

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1528th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 20 June 1967,
at 3 p.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 PAZHWAQ
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. The PRESIDENT: I announced this morning [1527th meeting] that it was my intention to close the list of speakers in the general debate on Friday, 23 June, at 11 o'clock in the morning. Since I have heard no objection to that proposal, I take it that the General Assembly decides that the list of speakers in the general debate will be closed on Friday, 23 June, at 11 o'clock in the morning.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. ZHIVKOV [Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria]:^{1/}The convening of the current emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly expresses the concern of the peoples over the situation resulting from the aggression perpetrated by Israel against its neighbouring Arab countries. Peace has been violated in such a sensitive area of the world as the Middle East.

3. The fact that the guns have grown silent since the cease-fire does not at all offer us grounds for any reassurance whatsoever. On the contrary, the atmosphere of tension and hostility which flared up during the military conflict has not been eased. The troops of the aggressor are occupying parts of the territories of the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan. The invaders are subjecting the Arab population in the seized areas to a brutal mass persecution.

4. As things are, the United Nations, whose principal aim is to maintain world peace and security, cannot be an indifferent observer of these acts which spell a grave danger to world peace. The world Organization should not remain idle in the face of the most flagrant encroachment upon the security and territorial integrity of the Arab countries which fell victim to the Israeli aggression.

5. The international situation has become tense enough as a result of the American aggression against Viet-Nam. The emergence in the Middle East of yet another hotbed of war has further heightened the dangerous consequences to world peace. Those same forces and factors which unleashed the conflagration of war in South-East Asia have acted to aggravate the Middle East crisis by aiding and abetting the aggression against the Arab countries. This makes the adoption by the United Nations of measures for the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression—which may cause a new outbreak of still more perilous conflicts—ever more imperative.

6. That is why the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria voices its satisfaction in the fact that the initiative of the Soviet Government has been accepted for convening the present emergency special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to consider the situation created in the Middle East and to take decisions and speedy measures to eliminate the consequences of Israel's aggression and for the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli troops behind the armistice lines.

7. The fact that the majority of the Member States have supported this idea shows that they have been seriously disturbed by the events which have occurred in that part of the world during the past few weeks. It also bears testimony to the prevailing conviction that the possibilities of the United Nations have not been exhausted and that the current session can and must facilitate the speedy settlement of the conflict. It is our duty to justify the hopes which the peoples have pinned on the United Nations.

8. The events that took place before the aggression was committed and the unbridled and ambitious political and territorial claims of the Israeli extremists which followed it testify to a long and carefully nurtured plan of certain imperialist forces directed against the progressive development of the Arab countries and aimed at changing the correlation of forces in the Middle East in favour of imperialism. It is hardly necessary to point out that the strategic and economic importance of the Middle East has always attracted the attention of imperialism. As is well known, that region supplies about one third of the world's oil output containing over 60 per cent of the world's oil deposits. There, monopoly capital has enormous investments bringing in fabulous profits. American companies alone have over \$2.5 million million worth of investments in that area.

9. Capitalist monopolies are trying to hold on to their domination in the exploitation of the natural resources and to keep millions of Arabs in a state of colonial dependence. Aside from this, control over

^{1/} Mr. Zhivkov spoke in Bulgarian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

the Middle East means to the aggressive imperialist forces control over the entire Mediterranean area and the European approaches to Africa and Asia. For this reason it is no accident that many of their war bases as well as the American Sixth Fleet are located in that region.

10. The plans of imperialism to maintain its domination run counter to the struggle of the Arab peoples for freedom and independence. To offset the striving of the Arab countries to pursue their own independent home and foreign policy as well as the economic, social and political transformations carried out in the United Arab Republic, Syria and other Arab countries in the interest of their peoples, the imperialists are trying to whip up perpetual tension in that area so that they may, by means of threats and coercion through interference and armed aggression, halt the progressive development of the Arab countries.

11. It should be emphasized that Israel has placed itself in the service of this policy. Facts show undeniably that the present aggression on the part of Israel is no accidental or isolated occurrence, but part of a long-standing and premeditated plan directed against the Arab States. As a first step in the implementation of this plan, Israel embarked upon the creation of an army armed to the teeth and, judging by its numbers and types of armament, clearly designed for aggressive purposes. The suppliers of the arms and equipment for that army were the United States, Britain and the German Federal Republic.

12. At the same time, a large-scale propaganda campaign was launched to mislead world public opinion. While Israel was constantly importing weapons, the Israeli Government was offering solemn assurances that it had no aggressive intentions towards the Arab countries.

13. But what was the situation in actual fact?

14. Israel engineered provocation after provocation causing incidents in the border regions and the Demilitarized Zone. It would be sufficient to leaf through the numerous reports of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization to find violation after violation of the truce committed by Israel. These provocations and incidents very often turned into full-fledged military operations for which Israel was censured repeatedly in resolutions of the Security Council. Since 1951, Israel, in carrying out these actions, has refused to co-operate in the mixed armistice commissions.

15. In the preparation of its latest aggression, Israel resorted to the same methods of provocation against the Arab countries. In January of this year, Israel started a campaign to aggravate further the situation in the Middle East. Israeli leaders again advanced claims to the Demilitarized Zone, declaring that they were ready to back up their claims by force of arms. These statements further inflamed tension in that area.

16. On 7 April, Israeli troops mounted a heavy armed attack against the Syrian Arab Republic. After the provocative attack against Syria by Israeli troops on 7 April of this year, the Premier of Israel threatened: "We may have to adopt measures no less

drastic than those of 7 April". Later, on 13 May, he stated even more belligerently: "Israel is prepared to risk all-out war in a military offensive to topple Syria's army régime". Echoing these warlike threats, the Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army confirmed that "the time might have come to seize Damascus and topple the Syrian Government".

17. On 9 May of this year, the Commission of Defence and Foreign Policy of the Knesset untied the hands of the extremist military circles by voting for powers to carry out military operations against Syria.

18. The course of events shows that these statements were not just verbal threats. During the last ten years, since the aggression against Egypt in 1956, the Government of Israel was actively preparing for an attack. As is obvious, it was only seeking for the most suitable moment for an aggressive thrust. As for the pretext, it is well known that aggressors have always easily found pretexts to try to justify the launching of an attack.

19. The peace-loving countries had repeatedly warned the Israeli extremists before the latter kindled the fires of war in the Middle East. The Bulgarian Government also voiced its concern and anxiety over the actions of certain imperialist circles and of the Israeli Government in the Middle East, issuing the warning that those actions threatened peace and complicated the situation in that region. It appealed for prudence and restraint from the use of arms.

