

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1529th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 21 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 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. Mr. BROWN (Secretary of State for Foreign  
Affairs of the United Kingdom): This emergency  
session of the General Assembly has met to dis-  
cuss very grave problems. We have to discuss with  
great urgency the problems which have been caused  
by the war in the Middle East.

2. We are dealing with political problems, but let  
us not forget that politics involve and are about  
human beings. We are concerned here with the fate  
of hundreds of thousands of ordinary men and women  
who have suffered from this war. This is more  
important than all the resolutions in the world.

3. All countries must bear a measure of responsi-  
bility for the problems that now beset us. Attempts  
have been made in the past to reach a settlement in  
the Middle East. But for a long time we have given  
up these attempts. For the last ten years there  
has been an uneasy calm broken at frequent inter-  
vals by frontier incidents and conflicts. We all hoped  
that the peace might be maintained by the United  
Nations Emergency Force. But we have been brought  
face to face with problems that we can no longer  
ignore, and this is the background against which our  
discussions have to take place.

4. What is the reason for this emergency session  
of the Assembly? Her Majesty's Government had  
some doubts whether it was right to bring out prob-  
lems before the Assembly while they were still being  
considered by the Security Council. But the plain  
fact was that we were prevented from making progress  
in the Security Council because of the threat of the  
veto. Therefore, we must hope that some real practi-  
cal results will emerge from this meeting of the  
Assembly. I suggest, therefore, that we need to  
concern ourselves here with practical problems.  
There are gathered here the representatives of  
most of the countries of the world, and the people  
of the world are waiting to see what we can do.  
We must not disappoint them. We must all remember

what happened in the last years of the League of  
Nations. We must do everything we can to ensure  
that the General Assembly of the United Nations  
does not follow the same road as did the League.

5. I must say, in all frankness, that we have been  
subjected here to an amazing amount of double  
talk.

6. I read very carefully the speech which Mr. Kosygin  
made on Monday [1526th meeting]. I was sorry that,  
because of parliamentary business in my own coun-  
try, I could not be here to listen to him. He made  
a number of specific charges against the United  
Kingdom. I heard them repeated yesterday and I  
want to answer them one by one.

7. First, Mr. Kosygin said, and I quote his words:

"Israel has enjoyed outside support from cer-  
tain imperialist circles... these powerful circles  
made statements and took practical actions which  
might have been interpreted by Israeli extremists  
... as direct encouragement to commit acts of  
aggression." [1526th meeting, para. 54.]

In this context he went on to refer to the movement  
of British naval and air forces to bring pressure  
to bear upon Arab States.

8. I notice that Mr. Kosygin did not say that there  
was direct participation by British forces in the  
fighting. He knows that this cannot possibly be true.  
He can verify—and no doubt has—the facts from his  
own sources. There were, after all, rather con-  
siderable Soviet naval forces in the Mediterranean  
at the very same time. Those who put around these  
falsehoods must have known, must now know, that  
they were and are totally untrue. Nevertheless,  
throughout the fighting, and since, they were repeated  
over and over again by Cairo Radio and by other  
radio stations all over the Middle East. I doubt if  
there is one person in this Hall today who accepts  
any of these allegations. We for our part have  
said that we would welcome investigation by the United  
Nations, and this offer still stands. We have taken  
an unprecedented step: we have placed the log books  
of our ships in the library of the House of Commons  
and they are there now for consultation by anybody  
who wishes to consult them.

9. Her Majesty's Government, and I myself es-  
pecially, deeply regret the damage which these false  
charges have done to our relations with our Arab  
friends. Now that they are seen to be without founda-  
tion, I hope that we can re-establish once again our  
friendly relationships with these Arab States.

10. I now turn to other charges which Mr. Kosygin  
made. He implied that we had caused delay in the

Security Council. He also suggested that by failing to give our assent to a decision prompted by the emergency we were promoting an aggressor. Once again, nothing could be further from the truth. If Mr. Kosygin will read the records of the Security Council for the weeks before the fighting took place, he will be reminded that the United Kingdom urged the Council to take action to avoid a crisis. The whole aim of our policy was to try to prevent an issue, which we knew to be highly inflammable, from developing into a war. If we could have got the support of the Soviet Union at that time, we might not now be faced with our present grave problems. Immediately after the outbreak of the fighting we were among the first to urge that the Council should call for an immediate cease-fire. It was not we who delayed that call until the second evening of the war.

11. As you see, there was much in Mr. Kosygin's speech with which I profoundly disagree. But I have not been seeking differences; I want to find some common ground with him. We certainly share his view that when questions of peace and war are involved no State could, should or can remain aloof. At the end of his speech Mr. Kosygin said:

"Much depends on the efforts of the big Powers. It would be good if their delegations...found a common language in order to reach decisions meeting the interests of peace in the Middle East and the interests of universal peace." [*Ibid.*, para. 81.]

12. That could be a very interesting and a very challenging statement. I should like Mr. Kosygin to tell us exactly what he means by that statement. I found it a little hard to understand. Would he tell me—or, better still, would he tell the Assembly—what he had in mind? I will set out in what I have to say this morning what I think should be done. Will Mr. Kosygin tell me, or the Assembly, whether he is prepared to discuss these same proposals with us?

13. May I turn to the British position. Before the fighting broke out I said in the British Parliament that, as a permanent member of the Security Council, we had a duty to support efforts to keep the peace everywhere. I made it clear that we, Her Majesty's Government, regarded the United Nations as primarily responsible for peace-keeping. I repeat here what I said there. We have had long-standing ties of friendship with all the Arab States of the Middle East, and also with Israel. If I may speak personally for a moment, I have for a long time felt a very deep concern for those countries. Our friendship with them has, I believe, been a great mutual value in the past. It is my desire to see it renewed and strengthened in the future; and I for one will work for that purpose.

14. The attitude of the British Government is clear. We want the area to be at peace. We recognize that peace demands the greatest measure of justice in its political arrangements. And on this foundation the progress of its peoples, especially of those whose need is greatest, must be based.

15. I should like, if I may, to set out certain principles which I believe should guide us in striving collectively for a lasting settlement. Clearly, such

principles must derive from the United Nations Charter. Article 2 of the Charter provides that

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State...".

