, did and the Arabs belong to the Mediterranean basin. Who were the Jew-baiters? Look into the history books. The Inquisition pitted Christian against Christian and Christian against Jew and if there was no Jew, they would invent one and kill him. That happened in Europe and it is not in the Arab or Latin American tradition to kill Jews. You have only to look at Latin America, at Brazil, at Argentina and Mexico where the white elements have co-mingled with the natives. The people in certain parts of Europe are a breed unto themselves; it is as if they were made from a special mould. The Latin Americans are different. Many of them look like Arabs. They have heart. I do not think that the Latin Americans and the Arabs have a monopoly on fine sentiments, but it happens that they are tolerant because they have suffered, and tolerance has become one of their traditions as is manifest in their history. It seems that with all the economic progress of the Western Powers, these Powers have not suffered enough, in spite of two world wars. They are merely children in history, in civilization and in culture, going back only a few centuries.

167. We may have lost our material power, but the power of the spirit is still in us. Our dignity is more important than our pockets, than our money. The Western Powers do not think that this is true of us. Everything seems to be money nowadays. How much have you got? A dastardly act has been perpetrated on the Arabs. The injustice of it is immaterial. Condemning Israel. Huh! Israel has been condemned time and again. It does not heed what it did. It knows who stands behind it. Twenty-six per cent of the Arab territory beyond the armistice line of twenty years ago, was annexed. Did Israel obey the resolutions of the United Nations? Huh! Not Israel, it knows who stands behind it.

168. This morning I received a very touching telegram from Sephardim Jews asking me to use my good offices with my Arab brothers, wherever there were some Sephardim Jews, to see to it that they are not hurt. But if any of those Sephardim Jews were hurt, it would be perhaps because of the mobs which sometimes cannot be controlled by Governments. And whose victims would they be? The victims of the Arabs or the victims of the Zionists who created this feud between us and Zionism? As I was coming today, someone spoke to me in Arabic. He told me, "I am the correspondent of an Arabic newspaper, Al-Hayat." Al-Hayat means "life", it is a Beirut newspaper. I said, "What is your name, my son?" He said, "I am Mizrahi." I said, "Come now, shake hands with me." He is an Arab Jew. He told me, "I speak with you in Arabic." I said, "Do you know Hebrew?" He said, "Only a few words." These are our brothers, the Mizrahis in Beirut.

169. "We are the arch enemies of the Jews." Who says that? The European Jews say that for the axe they grind. Not all of them, I know many European Jews who are non-Zionists, mind you. I must make this distinction. These non-Zionist Jews are honourable people, as honourable as any one of us, and as dishonourable as many of us, too. No, the Arabs refuse to have the peace of the grave.

170. And none other than the President of the United States enunciated five principles which are reflected in the draft resolution of the United States. These points read very well, but in practice, I am afraid those points are indeed difficult to implement. One point deals with the recognized "right of national life". What about the national life of the indigenous people of Palestine? That is national life. Do the native Palestinians no longer belong to the area? "They should be resettled," we are told. Suppose they retort: "We wish to go back to our homes." Why should any imperialist Power, western or eastern, northern or southern, prevent them from so doing?

171. "Justice for the refugees" is another point. Justice by what means? By giving them food? Seven cents a day to live on? Maybe that will be raised to eight cents, because now the eyes of many of our friends are lachrymose; they shed tears and can afford to be charitable. They are good people here in the United States. I have been receiving mail I cannot keep track of, say what a dastardly act was dealt to the Palestinian people who have been chased out of their country. The humanitarian Mr. Truman did it. When he knew that the World War was almost over, he ordered atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Humanity is indivisible. He cannot be inhuman to the Japanese and human to the Zionists. Likewise, you and I cannot be kind to one person and unkind to another and still be called kind. Kindness and humanity are indivisible.

172. "Innocent maritime passage" is another point. Passage to where? To Elath that was annexed by the Zionists? The whole area was annexed. Why did not the imperialist Western Powers counsel the artificial State of Israel to resort to the International Court of Justice for a recommendation on this point? No, Israel,

the pet child of the imperialist Western Powers must be cajoled. No court of law is needed.

173. "Limits on the wasteful and destructive arms race" is yet another point. Who started the arms race in our part of the world? When Israel was transplanted, what happened? The Western Powers began to send arms to it. Of course, the Arabs cannot stand by with arms folded. They began to arm themselves too. I wish all were Gandhi and used Satyagraha (boycott). But they were not Gandhi, Gandhi is a product of India. I, myself, would prefer the Satyagraha. But who am I? It is the Arab people that count, not Baroodi or the Secretary-General, or our illustrious President.

174. "Political independence and territorial integrity for all." This is the last point. What does it imply? The artificial State of Israel is there to stay, whether you like it or not, we are told. Bang your head on the walls, Arabs. This is not rudely said, but they find a polite way of saying it. I wish I could see such a dream come true as is envisaged by the President of a very friendly country—and I am speaking now of Saudi Arabia.

175. But one thing I wish all Western countries would do: take Zionism out of their domestic affairs. Zionism has marshalled the mass media of information in all the Western countries, without exception. Zionism, furthermore, has wormed itself into the heart of Western institutions in order to assert its own will. I do not say this with hatred or rancour. I pity the Zionists because there will be a day of reckoning, not from the Arabs, because we have an Arab proverb which says: "God always has mercy upon a person when he knows his limits and does not go beyond them."

176. The Zionists know no limits, and I feel sorry for those of them who are innocent, because one day—and I hope I will not be alive—they will be made scapegoats in none other than Western countries. We have seen that before.

177. I invoke the mercy of God and His compassion so that a real peace, not the peace of the grave and not the peace of compulsion, may prevail among all men.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.