20. At the same time, patient and persistent efforts were being made in the Security Council to forestall an armed clash between Israel and its Arab neighbours. The President of the United Arab Republic assured the Secretary-General that the United Arab Republic would not initiate offensive action against Israel. The other Arab countries likewise expressed the same attitude. However, the appeals for common sense and restraint were disregarded by the Israeli Government and by its instigators and protectors.

21. The Government of Israel was nursing a different plan. It was preparing for a treacherous attack, fearing as it did that the Security Council recommendation for restraint might hamper its aggressive designs. The aggressor cut short the efforts being made for a peaceful solution by launching a sudden attack against the Arab countries.

22. Later, the Israeli Government paid no heed to the calls of the Security Council for a cease-fire and did not halt its aggression before it had executed its plan to invade the territories of the countries under attack. In this respect, the tactics of protraction in the Security Council objectively facilitated the plunderous designs of the aggressor. Thus the present situation has come about with the Israeli extremists putting forward brazen and provocative political and territorial claims as their troops are committing atrocities upon the population in the occupied Arab territories. The military operations did not and could not provide favourable conditions for the future of the Israeli people but only further complicated the already entangled problems of the Middle East. If Tel-Aviv was now in a position soberly to appraise the situation created there, it could reach

the conclusion that Israel's present policy is sowing the seeds of future conflicts and risks for the Israeli people themselves and that it should therefore abandon the policy of aggression and take the path of co-operation for a just solution of the problems vital to the Middle East.

23. Unfortunately, however, we are witnessing the declarations of highly-placed Government leaders in Israel dreaming of territorial expansion and military diktat. Those leaders should not forget that such declarations and plans are futile because, in this age, aggression is considered a crime, and it is the perpetrators and not the victims of aggression that will have to pay for it.

24. The rulers of Israel should also realize that their attempts to shift the responsibility for their aggression onto the victims of aggression, and to accuse those resisting it of anti-Jewish feelings and sentiments, are also doomed to failure.

25. The Bulgarian people have always been alien to racial prejudices. At the most difficult moments they have rendered assistance to the victims of racism and national oppression. Allow me to recall only one fact from the recent history of my country. During the Second World War, inspired by the communist party, the Bulgarian people resisted the plans of the monarcho-fascist clique to help Nazi Germany exterminate the Jewish population in Bulgaria. Thanks to the struggle of our people, Bulgaria was the only European country overrun by Hitlerite fascism where the lives and safety of Jews were fully protected. This is a historical fact universally acknowledged. The Bulgarian people have never been and will never be against the Jewish people, just as they have never been against any other people.

26. Our country broke off its diplomatic relations with Israel not because we are against the State of Israel but because the Government of Israel started an unprovoked and criminal war against the Arab peoples, because it is a tool in the hands of the imperialists in the latter's struggle against the Arab national liberation movement, because it flouted the decisions of the Security Council and failed to withdraw its troops from the territories of other countries.

27. Considering the situation in the Middle East, we should not forget that we are actually considering one of the acutest aspects of the present-day international situation. Israel's aggression has once again proved how much the danger of imperialism encroaching upon the independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America has heightened. This obliges us not to overlook the consequences to the freedom and independence of many countries and peoples which may arise if the aggressor goes unpunished, if no assistance is rendered to the Arab countries, if the nations are not alerted to maintain their vigilance and to resist the criminal designs and actions of the imperialists. It is inadmissible, from the point of view of the interests of peace and the liberty of peoples, that the aggressor should receive a prize for his criminal aggression instead of retribution and punishment. And that is exactly what the Israeli aggressors and their protectors are seeking.

28. What are the principles that should guide one in solving the problems of the Middle East situation?

29. We hold the view that, in settling the Middle East problems, one should be guided by the vital interests of the peoples inhabiting that region as well as by the interests of world peace. For this reason it is necessary, above all, to condemn the aggressor, eliminate the consequences of the aggression, settle the problems in a peaceful and equitable manner, render help to the victims of aggression by forcing the aggressor to restitute, in the shortest time possible, all it has destroyed and seized, and find a just and lasting solution to the problem of the Palestine refugees, who have been subjected to humiliation, poverty and suffering. This would furnish proof that the principles underlying this Organization and the ideals inspiring it will triumph, that aggression cannot and shall not go unpunished, and that the crimes against peace and the security of peoples shall not be tolerated.

30. The main prerequisite for the solution of the Middle East problems at the present moment is the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. The continued seizure of those territories is nothing but a continuation of the aggression. The illegal presence of Israeli troops in those areas is aimed at offering undeserved advantages to the aggressor; in point of fact, it fans its expansionist claims and places obstacles to the solution of the questions relating to the restoration and consolidation of peace in the Middle East.

31. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, just as the other socialist and peace-loving countries, does not recognize the forcible seizure of Arab territories by Israel. We declare that our country will support measures within and outside the United Nations designed to eliminate the consequences of the Israeli aggression and to establish a lasting peace in that region.

32. Bulgaria is a small country in the heart of the Balkan Peninsula. Everybody knows the sad fortune of the Balkan Peninsula, which used to be one of the most explosive regions of Europe in the past. From our own experience we know the danger to the security of small countries stemming from the interference of foreign Powers. The Middle East is not so far away from us and we cannot watch the course of events there with detachment or indifference. We would like to see not only the Balkans but also such a major region as the Middle East safeguarded against any interference from the outside or against aggression. For this reason we are of the opinion that the United Nations should rapidly take all necessary steps for the just solution of the problems which have resulted from the Israeli aggression, and the conflict in the Middle East must not be allowed to escalate into a new, world thermonuclear war.

33. We support the draft resolution tabled by the Government of the Soviet Union [A/L.519] to restore peace and justice in the Middle East. We consider that this draft resolution is a constructive contribution to finding a positive solution of the questions confronting the current General Assembly session. We hail the appeal of the Soviet Government for the great Powers to find a common language and arrive at decisions in keeping with the interests of peace in the Middle East and the world over.

34. The responsibility of our Organization too for taking such decisions is extremely important. One should not forget that if the United Nations should fail to speed up the settlement of these problems, it will emerge from the crisis with its prestige strongly shaken; it will show a weakness that will encourage the forces of war. And vice versa: an equitable solution of the problems under discussion will increase confidence in the United Nations and will discourage the partisans of the policy of acting from a position of strength.