Here the words "territorial integrity" have a direct bearing on the question of withdrawal, on which much has been said in previous speeches. I see no two ways about this; and I can state our position very clearly. In my view, it follows from the words in the Charter that war should not lead to territorial aggrandizement.

16. Reports suggest that one particular point may be of special urgency. This concerns Jerusalem. I call upon the State of Israel not to take any steps in relation to Jerusalem which would conflict with this principle. I say very solemnly to the Government of Israel that, if they purport to annex the Old City or legislate for its annexation, they will be taking a step which will isolate them not only from world opinion but will also lose them the support that they have.

17. Having made clear my stand on this issue, I go on to recognize that in all this both the Arabs and Israel have matters to raise which they are entitled to feel must be heard and must be treated with respect. And we in the international community also have our legitimate interests which must similarly be respected.

18. Firstly, there are the interests and welfare of the refugees. This very serious problem has been with us for a very long time. The problem has been made more difficult by what has happened in the last few weeks. We have fallen down so badly on this problem in the past that we cannot live with it any more. I shall have something more to say about this in a moment.

19. Secondly, any settlement must recognize the right of all States in the area to exist in true dignity and real freedom, and that must include the ability to earn their living in assured peace. I understood this to be the view of Mr. Kosygin, and I hope my understanding was correct.

20. Thirdly, there must be respect for the right of free and innocent passage through international waterways for the ships of all nations. There is, too, the immediate, practical problem of getting the Suez Canal cleared. Once this is done, this great international waterway must be reopened as soon as possible. This is of vital importance to very many countries represented in this Assembly.

21. Fourthly—and now I come to a critical point—if the countries of the Middle East are to live together in peace and develop their resources, they must be freed from the pressures which have driven them to waste their resources in an arms race. Obviously, no Government can resist those pressures if its neighbours are not doing the same. The problem imposes responsibilities not only on the Governments in the area but also on the Powers who are at present supplying arms. The latter, therefore—and, of course, that includes us—should reach an agreement on this

as soon as possible. Already new countries are coming into the business of supplying arms to the Middle East. It is imperative that an agreement on arms limitation should be concluded as soon as possible.

22. I come now to the immediate, practical things we can and must do. I shall say first, if I may, a word about humanitarian action, and shall then come to broader political action by the United Nations itself.

23. First, we must deal with the problem of displacement. The aftermath of war is always full of tragedy, and we have all been distressed by the suffering caused to those in the areas where fighting has taken place. I do not think anybody expects a final settlement to be reached during this Assembly. Such a final settlement is going to take time. But meanwhile our most urgent thoughts should be given to the populations which have suffered and are still suffering from the upheaval of war. It is imperative, if feelings are not to be further inflamed, or a settlement made still more remote, that the Arab communities whose lands have been overrun should be allowed to stay where they are, or to return if they have fled and wish to come back. We cannot allow these people to suffer further, and we cannot allow what has happened to them to result in a further escalation of the already intractable refugee problem. We must express this intention in any resolution we adopt.

24. But this will not be enough. We must in the meantime lose no time at all in bringing relief to those who have been driven out of their homes and who have suffered directly from the fighting. This problem has been tackled energetically by many voluntary relief agencies which are doing magnificent work.

25. The British Government has sent a major contribution to the relief programme administered by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [UNRWA]. By the end of this year we shall have contributed \$100 million, since 1950, to the UNRWA programme—14 per cent of the total of all governmental contributions. In particular, as a contribution to the present emergency, we are making a special grant to UNRWA of half a million dollars in addition to our normal contribution. We have also produced substantial relief in kind at very short notice, including badly needed blankets and medicines. We have told the Government of Jordan that we will make a grant to them of £500,000, to be spent on agreed rehabilitation and reconstruction work in Jordan.

26. I am not saying all this in order to boast or to say that we are better than anyone else. I am saying these things simply because they are the practical things which can be done now. If any Member of the United Nations has not yet done anything, it can start today.

27. But when we have done all we can to relieve suffering, it is still our main task in this Organization to keep the peace. There cannot be any greater issue for the United Nations. And this brings us to the main recommendation I want to make. I believe that the

Secretary-General should nominate a representative, whose standing should be unchallenged, to go at once to the area. This representative should have a proper staff and full facilities. He should advise the Secretary-General on the whole conduct of relations arising from the cease-fire and the subsequent keeping of the peace on the frontiers. His task would be both to report to the Secretary-General and to play an active part in relations with all the parties in the area itself.

28. The first task of the Secretary-General's representative would be to make recommendations, in consultation with the Chief of Staff, about the work of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. May I say here that the whole world community has every reason to feel and to express the sincerest admiration and gratitude for what the present UNTSO team has done under the leadership of General Odd Bull. General Bull has, in circumstances of the greatest danger and difficulty, conducted his operations with outstanding courage and efficiency.

29. It seems clear, however, that General Bull could do with urgent reinforcement of both men and material. I suggest that the Secretary-General should be authorized to recruit and dispatch at once any extra personnel General Bull may need. He will also need better communications, and the Government of Israel should allow him without delay to reoccupy the headquarters from which he was excluded during the fighting around Jerusalem.

30. This operation and its expansion should be conducted under the direction of the new representative to be appointed by the Secretary-General. But this operation deals only with the cease-fire and the arrangements which follow immediately from disengagement. There is the much bigger and more lasting problem of future peace-keeping in the area. It is clear that for this a new form of United Nations military presence will be necessary which will give reality to the preservation of peace in an area which may well be troubled for some time to come. One of the most urgent duties of the Secretary-General's representative should be to advise the United Nations on the form which a future United Nations presence should take. Needless to say, it should be set up in a form which sets out precisely the conditions under which it operates.

31. As I said earlier, the world looks to us now to do more than state principles and long-term objectives. My Government believes that the principles for a settlement which I have set out today will gain increasing acceptance and support. But that will not be enough. What everyone wishes to see, what everyone expects now, what is desperately required, is some immediate, positive, practical action. It is for that reason that we have to set our minds to the problem.

32. Whatever we achieve by way of statement of principles, it is by the action which follows our meeting here that we shall be judged. This is the purpose of the proposals I have made for more effective United Nations action for dealing with distress, for preventing conflict, for laying the foundations of a just settlement. We must move now to meet the desperate need.