35. With amazement and indignation we heard the statement made yesterday [1526th meeting] by the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs. One might have expected that the Israeli representative would facilitate the work of the General Assembly by showing a realistic attitude to the problems. Instead, we were witnesses to new and flagrant attempts to justify the Israeli aggression, to shift the blame to others, and to justify unsubstantiated political and territorial claims. This can only complicate the situation. It is high time Israel finally listened to the voice of reason, to the appeals for a just solution of the complex and acute problems of the Middle East.

36. It should be emphasized, with regret, that the draft resolution, submitted by the United States [A/L.520] is not a constructive contribution to the Middle East crisis. The United States draft resolution not only does not condemn the aggressor, but also contains proposals the adoption of which is very clearly aimed at consolidating his position, at intensifying the already provocative irreconcilability of the Israeli Government, and at seriously impairing the rights of the Arab States which have become victims of the Israeli invasion. Such a draft resolution can only deepen and aggravate the problems. It is entirely unacceptable that the demand for the immediate withdrawal of the invader's troops should be made dependent upon numerous conditions the implementation of which would be nothing, as I have already said, but an undeserved reward for the aggressor. As a matter of fact, this would mean that our Organization, the main goal of which is the preservation of the peace and security of States, would be giving a green light to all future aggressors. One should not, indeed cannot, allow such a thing to happen.

37. In conclusion, I wish to declare from this rostrum that the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that resolute joint action of all peace-loving forces is necessary to condemn the aggression and to defend the freedom and independence of the Arab peoples. "If the Government of Israel does not terminate its aggression and if it does not withdraw its troops beyond the Armistice Line," the Moscow declaration of 9 June reads, in part, "the socialist countries signatories to this declaration will do all that is necessary to help the peoples of the Arab countries to give a decisive rebuff to the aggressor, to defend their legitimate rights, to extinguish the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to restore peace in that region".

38. I feel obliged to declare that the Bulgarian Government and the entire Bulgarian people adhere firmly to this position and will do their duty by joining their efforts to those of all peace-loving

countries to bring about the complete elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression.

39. We would like to believe that reason, the sense of justice and the concern for peace and tranquillity in the world will triumph in this hall where representatives of 122 States have assembled. The peoples of these countries are waiting for such a decision, on the urgent problems currently under consideration, as will strengthen their confidence in the United Nations and in its mission to serve the peace and security of mankind.

40. We are convinced that, irrespective of the difficulties now facing the Arab peoples, they will in the final analysis win their fight against colonialism and imperialism because they are defending their vital interests and their right to an independent and progressive development.

41. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has requested to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

42. Mr. EBAN (Israel): The representative of Syria made a long and bitter address this morning in which he represented his Government as the innocent victim of Israeli aggression. No Government in the world has less cause and less justification for accusing any other Government in the world of aggression; for amongst all the States of the Middle East, Syria in recent weeks and months has stood out for the vehemence, the bitterness and the violence of its aggressive designs upon Israel. The fact that criticism of murderous Syrian attacks has been vetoed three times in the Security Council does not alter the fact that the majority of that body has three times sought to certify Syrian guilt.

43. If Israel is accused of violating Syria's rights, then surely it is legitimate for the General Assembly to ask itself what Syria's policy has been towards Israel. What has that policy been in theory, and what have been its practical manifestations? To find out what Syrian policy towards Israel has been we need seek no better authority than the statements of Syrian leaders themselves. These statements, if I were to take them back to the beginnings of Israel's sovereign existence, would create a mountainous pile on this rostrum. Let me, therefore, confine myself to those expressions of Syrian policy towards Israel which are relevant to the specific matter now under discussion namely, the aggressive design which began to unfold on 14 May and which reached its point of culmination in the first week of June.

44. Radio Damascus, which is an official Government agency, defined Syrian policy towards Israel in the following terms, which Members of the General Assembly might wish to compare with the terms of the United Nations Charter. The official Syrian commentator said:

"We have taken into account all the expected possibilities. We have prepared everything necessary in order to engage in battle with Israel and with those who stand behind her."

That was on 23 May. A day later, the Syrian Prime Minister addressed reporters in a similar vein. These are his words:

"The entire Arab nation meets in the heart of the campaign around Damascus and around the failure of imperialism in order to destroy the focii of imperialism and its primary base Israel and to wipe Israel off from the face of the earth."

45. Let the General Assembly therefore understand that it listened this morning to the statement of the representative of a State which desires to wipe another Member State off the face of the earth. Only a day before the statement I have just quoted, Mr. Al-Atassi stated in Damascus—this was on 22 May:

"All necessary steps will not only be taken to repel the conspiracy but to start a liberation campaign with the first step."

46. The Defence Minister of Syria, General Asad, whose evidence might be of interest because so much has been heard here of military circles in various countries, said:

"The Syrian forces are prepared to initiate the liberation and the blowing up of the aggressive Zionist existence in our homeland. The Syrian army, which has been waiting for a long time, is unanimous in its will to precipitate the battle. However, the army has been waiting for a signal from the political leadership." The Minister of Defence himself, a military man, was of the opinion that the time was ripe for a liberation war, and that it was necessary at least to "undertake minimum measures to ensure a punitive blow on Israel that will return wisdom to her and compel her to go on her knees humiliated and defeated, in an atmosphere of fright that will prevent any further thought of aggression."

47. The Syrian Minister boastfully admitted that Syrian aircraft had encroached upon Israeli territory tens of times since 23 February 1967 for observation purposes and other. The last time, according to General Asad's statement, had been on 14 May 1967 at 12 hours when Syrian aircraft had penetrated Israeli airspace for tens of kilometres.

48. Reference was made this morning to the events that took place in the middle of May when engagements of local scope but of great intensity took place on the Syrian-Israeli frontier. Those who desire to ascribe responsibility to Israel for these events find themselves refuted by Syrian sources themselves. For it was the Syrian Minister of Information who declared in a Press conference on 8 April 1967:

"As our communiqués have announced, our guns shelled the positions of the enemy and caused heavy damage to four Jewish villages."

Here I can assert that the Minister was telling the truth when he said that Syrian guns had shelled the positions of the enemy and had caused heavy damage to four villages. He continued:

"We consider that yesterday's engagement is not the first and will not be the last. There must still be hard and fierce battles, for our objective is the freeing of the country and the total liquidation of the Zionist existence there. There can be no quiet in this area as long as that State exists."

49. Why, then, do we have to go beyond and outside Syrian statements in order to ask ourselves what that country's policy is? The Syrian policy towards Israel is to deny its sovereignty, to attack its independence, to destroy its statehood and to kill as many of its citizens as possible by every means. Is that not the Syrian policy towards Israel? Everybody in this room and outside it knows that it is.

50. There were times in recent years when it appeared that relative tranquillity existed on most of the frontiers between Israel and neighbouring States. We heard many declarations and announcements of violent intention, but for long periods the borders were quiet. It was then, especially since the beginning of 1956, that Syria adopted a policy first of all of inflaming the Israel frontier and then of conducting violent propaganda campaigns against any other Arab State which appeared to have accepted a situation of de facto coexistence with Israel.

51. Who does not remember how the Syrian radio would attack those Arab States which had for a long time maintained a tranquil frontier with Israel; how all Arab States which—sometimes by verbal expression, but more often by passive acquiescence—appeared to be moving towards a stable relationship were attacked as the tools of imperialism, as the tools of Zionism; how their passions were incited; how the propaganda from Damascus was directed not only against Israel, which was to be liquidated, but against all other Arab States which were deemed not to be sufficiently energetic in pursuit of that liquidation?

52. It was also in Syria that there took place the development which historians might regard as the prelude to our current crisis, namely, the initiation of what they called "popular war", a new form and a new technique of aggression. The doctrine of this technique can be simply stated: instead of engaging regular forces in direct confrontation, the proposal was to make Israel's life an inferno by dispatching terrorist gangs in order to attack not the armed forces but civilian populations—farmers and settlers in their homes, schools and football fields—and electrical installations, hoping thereby to evade the logic of the military balance, to take advantage of Israel's extreme geographic vulnerability, and in that way to convulse the whole rhythm of normal life within our country, especially in the north.

53. In a later extension of this terrorist technique, the Syrian Government trained terrorists, warriors in camps whose sites are known, and dispatched them as far as possible through Jordan and Lebanon in an effort to embroil other Arab States in conflict with Israel, especially those Arab States which did not seem to wish to have such a confrontation or to translate the rhetoric of hostility into the reality of violence.

54. That was the situation that the United Nations Security Council considered in October 1966, and the majority of the members of the Security Council, representing all the five continents of the world, drafted a resolution defining the responsibility of the Syrian Government for acts of sabotage and terrorism that had taken place, and expressing the hope, in the

mildest possible terminology, that Syria would change its policy in that regard.

55. In other words, the fact that this terrorist doctrine was both invented and practised and fomented in Syria became a part of the international jurisprudence. The resolution was not adopted because, as I explained yesterday, there has for the past fourteen years existed a situation arising out of global rivalries, under which no resolution which determines the responsibility of any Arab State for anything at all can be adopted, even if a majority of the Members wish it to be adopted. Nevertheless, responsibility was determined by a majority of the international community.

56. I shall not weary the General Assembly or evoke harsh and bitter memories in Israel by giving a list of the kind of events which used to follow each other in daily succession. On one day, at a football game at Dishon, terrorist groups would kill one and wound two men. On another day, a jeep would be blown up by a mine and both its passengers killed. At another time, as on 2 June 1967, at Kfar Hassid, a terrorist team, bent both on sabotage and on reconnoitring, would penetrate the border, kill two people, wound two people, and go back across the frontier. On a day in October, before the series of Security Council meetings last year, a mine would be put on a road just before a truck passed by, and four of those riding in it would be thrown fifty metres and smashed to the ground. On another day, a train track would be sabotaged. On another day, the railway would actually be put out of use.

57. It is impossible, as we look back over the past year, to find a single month—it is very rare to find a single week—in which such acts were not committed. A period of three or four days without such an attempt to convulse the nation's life, to exploit its vulnerability, would be considered a lull, almost an armistice, in this terrorist war. So much then for the general pattern of Syrian aggression, which has had a special place in the memory and the jurisprudence of the United Nations.

58. Last year, many Member States informed us that they would not support Syria's candidacy for the Security Council because, of all the States in the Middle East, this was the one whose militancy was most explicit, whose refusal to have even a provisional period of tranquillity was so marked. Every one of the great Powers was invited to use its influence—some of them did use their influence—in order to bring about a cessation of this violence and to create a condition in which there could be at least an effective, a *de facto*, tranquillity on Israel's frontiers.

59. Therefore, the maintenance by Syria of this violence and its intensification in recent months can be described as the first link in the chain which developed in accordance with the process which I outlined yesterday. I therefore listened today to hear whether the Syrian representative had anything to say about the future. Is there any disposition to despair of the belligerent relationships of the past? Syria could at any time have had peace with Israel in accordance with the principles of Article 1 and Article 2

of the Charter. Syria can now have a peace treaty with Israel based on those principles of the Charter. The transition from the cease-fire to a condition of permanent peace is feasible if the international community mobilizes the full measure and extent of its influence.

60. I should like to refer to some other matters which have been raised in the discussion and in connexion with which Israel's name has been mentioned. Yesterday morning [1526th meeting], I gave a detailed account of the events leading to the outbreak of hostilities, and in that detailed survey I said a few sentences about the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force on 18 May. I said in effect that that withdrawal, unaccompanied by effective measures by the General Assembly or the Security Council to prevent belligerency by sea and land, was one of the stages leading to the recent intensification of tension. My object was to suggest that the legal and political aspects of United Nations peace-keeping functions need to be explored in the light of this experience, whether with reference to the Middle East or to other areas of the world.

61. Now, this is not an unusual view. It is not an Israeli view alone. It expresses a very broad international and public consensus. I doubt whether anyone will ever write the history of the recent crisis without giving the full weight to the Egyptian request for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force on 18 May, a request made with such urgency as to give no adequate time and effort to meet the consequences of that withdrawal. I said yesterday that I was not concerned with the compulsions which led to those steps, but only with their consequences. I described those consequences as they evolved. I said that there took place a sudden disruption of the local security balance and that an international maritime interest was exposed to almost certain threat.

62. Those were the consequences of the sudden change in the *status quo* which had existed in March 1967. Security was weakened. A maritime interest was threatened with what were authoritatively called "dangerous consequences". These were not unforeseen consequences. The Government of the United Arab Republic could have had no misunderstanding about what the anticipated results of its request would be. For, in the report of the Secretary-General on 7 September 1966, it is explicitly stated that if the United Nations Emergency Force were removed, Syria's fighting would quite likely soon be resumed.

63. It would have seemed logical, therefore, that some United Nations organ would, if confronted by the prospect of a withdrawal, do something to meet the anticipated consequences. Whether the organ should have been the General Assembly or the Security Council is not a matter into which I shall enter.