33. Seldom has the United Nations faced such a crisis and such a challenge. Its whole future, on which we all depend, could turn on its ability to handle this situation. I speak as one who for all his political life has had faith, first in the League of Nations and subsequently in the United Nations. At this moment I confess to a desperate anxiety about the future. As I speak now in this emergency session, I feel that the future of the Organization in which we have put our trust is in peril. And I am compelled by the strength of my conviction—a conviction which is shared, I believe, by countless people in different countries around the world, a conviction that the longings of the world depend very much on what we now decide.

34. Some of us remember that we have walked this road before. We have seen once before in our lives the collapse of an international organization, the failure of an international ideal. But what is more, as we meet here we cannot forget that even in the last few days news has come of new dangers on a scale we can scarcely imagine and a new threat to human survival. These dangers and threats give new urgency to all we do here.

35. If we in the United Nations fail now, if we fail to meet this challenge, if we fail to act now, if we fail to take positive and practical action before we disperse, we shall put in peril all those who depend upon us.

36. I have tried to suggest the practical ways in which we might start to resolve the issues which face us in the Middle East. But if we fail to take the straightforward actions open to us, we must consider the consequences. I am not the only man in this Assembly—or, as I learned from the news this morning, outside of it—with children and grandchildren, daughters and grand-daughters.

37. If we fail in an area as dangerous as the Middle East, the chances of the world and of our children and grandchildren going up in a mushroom cloud must be enormous.

38. Mr. FAWZI (Assistant President for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic): The Assembly owes a debt of gratitude to the Government of the Soviet Union for its wise and timely initiative in requesting that this emergency special session be convened.

39. As we all recall, the Soviet Government in its letter dated 13 June 1967 stated that:

"Despite the Security Council's decisions concerning the cessation of hostilities between Israel and the Arab States, Israel is continuing its spiralling aggression. In flagrant defiance of the Security Council demands for a cease-fire adopted on 6, 7 and 9 June, Israel has seized further territories belonging to the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria.

"The Soviet Government considers it essential that the General Assembly, in accordance with Article 11 of the United Nations Charter, should consider the situation which has arisen and should adopt a decision designed to bring about the liquidation of the consequences of aggression and the immediate with-

drawal of Israel forces behind the armistice lines."  
[A/6717.]

40. A few Members, headed queerly but not surprisingly by the United States, took a negative attitude to this demand; but the fact that we have promptly convened here points out the solicitude of the vast majority among us dealing with this extremely dangerous and intolerable situation resulting from recent developments in the Middle East.

41. On 19 June 1967, the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union submitted a draft resolution [A/L.519] in this connexion proposing that the Assembly:

"1. Vigorously condemns Israel's aggressive activities and the continuing occupation by Israel of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, which constitutes an act of recognized aggression;

"2. Demands that Israel should immediately and unconditionally withdraw all its forces from the territory of those States to positions behind the armistice demarcation lines, as stipulated in the general armistice agreements, and should respect the status of the demilitarized zones, as prescribed in the armistice agreements;

"3. Demands also that Israel should make good in full and within the shortest possible period of time all the damage inflicted by its aggression on the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan and on their nationals, and should return to them all seized property and other material assets;

"4. Appeals to the Security Council to take for its part immediate effective measures in order to eliminate all consequences of the aggression committed by Israel."

42. This draft resolution, I hardly need say, is both just and constructive: it flows naturally and logically from the elements and requirements of the situation.

43. On the other hands, my delegation finds itself unable to agree to or to commend the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States [A/L.520], which gives expression to and shows further the unfair, unjust and unacceptable approach of the Government of the United States to this whole situation.

44. Once again, in less than eleven years, I come to this rostrum in the wake of my country's having been subjected again to multiple aggression and having once again lost control over parts of its territory, without, nevertheless, losing either its faith in good principles or its determination to defend itself and to stand by what it believes is right.

45. In 1956, Egypt was singled out for attack. In 1967, Syria and Jordan have been brought in. Who is next? Who is next in line? You? You? You? In Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Balkans and God knows where else. Who is next in line? In the Middle East, it is our very life which is threatened; if this goes on, I confess that no Arab Government, even if it wished to do so, would be able to stop explosion; the whole situation would get out of hand, with no holds barred; and the bluff of those, particularly in

the West, who say that they do not care would definitely be called. The Arab people would then be entitled to ask: why is it all right for others to despise our rights, trample on our dignity and disrupt our life, and all wrong for us to resist this foolishness and to combat these crimes?

46. Two days ago, the President of the United States on television, and Mr. Eban from this rostrum, told us, with invisible tears rolling down their visible cheeks, how foolish it was for Arab countries to spend a large part of their much-needed income on arms. Neither of them, however, bothered to give a thought, even for a single minute, to why that was so—if it was not because of the United States encouragement or sponsorship of Israeli aggression before and after 1956, culminating in the treachery of 5 June 1967.

47. Nor, of course, did President Johnson or Mr. Eban care or choose to remember the tarnished history of Israel in Arab lands, a history saturated and overflowing with aggression even—strangely enough—since before Israel was born. The names were different: Irgun, Haganah and all sorts of political Zionist terrorist organizations; but the crimes were the same; Dair Yassin, Tiberias, Haifa, Jaffa and Safd before 1948 as the prelude to Gaza; Khan Younis, Kibia, Houla, El Sammar; and, as late as 1967, Syria. This was followed in May and at the beginning of June of this year by military and other Israeli threats and provocations. The Arab countries, while trying to take the necessary precautions, exerted themselves to keep matters under control, taking in Sinai as well as elsewhere a posture of defence and not of attack. At the same time, as we assured the Secretary-General when he came to Cairo, and as he later mentioned in his report to the Security Council about his visit there, it was our firm policy not to take the offensive, nor did we spare any effort to avoid any eruption of the situation; and we have been in continuous consultations with many capitals in the world, including Washington, with the same objective in view. Yet, it is now common knowledge that, while the Security Council was discussing the situation, and while a Vice-president and a Deputy Prime Minister of my country were, upon agreement with Washington, on their way to Washington for a talk with President Johnson—while all that was being prepared or was going on, Israel let loose its treachery and launched its carefully planned aggression.

48. We shall have here in the coming days a long and arduous debate; and we know that debate is not, or must not be, an end in itself, that it must be a contribution towards establishing facts and deriving proper conclusions, a road leading us to truth and not away from it. May our endeavours, therefore, be well guided, lest we lose our bearings or unpardonably miss an irrevocable chance to do our duty in behalf of world peace. Even to those who look upon debate as a kind of sport, we can say: let us then be worthy sportmen and observe honestly the rules of the game, as well as the basic principles which form the foundation of our endeavours.