64. Now, this did not happen. I am certain that everything was done in good faith. Some believe that nothing else could be done. But this does not alter the fact that a weakness in the United Nations peace-keeping texture must rank amongst the factors which are universally admitted to have led to the situation we are now discussing. If we are to tell the truth of

recent developments, we cannot avoid reference to that fact. The United Nations is still young in years and in peace-keeping experience. If some Governments like my own do not believe that everything in this field is perfect, then it is their duty to say so. Our object is not recriminatory but constructive. By learning from the past we may help to save the future.

65. My point is that the issue is not in any sense a debate between our eminent Secretary-General and myself. He knows the personal friendship and the deep respect in which all my countrymen and I hold him. There is an objective substantive issue here to be considered, namely, to what extent the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations, as now envisaged, have an adequate stability for the fulfilment of their objectives.

66. Many Governments, hundreds of commentators in law and journalism, and, I have no doubt, multitudes of people throughout the world were disturbed by the events of 18 May and 19 May. And many who look back on those events see in them a link which has led to our present situation.

67. It was in this sense, for example, that the President of the United States, President Johnson, said on 23 May:

"We are dismayed at the hurried withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from Gaza and Sinai after ten years of steadfast service without action by either the General Assembly or the Security Council."

68. On 18 May, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom expressed his views in characteristically trenchant terms. I even found on reference that he, and not I, is the author of the fire brigade simile. I acknowledge this, as I would have done yesterday, if my memory and my files had been in better order. Referring to the decision of the Government of the United Arab Republic to call for the immediate withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from its territory, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the United Kingdom stated:

"It would really make a mockery of the peace-keeping work of the United Nations if as soon as the tension rises the United Nations Force is told to leave. Indeed, this might well have repercussions on other United Nations peace-keeping forces and the credibility of the United Nations efforts in this field would be thrown into question."

69. On the same day, the Minister of Information of the French Republic said that it was no doubt perfectly legal to request and to carry out the withdrawal of the Force, but it would have been politically wiser if the Powers had first been consulted.

70. On 25 May, the Foreign Minister of Canada stated objectively in reference to the action of the United Arab Republic:

"I will simply state again that I believe it was regrettable that the Force was withdrawn. I do not question the sovereignty of the host country that asked for its withdrawal, but I am firmly of the view that there was no clear legal basis for the way in which it was withdrawn."

71. In other words, in the light of this wide range of comment, certainly inspired by a positive attitude towards our Organization's peace-keeping functions, there is surely no need to present the issue as a sudden controversy or Israel's view as being an Israel view. There is not a specifically Israel view. There is a wide international consensus in favour of examining past experience in an effort to draw some better legal and political provisions for the future peace-keeping work of our Organization.

72. It is true that Israel's interests were affected, as our Permanent Representative informed the United Nations on 19 May, but the discussion is of international, and indeed of historic scope. Israel is only one of the many States which have enunciated views to which I gave very brief expression yesterday, and the spirit of our comments is one of concern for the better working of this Organization. It is also an effort to explain why, at the present stage in the evolution of international machinery, it seems to me that agreements for peace-keeping are likely to be more effective if they rely on bilateral enforcement agreements rather than on arrangements such as emergency forces which are at the mercy of the host country and which can, therefore, apparently be dismissed without notice.

73. Nor is our understanding of what would occur in the event of a request for withdrawal peculiar to ourselves. In general, we had felt that the country which was the host to the Force would not face the United Nations and the world with a fait accompli, and that if it did, then the consequent situation, especially at the entrance to the Strait of Tiran, would bring about a possibility for consultation.

74. It was in this spirit that the architect of the Emergency Force, the Prime Minister of Canada, explained in an address on 9 June:

"The expectations that had been held in 1957, namely, that if Egypt should at any time make a request for withdrawal, the appropriate procedure would be for that request to go first to the Advisory Committee, there to be discussed by the Committee which had been set up for that purpose by the Assembly, and if necessary and desirable, the whole matter could then be referred to the full Assembly for decision, and therefore any question of whether the Force should be withdrawn would become a matter for discussion with, and decision by, the United Nations."

75. In the context of which I speak, this is perhaps an academic question. It is a historic question; the past cannot be recaptured. But since there is still a great deal of discussion about the hope of solving certain regional problems by a United Nations presence, I think it is essential that we should understand what are the capacities and what are the limitations of that presence. The United Nations Emergency Force rendered great service to the international community during the decade of its tenure, but the ease with which the host Government could expel it, could require its removal, shows that perhaps we lived those ten years on a much more fragile basis than some of us believed at the time.

76. My final words of reply refer to the statement which has just been made by the representative of Bulgaria. That representative repeated the charges—which have no international foundation—concerning the basic responsibilities for this situation. Whoever says that Israel is here guilty of aggression has no legal or international justification on which to rest. Israel has always cherished its relationships with the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. Those relationships had recently undergone a marked expansion in certain practical fields. I am confident that when the heat and the dust of the present controversy have been dispelled, the relationships will be renewed, perhaps in greater intimacy and confidence than before.

77. Israel is especially appreciative of the recollections which the Bulgarian representative evoked of the common struggle against the common terror, against the horror that stalked through Eastern, South-Eastern, Central and Western Europe during the Second World War, and the fearful martyrdom and ordeals of which the Jewish people and the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe were the victims under the Hitlerite assault. These memories are far too deep to be effaced. They cannot be wiped out by any transient conflict of judgement, but precisely those who understood and who witnessed from first hand the way in which a whole people was being wiped off the face of the earth should give greater understanding to Israel's apprehensions and Israel's responsibilities, when it saw that armies were massing against her from the South, the North and the East, in order to complete the liquidation of a people which had suffered such vast losses in the Second World War. It is precisely because so many of Israel's citizens have such horrific memories that their sensitivity to the problem of physical security is so sharp.

78. It is in that spirit that I emphatically deny this definition about Israel's aggression. This definition can be put to simple tests. What has happened in the past decade? Did Israel during that decade deny the sovereignty, the statehood and the existence of the Arab States, or did they deny its sovereignty, its statehood and its existence? Did Israel make plans and have conferences about how to destroy the thirteen Arab States, or did they have meetings and conferences in order to make plans for Israel's destruction? Did Israel ever block an Arab port, or did an Arab State impose an illicit blockade on Israel and deny it free passage in an international waterway? Has Israel ever attempted to divert the sources of the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Nile, or did the Arab Governments form political and technical commissions with the object of denying to our parched little country that pathetic little trickle of water which flows through its desert space? Did Israel organize a terrorist campaign called a popular war for the purpose of penetrating the cities and villages of Arab States in order to blow up schools and sports grounds? Did Israel announce the doctrine of the so-called liquidation of another State?