49. What are these principles to which I have just referred? We are sometimes led to wonder what they are—or rather what they are not. Do they say, for

example, with President Johnson, that the United States would be justified in imposing by force its point of view on a moot question like that of passage in the Gulf of Aquaba? Or do these principles still say, with the Charter, that we, the Members of the United Nations, have forsaken the use of force for solving differences? Do they say, again, that force is to be the arbiter, that aggression must be rewarded, that the aggressors must be pampered and, for good measure, allowed to keep the spoils of their treachery? And do these principles say that the victims of aggression must be punished, told to keep quiet about it, and resign themselves to their fate?

50. Do these principles tell us further that, even before coming to this hallowed Hall and before any discussion at all begins on a vital question like the one before us now, it is permissible that Mr. Eban allow himself to say, as the Jerusalem Post quoted him, that even if the General Assembly were to cast 121 votes to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the armistice lines, Israel would refuse to comply with that decision? If those principles do tell us that, why then is Mr. Eban, in particular, attending these meetings, and why are we all here in our hundred and twenty-one delegations? Why are we carrying on our deliberations in spite of Mr. Eban's having thrown the gauntlet at the Assembly's face?

51. Is that approach what we want? Is that what anybody else, in his senses, should want? The answer must clearly be "no". It must be that what we all, without exception, should want is peace and prosperity, a life full of hope and based on justice, a life permeated with honest respect for the rights of people.

52. Some told us, around breakfast time two days ago, that what they are aiming at is virtually the same. To them we say: Prove it. Prove it in deeds and show a clean hand—if you will, if you can; none would then be happier than we, for our own and our children's sake, for your own and your children's sake, for the sake of all the peoples of the world.

53. The Secretary-General has been nastily and repeatedly criticized by President Johnson, by some other Western leaders and by Mr. Eban for what they have termed his "hurried" action in relation to the withdrawal from the United Arab Republic of the United Nations Emergency Force. They have been taking this thoroughly unwarranted position against U Thant for obvious reasons, but he proved himself, yesterday and before, quite capable of defending his actions and truth. His critics have taken their position unjustly and mischievously—and they have not done anything at all, or even recommended anything at all, in order to deal with the misery, the debris and the mess brought about by the treachery, the results of which we are dealing with now.

54. May I refer in this connexion to a statement I made on 2 February 1957, in which I reiterated the position of my Government, and submitted that:

"... the entry, the stationing and the deployment of UNEF must be with the consent of the Egyptian Government as an indispensable prerequisite.

"The United Nations Emergency Force is in Egypt not as an occupation force, not as a replacement

for the invaders, not to resolve any question or to settle any problems, be that problem in relation to the Suez Canal, to Palestine or to freedom of passage in territorial waters. It is not there to infringe upon Egyptian sovereignty in any fashion or to any extent but, on the contrary, for the sole purpose of giving expression to the determination of the United Nations to put an end to the aggression committed against Egypt and securing the withdrawal of Israel behind the armistice demarcation line." [651st meeting, paras. 153-154.]

55. Near and during the time of this latest Israeli aggression, that which started on 5 June, the Sixth Fleet, bristling with evil and the foul-smelling CIA, was ominously poised, not near its usual haunts but right next to the Arab shores, where its presence had been resented, and near Arab ports to which its proposed visit had been rejected.

56. During the last few days, it has transpired still more clearly, and it has been reported even by several United States broadcasting stations and several United States newspapers, that the American ship Liberty—I wonder about the name—jammed the United Arab Republic radar in order to prevent the United Arab Republic from detecting the approach of Israeli planes and their conspiratorial surprise attack. The Israelis, therefore, were for once accurate when they said that the bombardment of that ship by some unaware forces of theirs was a mistake. Of course it was. Meanwhile, if Israel on a previous occasion was described as a bull in a China shop, the United Kingdom Government has been assuming the same role, trailing miserably behind and joining in with its American masters, big bull USA, and polluting, in its turn, the waters of the Mediterranean Sea.

57. As if what had already happened were not enough, Israel, true to form and style, committed a great variety and a great number of almost unbelievable atrocities in the territories it invaded. These included bombarding the Arish Hospital, the civil hospital and the ambulances; doing away with a great number of the wounded, both civilian and military; killing great numbers of civilian youths, especially in the Gaza Strip; bombarding towns with napalm bombs; leaving the wounded, both civilian and military, stranded in the desert to travel, on foot, long distances from Gaza to the Canal, approximately 250 miles, with no food or water, for days after the cease-fire, and stripping them of their clothes—acts which resulted in hundreds of them perishing—destroying all construction works and projects; looting all store houses, including those of relief works; taking even the milk stored for the children; killing all those who disobeyed order to make anti-Nasser denouncements; trying to block all aid offered by the Red Cross or the United Arab Republic to transport the wounded. These atrocities, among many others—I am not giving a full list—have been reported to the Red Cross and to the Secretary-General by the Government of the United Arab Republic.

58. These are but a few instances of what has been committed in Sinai and the Gaza Strip. Similar atrocities have also been committed against the population in Syria. The Israelis, moreover, have been engaging in an even more dangerous and criminal act, an act

which, if not stopped and redressed immediately, will affect the peace of the world, namely, the continuing expulsion of Arabs from Jerusalem and the western bank of the Jordan. Israel, of course, does this in line with its avowed policy of expansion and expulsion of the Arab people from their own land.

59. Such then is the trail of marauding Israel; such then are the ugly scenes. The crimes which resulted from these acts of vandalism are far below being dignified by calling them war. Whatever they may be called, they must be stopped, they must be irrevocably relegated to the past and never allowed to happen again. However, this can be done only if we, in this Assembly and beyond, base our action on the principles and decencies in which we firmly believe and on full regard for the purposes of the Charter and the dignity of man.

60. Please bear with me if I take a few more moments to recapitulate and sum up the position of my Government.

61. Firstly, on the statement of relevant facts, on principles and proper norms of good, civilized international behaviour and on our rights relating to our territorial waters—on all these basic matters, our position is fully supported by Governments representing more than two thirds of the population of the world.

62. This has been greatly reinforced by the statement which President de Gaulle honourably made this morning in which he unequivocally condemned Israel's having started the hostilities. What is now left for Mr. Eban except to throw at France the same bouquet that he threw at the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union after Mr. Kosygin came here and told us the truth?

63. Secondly, long before Israel launched its attack against us on 5 June, Israel and its co-conspirators had prepared their aggressive plans with absolute thoroughness. The blueprint was ready, the die was cast, and the finger of treachery was tight on the trigger. As the moment of infamy approached, Israel released a chain of calculated threats, of redeployment of armed forces, and a vicious crescendo of aggressive probings all around, several of which have already been condemned by the United Nations.

64. Thirdly, when on 5 June Israel exploded evil, we, as our representative, Mr. El Kony, told the Security Council in great detail, had not yet even completed our defensive precautions in Sinai. A similar condition prevailed in Syria and in Jordan.

65. Fourth, for years and years, well before President Johnson imparted to us his pious advice the day before yesterday—how I wish I could wear the same perfect expression of innocence as President Johnson—yes, many years before President Johnson spoke to us on television the other day, and even before President Johnson was President at all, we had started briskly, and activated with utmost determination, bold programmes of economic reconstruction, social progress and national rehabilitation. President Johnson may perhaps have heard of our High Dam, our agrarian reform, our new steel works and other industries, our much-improved Suez Canal, and our

great discoveries and production of petrol. We could have much more of that; we ardently want to. We could dedicate ourselves more completely to the improvement of our people's lot, and to a bigger contribution by us to world happiness and prosperity.

66. If only Mr. Johnson would "reason" more, as he loves to say; if only he would put an end once and for all to aiding and abetting Israel's insane ventures.

67. Mr. President and distinguished colleagues, as you all love your peoples, we love ours. As you all care, we care. As you are all aware of the madness of war, we are aware. And as you wish to work honourably for world peace and prosperity, we wish so to work.

68. Mr. KRAG (Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark): When, on the early morning of 5 June, Israel and the United Arab Republic took up arms against each other, it was the third time in the course of two decades that the ever-looming conflict in the Middle East erupted into open war. A new tragedy was added to the trials of the peoples of that area. Once again they had to sustain irreplaceable losses of human lives, and the economic and social progress of the countries in the region suffered a serious setback. Fortunately, the United Nations once more succeeded in bringing an end to open and large-scale hostilities, and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization is now again set for the tedious, difficult and sometimes dangerous task of supervising a fragile truce, a task which this unit has performed with distinction since 1949. These achievements by the United Nations certainly have been of extreme significance and most helpful in that they have brought an end to bloodshed and contained the dangers of the situation within certain limits.

69. However, these achievements have not been sufficient to bring about a stabilization of the situation in the Middle East or any solution to the political problems of that area, extremely complicated and fraught with emotions as they are.

70. In the face of this situation I think that two main considerations are called for. First, it must be accepted that the aim should be not to re-establish the unstable conditions existing before the outbreak of hostilities. The arrangements obtained until then clearly were ineffective and insufficient; they were never meant to be permanent, and they could not, without being amended, form the basis of a genuine peace and normalization in the area. Second, the United Nations consequently must contribute to laying the foundation for a lasting peace based upon just and equitable solutions which are acceptable to all concerned.

71. In doing so, I think we should have two basic principles in mind. Military action should not lead to territorial gains. This is the first principle. And the right of all Member countries to peaceful existence must be generally recognized. That is the second principle. These principles point to the necessity of withdrawal of troops and to the urgent solution of the political problems underlying the crisis in the Middle East.

72. For the working out and implementation of such a comprehensive solution, the matter will have to be referred to the Security Council which, according to the Charter, has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In this connexion, there could be contemplated a recommendation that the Council despatch a United Nations special representative to the capitals directly involved. One of the aims of the endeavours of the special representative should be to try to create an atmosphere in which the parties could conceivably be expected to be willing to embark upon discussions among themselves; directly, if they so wish, or within the framework of the United Nations.

73. I shall now in general terms outline the position of the Danish Government on some of the most outstanding problems in present relations between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States. There are today Israeli troops in positions on the territories of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. It should be kept in mind that the occupation of the territories in question resulted from a state of war, and there have been repeated assertions from parties to the conflict that there is in fact a state of belligerency between them. I therefore suggest that the problem of withdrawal cannot be envisaged as an isolated step. The problem of the withdrawal of troops is closely connected with some of the most burning and sensitive political problems, such as the final settlement of the borders in the area and the claim of Israel, and indeed of all States in the area, for the safeguarding of their territorial and political integrity.

74. In this connexion, I wish to emphasize that there is no link between the question of withdrawal of troops and the question of pointing out any of the parties as aggressor. The evidence produced before the Security Council and this Assembly offers no ground for an identification of the country which struck first, let alone the question whether any of the parties could be identified as an aggressor.

75. Turning to another major problem, I would like to point out that the State of Israel came into existence as a result of a resolution in the United Nations General Assembly, a resolution which, by the way, was supported, among others, by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As I stated previously, we cannot accept that any Member of the United Nations should base its foreign policy on the assumption of the non-existence of another Member State. For the Arab States to recognize Israel, de jure or even de facto, evidently would be a great concession, and such a step could certainly be envisaged only as part of a comprehensive arrangement based upon due consideration of the legitimate interests of all parties. What is needed is the fulfilment of the claim of all countries in the Middle East for the safeguarding of their political and territorial integrity. To this end, consideration could be given to arrangement of international guarantees, possibly in a United Nations context. If or when such an arrangement could be realized, it might also include provisions for halting the military build-up in the Middle East and thereby further reducing tension and promoting the economic development of the countries concerned.

76. There is one problem which, I am sure, is very close to the hearts of us all: that is the refugee problem. For years these unhappy people have been living in camps and, although much has been done to alleviate their misery, the very fact that they are not allowed to take up a normal existence is a shame to humanity. And now their numbers are increasing. This is, of course, first and foremost a humanitarian problem, but it has political overtones. I shall not elaborate upon these, but shall confine myself to recalling the sad fact that the political interests involved on both sides have contributed to complicate the problem to a point nearly beyond solution. I am afraid that nobody is today in a position to point out a practicable solution which would bring an end to the ordeal of these unfortunate people and which would, at the same time, be acceptable to all parties. Nevertheless, there should be no doubt that the refugee problem must take a very high priority in the negotiations which we hope will eventually come about.