79. It is essential that these elementary tests be applied. It is because they have been applied by world opinion that world opinion does not take seriously this definition of aggression. It is for this reason that the

Security Council rejected—as I hope and believe the General Assembly will reject—this eccentric and totally fallacious definition of Israel as the aggressor. It is for this reason that the Security Council refused—as I hope that the General Assembly will refuse—to be satisfied with solutions that take us back to that point at which the explosion took place. For if we have nothing to do but to go back to the point of explosion, we make a new explosion inevitable.

80. That is why, having heard the course of this discussion so far, my delegation continues to stand on the propositions and principles that I enunciated yesterday; namely, that once the cease-fire is consolidated, there should take place immediate discussions between Israel and its neighbours, in order to define, in free and open negotiation, all the terms and conditions of their coexistence. Nothing yet said in this discussion—and, I think, nothing that can be said in its future course—can possibly compare with the validity of this approach. Israel and the Arab States must understand the compulsions of a future to be shared in peace. On that basis, once their dialogue beings, it will, I am sure, lead to durable, viable and honourable solutions.

81. The PRESIDENT: There is one more representative who has asked to exercise his right of reply. Before calling on him, however, I should like to request the Assembly to permit me to take the liberty of making a very brief observation on the statement we have just heard from the representative of Israel. I do so because I feel it is necessary. And in saying that I feel it is necessary, I base myself on the fact that, in the past, there has been a certain confusion as to the interpretation given in the Press and in public opinion with regard to the real intent of statements made during the deliberations of the General Assembly.

82. I think that when we are confident that the General Assembly has a very clear understanding of a matter, we should make that clear, also, to those who are not in this Hall. By this I mean, in the particular case before the Assembly, that we should avoid any confusion as to the interpretation of the statement made this morning by the Secretary-General and that part of the statement of the representative of Israel in which he referred to the statement made this morning by the Secretary-General.

83. In that connexion, it is my impression that it is the general understanding of the entire membership that, to use the words of the representative of Israel, the "good faith" [supra., para. 64] of the Secretary-General has not been questioned. I take note of that, and I also take note of the following observation in the statement made this morning by the Secretary-General: "I seek only to restore in that picture the balance which the facts warrant" [1527th meeting, para. 2].

84. I now call on the representative of Syria in exercise of his right of reply.

85. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): A common saying, known to everybody, runs like this: History repeats itself. While this is common knowledge, the tragic aspect of it is that people learn very little from history. The United Nations, in the summer of 1967, twenty-two years after its establishment, is

witnessing the same criminality and aggression that were committed by Israel nineteen years ago in the spring of 1948. What is the analogy between the two?

86. The analogy is this: that in the spring of 1948 the United Nations was discussing the future of Palestine. No definite plan was yet in sight, although two proposals were made. But while the United Nations was studying this and that plan, the Israelis took it upon themselves to present the United Nations with a fait accompli. This they did by conquest, by the conquest of the Arab land of Palestine, by throwing out the Arab people of Palestine. And when the United Nations met to decide on the issue, the issue had already been decided on the battle front by a perfidious attack perpetrated by the Israeli forces in the spring of 1948.

87. And what are we witnessing now? The same thing: history repeating itself, without people being aware of the facts underlying that history. For what is taking place now is exactly the same thing as took place in 1948. It took place while the Security Council was seized of the question of Palestine, while the Security Council was discussing various aspects of the problem, on the basis of two reports submitted by the Secretary-General. I am referring to his two reports of 19 May and 26 May 1967.^{2/} Paragraph 14 of the latter report is very relevant to the debate that we are discussing right now. The Secretary-General said this:

"In my view, a peaceful outcome to the present crisis will depend upon a breathing spell which will allow tension to subside from its present explosive level. I therefore urge all the parties 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."^{3/}

88. Therefore, at the very time when the Security Council was discussing that report of the Secretary-General, and his appeal for restraint, Israeli forces started their perfidious, sneaky attack against the United Arab Republic, and later against Jordan and Syria.

89. Those are undeniable facts; those are irrefutable facts. Not even the aggressor himself has attempted so far, in all his exercise of casuistry, sophistry and mockery of the United Nations, to say that the Arabs started the aggression.

90. It therefore is no mere coincidence and it came to my delegation as no surprise whatsoever that the Foreign Minister of Israel tried to blame the Arab States for the war that has taken place and for the crisis that has arisen in the Middle East, which constituted and which still constitutes a threat to world peace. In fact it would be rather strange if he did not do so. The General Assembly at this very time is meeting to consider Israeli aggression, the Israeli invasion of four Arab States, in which the Israelis have boasted that they have occupied areas

of Arab territory of adjoining States which amounts to four times the size of Israel. Therefore, what could the Foreign Minister of Israel come here to say except to go back to history whenever he likes to invoke history and to forget history whenever that is to his benefit. His whole statement can be reduced to two points.

91. First, he wanted to cover up for the naked and perfidious aggression, for the invasion of the Arab lands, by a State that prides itself on being a Member State, forgetting completely about the United Nations Charter and about Article 2 of the Charter, which prohibits a Member State from attacking the territory of another Member State and from trying to solve its problems by force. His second objective should not be strange to the Members of the United Nations, for it involves Syria and returns to Syria again. The obsession of the Israeli and Zionist spokesmen with Syria, which has become morbid in itself, is very significant; because they can never forget that up until 1920 what is now Israel, what later became Palestine under the British Mandate in preparing for the establishment of Israel, was an organic and integral administrative part of Syria. Therefore, when we speak of Palestine, when we speak of the Arab-Israeli conflict, we are not speaking about a land that we have usurped from the Israelis; we are speaking about a land that the Zionists and the Israelis have usurped from us.

92. It must certainly be surprising to many who know the details of the problem of Palestine, of the Arab-Israeli conflict, to hear the Israeli Foreign Minister address this body in complete cognizance of the situation but completely forgetting the facts of the situation, dwelling at such length on terrorism. Since he has done so, I, in my turn, shall dwell on terrorism and, in doing so, I wish to refer the Foreign Minister of Israel and this body to some Israeli leaders who have written books and published articles about Israeli and Zionist terrorism in the Holy Land, in the land of Christ and Moses and Mohammed, in the land of peace. I am referring specifically to two books. One of them is The Revolt, by Menachem Begin,^{4/} who is now a member of the Israeli Cabinet, and the second is The Haganah,^{5/} published in the United Kingdom under the title Strictly Illegal. The Israeli name of the second book is so difficult that I cannot recall it. However, the author of the book The Haganah is now Director of Development and Research in the Ministry of Defence in Israel.