77. One problem which has been highlighted on several occasions and which played a prominent role in the overture to the present crisis is the question of free passage through the international waterways in the area. This question is relevant, not only to the parties most directly concerned, but to all nations. With respect to the free passage through the international waterways in the area of the present crisis, recent events seem to indicate that durable solutions will be dependent upon firm guarantees.

78. Pending more lasting arrangements, I believe that the United Nations will be able to play a very useful role in the field by interposing United Nations observer teams between the forces of the parties. Further consideration should be given to the creation of genuinely demilitarized zones sufficient in depth to be effectively controlled. As to the practical modalities for such a United Nations effort, various possibilities could be contemplated. One would be to enlarge considerably the observer corps of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. Another would be the sending, with the consent of all the parties, of a new peace-keeping force to the area under terms of reference which would ensure the effective discharge of its functions in accordance with its purpose.

79. Peace is indivisible. It is therefore in the interest of all countries to remove the seeds of conflict in the Middle East. If the United Nations decides to send a peace-keeping force to the area with the consent of the parties, my country will be prepared to contribute with a contingent to such a force. And there are further problems. We must ensure the continued economic and social development of the countries in the Middle East and the welfare of their peoples. To this end Denmark will be prepared to contribute in money and in kind.

80. There will be no easy solutions to the problems before us and, if we do not approach them in the light of the political realities, I am afraid there will indeed be no solutions at all. The first and foremost responsibility of this Organization is to maintain international peace and security. It is a respon-

sibility for all Member States. But the greater the country, the greater the responsibility. Therefore, it is important that the big Powers take the lead in the search for realistic solutions. They can be found only if the parties, the great Powers, and indeed all Members of the United Nations, are prepared to play their proper role and take a constructive part in patient and concerted efforts with a view to comprehensive and well-balanced solutions, solutions which are equitable and just to all concerned. It is the principal responsibility of this Assembly to show the way towards such solutions.

81. Mr. SPILJAK (Prime Minister of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia:<sup>1/</sup> We have assembled under exceptional and very grave circumstances as a result of the aggression in the Near East, the repercussions and consequences of which are rightly causing concern to the whole world. The Yugoslav Government has concurred in the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly, believing that the United Nations, in keeping with its responsibilities, should take resolute action. I wish to recall that, in the statement of the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 5 June, the aggression was condemned emphatically, the United Nations was urged to take immediate steps with a view to putting an end to the aggression, and full support was pledged to the Arab peoples in their struggle for the protection of their independence and territorial integrity.

82. For the second time within a span of ten years, Israel has launched an armed attack against the United Arab Republic, extending it to Syria and Jordan. Israeli armed forces have occupied large parts of the territories of these States and inflicted heavy losses and great suffering on their populations.

83. The indispensable decision concerning a cease-fire was taken by the Security Council. Unfortunately, in spite of the efforts exerted by some of its members, it failed to condemn the aggression, let alone ensure the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli armed forces. It is precisely for this reason that we deem it to be the duty and responsibility of the General Assembly to contribute resolutely towards the achievement of this aim.

*Mr. Tinoco (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

84. The region of the Near East has constantly been an area of unrest, precisely owing to the fact that the Arab countries have been ceaselessly subjected to various pressures by those Powers which cannot reconcile themselves to the emancipation of Arab peoples from colonial and imperialist subjection. Obstacles are constantly being placed in the way of their legitimate efforts to develop in peace and independence and to utilize their natural resources for the material and cultural progress of their countries. By defending the positions and privileges acquired, on the whole, during the period of colonialism, some Powers are actually denying to the Arab

<sup>1/</sup> Mr. Spiljak spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

peoples the right to choose the form of government which they wish to have and the policies which they wish to pursue. A difficult and unequal struggle has been imposed upon the Arab countries, the main attack being directed against their independent and non-aligned foreign policy. Although in that part of the world peace can be promoted only on the basis of equality and full respect for the national sovereignty of these States, and thereby the legitimate economic interests of countries outside that area secured, the Arab countries have not yet been recognized by all as equal partners.

85. On their road to emancipation the Arab countries were exposed to pressures which culminated in the aggression that took place in 1956. Since then there has been interference, and pressure has been brought to bear upon the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries, with the aim of inducing them to change the orientation of their policies.

86. No wonder, therefore, that, under such conditions, no solutions have yet been found to the vital and urgent problems of this region, owing to constant attempts to solve the issues on the basis of the subjection of Arab peoples to foreign domination. It is a matter for regret that the policy of Israel has been incorporated into the framework of such attempts and goals. Although it may seek its security and prosperity in peace with its neighbours, Israel, by relying upon the forces opposed to Arab emancipation, has contributed by its policies to a further deepening and aggravation of the crisis in that region. And this has again led it to the path of aggression.

87. The Government of Israel has been refusing for years to implement a number of United Nations resolutions calling for the creation of conditions conducive to the consolidation of relations in that area. It has also prevented the activity of bodies provided for under the armistice agreements. Furthermore, Israel has turned a deaf ear to numerous resolutions concerning Arab refugees from the territory of Palestine, urging that those refugees should be given the opportunity to return to their homes or that they should be given compensation. Since 1948, more than a million persons have been compelled to live under extremely hard and humiliating conditions, driven from their homes and deprived of every possibility of returning to their homeland. Instead of trying to find ways and means of rendering this possible, another course was adopted.

88. Another blow has been struck against the neighbours of Israel for the purpose of creating room for the needs of the aggressor through the conquest of new territory and the simultaneous expulsion of their inhabitants. Can there be any illusion that such a situation is likely to provide a basis for peace and the settlement of relations between the Arabs and Israel?

89. The attack that was made was an expression of a comprehensive and deliberate policy. This is confirmed by statements made by responsible Israeli leaders who, after having said at the outset of hostilities that they had no territorial claims, immediately after the occupation of parts of Arab territories stated openly that they had come with the intention of staying there.

90. It is absurd, within the context of such a policy, to try to make the Secretary-General of the United Nations also responsible. The Secretary-General acted in conformity with the demand of the Government of the United Arab Republic, a demand based on the sovereign right to have the United Nations forces withdrawn from the territory where they were stationed exclusively with the consent of the host country. My Government wishes to reiterate, on this occasion also, its support of the efforts which the Secretary-General has exerted in the discharge of his difficult and responsible functions.

91. The attack against the territorial integrity of sovereign States Members of the United Nations and the conquest of their territories are aimed at re-drawing the frontiers in the Near East and extending one's own territory by means of military might. An attack has been made on the political integrity and freedom of Arab countries also in order to compel the Arab Governments either to accept a "diktat" or be removed from power.

92. In accomplishing his aims, the aggressor has resorted to ruthless violence against the Arab populations, a violence having the character of genocide, thus making his international responsibility even graver.

93. In attempting to justify this aggressive policy, its protagonists contend that what is involved is a kind of preventive war undertaken in self-defence. However, recent history teaches us that all aggressors have used this pretext. This cannot relieve anyone from the responsibility for launching and committing an armed attack. In the opinion of my Government—and I am confident that this is also true with the great majority of States—such theories are dangerous and utterly unacceptable. However difficult and complex individual disputes may be, recourse to armed force against another country cannot be justified at all. Attempts are being made here to show that the question as to who started the war—that is, who fired the first shot—is irrelevant. My delegation considers, however, that the very act of armed attack is precisely the unassailable criterion for ascertaining aggression and determining the responsibilities involved.

94. Yugoslavia is linked with the Arab countries by bonds of friendship and co-operation. We had maintained, until the recent events, normal relations with Israel, whose existence we have never questioned. Our position in this military conflict does not depend upon the state of relations with particular countries. It is not a matter of declaring oneself for or against this or that State. Yugoslavia is guided, above all, by considerations of principle. What is essential for us is the character of the policies pursued by the Governments.

95. By condemning aggression, Yugoslavia proceeds from the principle that, in international relations, one cannot tolerate the realization of territorial and other pretensions through the use of force, nor is it permissible to employ this expedient to impose political solutions violating the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States. Solutions founded on coercion cannot be sanctioned.

past experience with regard to acts of aggression proves that they are not even durable. In this case, too, such solutions would give rise to general indignation, hatred and resistance, which inevitably leads to new and more serious conflicts, and is fraught with danger to world peace. Have the lessons of the not-too-distant past been forgotten—namely, that yielding to aggression and acquiescing in a policy of fait accompli—merely encourages those responsible for the pursuit of such policies to new and even bolder actions, while the potential victims are frightened in advance of remaining isolated in the face of attack? Can we allow this to happen?

96. If the international community permitted such a course of development, it would undoubtedly have the gravest consequences for peace and the independence of a large number of countries.

97. For all these reasons, the Yugoslav Government considers that it is essential now to eliminate without delay the immediate consequences of the aggression. It is imperative to condemn the aggression and to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all the armed forces of the aggressor to the positions of 4 June.

98. Israel, as well as certain other quarters, are linking the withdrawal of armed forces with, and making it dependent on, negotiations involving the entire Arab-Israeli dispute, and even the whole of the Near East. The obvious intention is to dictate conditions to the victims of the aggression. Israel is going even further and is demanding negotiations with each Arab State separately, in order to split the front opposing the aggression and to realize its own designs more easily and fully.

99. Such attempts should be opposed most resolutely. The international community cannot allow a situation whereby, as a result of a unilateral recourse to force, the inflicting of a blow, and the conquest of a part of the territory of the country attacked, new positions would be gained for the purpose of imposing a "diktat".

100. There can be no negotiations prior to execution of the withdrawal, nor can there be any search for arrangements that would otherwise be necessary for the long-term stabilization of the situation in the Near East and securing of the independence and territorial integrity of the countries of that region, as long as the forces of the aggressor are not withdrawn from the occupied territory. Any other approach would actually be tantamount to a rewarding of the aggression and a sanctioning of attempts aimed at solving disputes among States by force.

101. We deem it indispensable also that Israel should be made to indemnify the countries victims of the aggression, which have suffered great losses and devastation. The obligation of indemnification stems from the responsibility of those who have committed aggression to offer just compensation to the victims of their attack.

102. We expect that the United Nations should also take it upon itself to co-ordinate actions for extending adequate assistance to the Arab inhabitants who were compelled to leave their homes owing to military operations and to persecution by the invading forces,

and to insist energetically, at the same time, that those people should be given the opportunity to return to their homelands.

103. We are not at all in doubt that the crisis in the Near East is a component part of wider international developments, which have been giving rise to serious concern during the past years. In international relations, particularly in some regions, tension, the use of force, and pressure on independent countries have been on the increase. The forces of imperialism, which see their interests, first and foremost, in maintaining and imposing relations of dependence and subjugation, are conducting a systematic action with an obvious tendency to eliminate Governments in individual countries and areas, and to suppress those political forces whose basic orientation is independence and non-alignment in international relations and democratic and socio-economic reforms on the internal plane.

104. The growing conviction that a new world war would result in total annihilation contributes towards the greatest powers endeavouring to avoid a mutual conflict. We can only welcome and support this for the sake of peace, progress and humaneness. This situation should encourage all countries to seek solutions to major international problems and, in particular, to contribute to a further promotion of the principles of peaceful co-existence and co-operation among States and peoples. However, it is obvious that the abuse of positive efforts to avoid a general war is constantly jeopardizing world peace.

105. It is in these circumstances that there is evolving the concept and practice of so-called local wars, which are directed towards the liquidation of the independence of individual countries. At the same time, the protagonists of local wars desire to appease and keep aside other countries, giving them assurances as to the so-called limited scope of their objectives, until they have squared accounts with the victim, whereupon such a situation is presented as a fait accompli. From Viet-Nam up to the latest crisis in the Near East, local wars have become even more frequent, all of them having a common denominator: subjection to foreign domination and attempts at imposing governments and policies to the liking of the attacker.

106. It is unacceptable to have the small countries live in a state of permanent fear for their independence and to witness blows being inflicted upon them in turn. It is more than ever necessary to oppose energetically such a trend in international relations, through the concerted efforts of all peace-loving forces. This is also the duty and responsibility of the entire international community and of the United Nations. The present confrontation with the aggression in the Near East constitutes undoubtedly a great challenge for all of us.

107. Although the situation is causing grave concern, there is no room either for faint-heartedness or for yielding to pressure. We are convinced that the international community can restrain and halt the protagonists of the policy of force and war. In this we see new possibilities and a need for concerted action by all independent States and the democratic public opinion of the world.