93. What do those two books tell us? First of all, Menachem Begin has conceived of the solution of the Palestine problem in exactly the same manner as, unfortunately, there was talk of the final solution of the Jewish problem. But here it is the final solution of the Arab problem, by killing the Arabs, by expelling them from their land, by occupying their territory. But more specifically, Menachem Begin, in his book, tells about the well calculated massacre that he perpetrated in Deir-Yassin, where, in a village whose inhabitants were not fighting and

^{2/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, documents S/7896 and S/7906.

^{3/} *Ibid.*, document S/7906, para. 14.

^{4/} Menachem Begin, The Revolt Story of the Irgun, New York, Schuman, 1951.

^{5/} Munya M. Mardor, Haganah, New American Library, 1966.

were not at war, 350 men, women and children were gathered together in the market and were machine-gunned and piled together. Then the loud speakers of the terrorists of the Haganah, the Stern and the Irgun went around in Arab villages and called on the Arabs to leave their land, otherwise the fate of Deir-Yassin would be their fate. In his own words, Menachem Begin, the leader of the Herut, who is now a member of the Israeli Cabinet, simplified the Arab problem in Palestine by having the Arabs of Palestine flee under those ugly acts of terrorism.

94. What about Kaffer Kassem, which, by itself, is something very significant in the history of Palestine? At the time when the Israelis started their invasion of Egypt in 1956, about forty villagers were returning to their villages and their homes. They were mowed down by the so-called Israeli defence forces in Kaffer Kassem, a village on the border of Jordan and Israel. First of all, the crime was hidden under a cover. But later the news came out and the horrible massacre that took place became known to world public opinion. World public opinion was revolted at the actions in which citizens of Israel, Arabs of Israel, not Jews, were massacred in that dastardly manner. There was a mock trial of the officer who conducted that Nazi-like atrocity. He was, so to speak, put in jail, and then later he was freed.

95. Need I remind this Assembly of the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, the mediator for peace, on whose behalf the Security Council adopted two resolutions reminding the authorities in Israel of their crime and of their responsibility under the Charter? And yet one of the perpetrators of the crime later became a member of the Israeli Knesset.

96. Terrorism was unknown to the Middle East. Terrorism was unknown to the Arab world. The Arabs were never terrorists. The Arabs never committed any acts of terrorism against the Jews or the Israelis. But how did the Israelis start this whole establishment of theirs? What about the King David Hotel, which was blown up and in which about 150 innocent people were killed? What about the hanging of the British soldiers? What about all the massacres in Gaza, in Qalkilia, in Tiberia, in Kaffer Kassem and in all the other places, of which the records of the Security Council are filled with condemnations of Israel and of its trampling under foot of the General Armistice Agreements, of its having made a mockery of peace, of its having made arrogance its law, and of having made the law of the jungle the law by which it abides, while coming to the United Nations to say that "we are a law-abiding people"?

97. Mr. Eban dwelt a great deal on the terrorism coming from Syria. Time and again I explained in the Security Council that there were 1,300,000 Arab refugees whose right to their homeland in Palestine, whose right to their properties, whose right to go back to their homeland were upheld in nineteen solemn resolutions of the United Nations. Some of these refugees stand on this side and on that side. They see a Jew coming, from France, from Germany, from South America, from North America, from here or there, occupying their land, their gardens, their property; and if they go back in order to see their property or

to look at their houses, they are driven away: they are called criminals.

98. Neither Syria, the United Arab Republic, Lebanon, nor any other State had any right to prevent a people, whose right to its homeland has been upheld by the United Nations, from returning to that homeland—let alone the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, let alone all the condemnations by the Security Council of acts of terrorism perpetrated by the regular Israeli forces against the Arab refugees in deadly massacres.

99. Mr. Eban referred to complaints being brought against Syria in the Security Council. This is very fresh in our minds. I challenge Mr. Eban to go back to the latest records of the Security Council when the Council was looking into the Israeli complaint of terrorism emanating from Syria. What was the text of the resolution adopted? What did the authors of the resolution say in explaining that resolution? None of them insinuated in the slightest degree that Syria was to be condemned. There was no condemnation of Syria whatsoever; the records are there and the authors of the resolution who explained the latter made it very clear that they had no intention whatsoever of condemning Syria in any way.

100. Surely Mr. Eban must remember what happened on 14 July 1966 when the regular Israeli Air Force attacked a development site across the Armistice Demarcation Line, destroying a whole development project and killing eleven civilians, including women and children, with a napalm bomb, the same kind of napalm bomb given to them by the United States and used, and being used now, against the Arab civilians. Let the Red Cross investigate. What do they see in the hospitals of Jordan, of Syria, of the United Arab Republic? The victims of napalm used by the neo-Nazis of Israel.

101. What happened in the village of Es Samu in November 1966? Surely there was a very clear condemnation of the dastardly criminal attack by the Israelis on the churches, the mosques, the schools of the village, destroying them completely, when there was no soldier or military target in that area. Could it be that Mr. Eban is suffering a lapse of memory? That lapse of memory is only a stratagem, a tactic, to remind the people of what the Israelis wish to remind them of and to forget what they wish to be forgotten.

102. Mr. Eban dwelt considerably on the sacrifices of the Jews in the Second World War. But what about the sacrifices of the Arabs? What did the Arab Legion of Jordan do during the Second World War? Did it not protect that very same Palestine that became Israel afterwards? Did it not fight side by side with the Allies during the Second World War? Did not regiments from North Africa—Tunisians, Moroccans, Algerians—liberate the concentration camps of Europe, and were they not among the first to get the Jews out of those camps? A former Algerian Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Abdelkader Chanderli, was himself the leader of the regiment which entered a concentration camp and liberated that camp and its inmates.

103. Does Mr. Eban forget that in the First World War the great Arab Revolt took place against the central Powers, against the oppressors of the Arabs,

against Turkey? Did they not lead to the victory of the Allies, which victory led to the establishment of the British Mandate over Palestine? And this Mandate, in collusion with the Zionists of the world, opened the doors of Palestine to the Jews to become so powerful and to throw the Arabs out. In Syria alone, in the First World War, out of a population of 4 million, in the whole of Syria at that time—namely, from the Tauros Mountain and including Palestine—300,000 people died of hunger, not to mention those who died in the armies fighting at the side of the Allies.