108. My country cannot, of course, reconcile itself to such developments, and those who are familiar with its history will understand our position and actions. The peoples of Yugoslavia were many a time compelled to defend their existence and independence at the cost of the greatest sacrifices. They are dedicated to peace and freedom and are on the side of peoples fighting for independence and for the right to develop according to their own wishes.

109. My delegation is firmly convinced that, in this grave situation once again, there shall prevail the determination of all peoples and the responsibility of all Governments to do their utmost in order to surmount the present crisis in the spirit of the principles which have brought us here and on which alone relations among countries enjoying equal rights can develop.

110. The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

111. Mr. EBAN (Israel): I should like to comment briefly on some of the observations that have been made by representatives in the course of this morning's debate. The main remarks that I wish to make refer to the address of the representative of the United Arab Republic.

112. The General Assembly witnessed an unusual spectacle this morning. The Government of the United Arab Republic, which announced its intention to exterminate Israel; which concentrated 90,000 troops and 900 tanks from that purpose; which issued operation order in mid-May to its commanders in the field for the bombardment of Israel's airfields; which imposed a total blockade of Israel's entire southern coast; which called on other Governments to join it in a war of extermination against Israel; which expressed confidence, in mid-May and early June, that Israel's end was near—that Government comes to this rostrum to present itself as a victim of aggression. It is a grotesque spectacle, the aggressor posing as the victim of aggression. The United Arab Republic is not the victim of aggression, but its primary author and architect.

113. Let us compare Mr. Fawzi's professions of peaceful intentions with the events of May and June of this year. For ten years there had existed in the relationships between Egypt and Israel a relative tranquillity based on the arrangements announced at this rostrum on 1 March 1957. There was to be an effective non-belligerency. A United Nations Emergency Force was to separate the parties in Sinai and Gaza. There was to be a cessation of raids into Israel from the Gaza Strip. Although no change had taken place in the basic juridical relationship between Egypt and Israel, many then hoped and some believed that a certain tranquillity might prevail.

114. Now, who was it that decided to disrupt that ten-year-old tranquillity? Who moved against the comparative stability that had existed for ten years and that, as far as Israel was concerned, could have continued to exist for a further period despite the weaknesses and fragilities of that relationship?

115. What happened was that in mid-May the Government of the United Arab Republic purposefully decided to disrupt, to dissolve and to destroy a system of relationships that had existed in comparative stability for ten years. And it was Mr. Fawzi's Government which made that decision. It was his Government which, in mid-May, brought about troop concentrations in what had until then been a relatively demilitarized Sinai. It was his Government which expelled the United Nations Emergency Force, not to assert its own sovereignty, which is legitimate but to facilitate an aggressive encirclement and assault. It was his Government which then closed an international waterway in violation of Israel's central interests and in defiance of the will of the international and maritime communities. And it was his Government which announced, time and time again between 14 May and 4 June, that the purpose of all these activities was to bring about the final round of warfare against Israel.

116. Why does Mr. Fawzi not believe the announcements of his President? Why does he not believe what his own President said so often in May and June: that it was then practical and necessary to concert the action of Arab Governments for the strangulation and the eventual extermination of Israel?

117. There is no war in history for which the responsibility of a Government is clearer than the responsibility of the United Arab Republic for this tragic war, the consequences of which the General Assembly is now examining.

118. I repeat: a purposeful decision was taken and implemented in mid-May and early June to bring about the violent disruption of the previous structure of relationships. In closing the international waterway, President Nasser revealed great frankness—a frankness which apparently emanated from self-confidence. He said, in effect—and I heard him say this with my own ears, over the radio network not far away—"I am closing this waterway because I am ready for war. And if Israel wants war," he went on, "welcome to war".

119. Since I last addressed this Assembly, there have come to our notice further operation orders, issued to Egyptian commanders in Sinai in May, which remove any doubts that might ever have lingered that what happened from 14 May until early in June was part of a plan and decision to bring about, first, the intimidation, and second, the blockade, and third, the encirclement, and finally, the destruction of Israel. I am not aware of any other instance in modern history in which the head of a State has declared that he was making war and in which such declarations have not been given full weight.

120. This is the central issue. A change took place in mid-May. Who inaugurated that change, who instigated it, and who was surprised by it—as I confess that Israel and most other members of the international community were surprised. There are Ministers for Foreign Affairs and others in this Hall who will recall the conversations that my colleagues and I had with them during those weeks in which we tried to explore why it was that this violent modification of the existing status quo was being undertaken

by the Government of Egypt. Now those who have disrupted the existing situation cannot possibly request or require that it be automatically reinstated; least of all can they do so when they accompany their request by statements which totally lack veracity. For example, the representative of the United Arab Republic asserted that the Red Cross representative had confirmed his wild stories about alleged actions and situations in Sinai. The fact of the matter is that the Red Cross authorities have refused to confirm those stories and have addressed to my Government an expression of satisfaction about the co-operation between the Government of Israel and the Red Cross in dealing with some of the humanitarian problems resulting from this war.

121. My Government will give close consideration to the other speeches made this morning, including that of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom. I should, however, like, not to add to what I have said on this point, but to clarify our position on a matter which figured prominently in the British Foreign Secretary's address. This concerns the position in Jerusalem on which my Government's policy has already been stated from this rostrum and also in our Parliament.

122. The division of that city brought about two results. First, it converted it into an arena of war. Gun emplacements in the Holy Places rained death

and destruction on Israeli citizens, institutions and streets.

123. Thus for the second time in twenty years Jordan committed the sacrilege of bombarding Jerusalem, and scores of our people met their deaths as a result of the installation of guns in the Holy Places. That, then, was the first result of the division.

124. Second, it was during the division of the City that, under the Jordanian régime, free access to the Holy Places of all the religions was not assured. Jordan is the only Government in recorded history which, since its annexation of the Holy City in 1948, has done these two things: made Jerusalem a battlefield and denied universal access to the Holy Places to all religions.

125. All I shall say is that our policy is the preservation of the unity of Jerusalem, the elevation of its material and cultural life, free access to the Holy Places to all faiths and perfect respect for religious interests.

126. The statements made by my Prime Minister in our Parliament and by myself at this rostrum are to be interpreted in the light of these objectives which I am sure will command much support throughout the international community.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*