104. And still we are reminded time and again of what the Jews suffered. But what did we do, we the Arabs, against the Jews? Did we persecute them? From time immemorial any student of history knows that when anti-Semitism in the Christian West—and I am a Christian Arab myself—was decreed by the churches to be a law of the church, the Jews in the Arab Moslem world found their renaissance. Musa Ben Maimoun, or Maimonides, need I remind the scholar, Mr. Eban, was the greatest authority in religious and theological thought of Judaism; he was an Arab Jew who lived among the Arabs. His famous book, Guide to the Perplexed, was written to the Arabs in the Arabic language, and I taught it myself. Just to mention one instance, need I remind the scholar that the first Hebrew grammar was written in the Arabic language? Need I remind him that while the Jews in recent times were being persecuted in Europe, they had their Ministers, their representatives, their Government officials, in all the Arab countries without exception—in Syria, in Iraq, in Egypt, in North Africa. And not only this, their business and finance were under their own control and nobody cared to bother them.

105. These are facts of life, facts of history. How can they be denied?

106. But what did the Arabs meet with at the hands of the Zionists and the Jews—I am sorry, I must say only the Zionists, because there is a great difference between the two, every one of my Arab colleagues has made that difference clear. Zionism is a distortion of Judaism. Judaism, with its prophets and its Bible, is a part of our own legacy that we respect.

107. Again, Mr. Eban felt obliged to speak of terrorism from Syria. Need I remind him of the three solemn resolutions adopted by the Security Council in 1951, 1956 and 1962 respectively, concerning specific attacks on Lake Tiberias when hundreds of civilians and soldiers were killed in darkness, for no fault of theirs, but so that the Israelis could exercise their lust for power? In one of those resolutions—specifically, that of 1956—it was stated that should Israel again commit those retaliatory attacks for no reason, then Chapter VII of the Charter would be invoked. What about those resolutions?

108. Mr. Eban referred to statements by Syrian leaders. This is a long story to go into, but my President, the Head of the Syrian State, quoted today in his address [1527th meeting] a statement made yesterday by Mr. Eban himself, reported in The New York Times, to the effect that if 121 Members of the United Nations vote in favour of a resolution that is not satisfactory to Israel, it will have no value what-

soever. Please refer to The New York Times and to the statement of Mr. Eban.

109. But I have another source. When this whole crisis started, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council his report of 19 May 1967. This is what he said:

"Intemperate and bellicose utterances, by other officials and non-officials, eagerly reported by the Press and radio, are unfortunately more or less routine on both sides of the lines in the Near East. In recent weeks, however, reports emanating from Israel have attributed to some high officials in that State statements so threatening as to be particularly inflammatory in the sense that they could only heighten emotions and thereby increase tensions on the other side of the lines."⁶

110. That is what was taking place in Israel. And in the weeks both before and after, I followed very closely the Jerusalem Post and most of the other papers from Israel that I could read. All Israeli leaders, including Mrs. Meir, who was sitting today with the Israeli delegation, were going from one town to the other in Israel and preaching, so to speak, a new crusade against Syria. Did they not threaten to occupy Damascus and throw out that régime which they do not like? This is very fresh; this happened in recent weeks.

111. Mr. Eban spoke about the diversion of the tributaries of the Jordan. I was really amazed, to say the least, for they had already diverted the Jordan river and submitted what was then the west bank of the Jordan and the refugees who were there to hunger and famine by that criminal act of diverting the tributaries of the Jordan waters. I have a big file on every Israeli leader, military, political or otherwise—and one can hardly differentiate between the military and the non-military—whom we heard in our own homes in Damascus and Beirut, in Jordan and the United Arab Republic. We were hearing: "If you Arabs attempt to divert the tributaries of the Jordan, we will prevent you by force from doing so."

112. But there is a simple fact about the matter: 70 per cent of the waters of the Jordan rise in Arab lands: in Lebanon, in Syria and in Jordan. And yet we are to be prevented from using the 70 per cent of the Jordan waters and must deliver them on a silver platter to the Israelis.

113. Mr. Eban, in closing his statement, spoke again, in his usual manner which has by now become routine, of peace. But what kind of peace is this? The peace of the invading forces that have occupied Arab territory four times the size of Israel? The peace of the invaders? The peace of Hitler occupying Czechoslovakia and asking for peace, having the Prime Minister of Great Britain negotiate a peace with him? The peace of Hitler occupying Poland and asking for peace? The peace of Hitler occupying France?

114. That is no peace; no one can be deceived by those words—above all, not the Arabs, nor anyone who is non-Arab. That is no peace.

115. For twenty years now, the Israelis have been speaking about peace whenever they attack and kill

⁶/ Ibid., document S/7896, para. 8.

and massacre, whenever they expel the Arabs, whenever they inflame the problem, whenever they create a crisis. They spoke of peace before 1956 and after 1956—after the invasion. They spoke of peace before 5 June and after what happened during the shameful week of 5-14 June. No one can be deceived by that talk of peace.

116. But we can never forget that Israel has been created by international monopolies, by the oil cartels of the world, by imperialist designs, in order to continue their pillage of Arab wealth and Arab resources. This is a fact which cannot be forgotten.

117. It certainly is no mere coincidence that this whole crisis, whose climax we are witnessing at the present time, started at the very time when we challenged the Iraq Petroleum Company regarding its faulty accounts with Syria, its cheating of Syria, when we also challenged the tap lines to come to the table and present their accounts. Thus we see that the oil monopolies and their hangers-on are behind this whole crisis. This is a fact which we can never

forget—that Israel is there to separate Arab-Asia from Arab-Africa.

118. As this crisis unfolds more and more, I am sure the Members of this Assembly will come to realize—if they do not realize already—that the aggressor in this particular case is Israel, which started the sneak, perfidious attack, on 5 June, in spite of its assurances to the contrary. The repercussions and the consequences of that attack are just beginning to be seen. We are bearing the brunt of the suffering, but the world community must come to realize that it is dealing now with a professional criminal who, for twenty years, has done nothing but commit crimes, one after the other; and, behind Israel, the United States to protect it with the Sixth Fleet and to give it napalm bombs and the latest-model tanks and so forth, with which it can kill Arabs. That is no bravery, and that is no peace. The world must realize—and will realize—as the discussions in this Assembly go on day after day, the ugly reality of the aggressor.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.