

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Official Records



**1537th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 27 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) . . .* 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. BALAFREJ (Minister, Personal Representa-
tive of H. M. the King of Morocco) (translated from
French): When the United Nations was set up at
the end of the Second World War, the international
community was entirely right in thinking that a new
era in international relations, full of promise and hope,
was opening before it.

2. The great Powers, whose conflict of interests
was the prime source of major international disputes,
reconsidered the approach they would henceforward
take to the problems which concerned them. All
other countries, and in particular all the States which
achieved national sovereignty after the creation of the
United Nations, regarded the United Nations Charter
as the best safeguard of their sovereignty, their
territorial integrity and their vital interests.

3. A new method emerged for the first time, a way
of diminishing, if not making away with, antagonisms.
Dialogue, negotiation replaced recourse to force in the
settlement of international problems. Certainly on a
great many occasions, and sometimes in crises which
greatly endangered peace, the United Nations was able
to give effect to Charter provisions which condemn
arbitrary action, the law of the jungle and the use of
force.

4. In the course of the past twenty years, peace has
been preserved many a time thanks to direct action
by the United Nations. Nevertheless, the United Nations
did not solve some of the conflicts with which it has
had to deal in a manner that was entirely just or
designed to remove the underlying causes of the
crisis. The creation of Israel in 1948, for example,
by despoiling Arab lands and expelling the Arab
population, was a very serious infringement of the
United Nations principles and a blow to its prestige.

5. That injustice, that blow to the authority of the
United Nations, could not but lead to a crisis—a crisis
which has been nineteen years a-brewing and which

early this month gave rise to the situation the Assembly
is examining today.

6. Since 1948, not a year has passed but the question
of Palestine was considered, from one angle or another,
by some United Nations organ. The debates in the
General Assembly and the Security Council were
often followed up by resolutions. Those resolutions
have still not been implemented. Created in violation
of international law and of the most obvious principles
of justice, Israel has ever since ignored the decisions
taken by the United Nations. Worse still, on several
occasions it consistently and deliberately resorted to
force to carry out its expansionist designs, occupy new
territories, and expel hundreds of thousands of people
from their native land.

7. This policy of Israel's was aimed at an objective
which we have denounced from the first, and which
was the construction of a State founded on Zionist
ideology. The United Nations has condemned this
policy time and time again; but Israel has never paid
it the slightest heed.

8. The General Assembly will recall the aggression
Israel committed in 1956 with the support of Powers
which do not belong to the region. Despite the strong
and sound reaction of world opinion and the clearly
worded resolutions of the United Nations, Israel
derived large territorial gains from that aggression
which strengthened its potential for still more aggres-
sion and once again occasioned the expulsion of the
population of the conquered lands.

9. Since 1956, still in pursuit of the same policy and
in total disregard of existing resolutions and conven-
tions backed by the full authority of the United Nations,
Israel multiplied its raids and attacks on Syria and
Jordan. In the past few months alone, the Security
Council has unequivocally condemned Israel for its
attacks on these two countries. A rapid review of
Israel's conduct and of its systematic treatment of
the Arab countries will clearly show anyone who still
needs to be convinced that Israel represents a real
threat to its neighbours and to peace in the Middle
East.

10. Some speakers have claimed that the present
crisis stems from the request made by the Government
of the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the
United Nations Emergency Force from its territory
and its decision to deny the right of passage through
the Gulf of Aqaba to the vessels of Israel and of those
who are helping Israel to strengthen its potential for
aggression. But we all know that when the Assembly
decided to station United Nations troops in the
territory of the United Arab Republic and of Israel,
it was Israel which ignored the Assembly's resolution

and, invoking its sovereignty, refused to allow those troops to be stationed in its territory.

11. Unable to station its forces in the region in pursuance of a resolution which Israel flouted, the United Nations had had to station its troops only in the territory of the United Arab Republic, under an arrangement which that country was free to terminate at any time.

12. The United Arab Republic's request that those troops should be withdrawn was therefore entirely legal and legitimate, and the Secretary-General's response to it was fully justified. We firmly deny the validity of the attacks to which he has been subjected, particularly by those who had refused to permit the United Nations to bring any troops into their territory.

13. We believe, moreover, that the action taken by the United Arab Republic with regard to the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba was fully within its sovereign rights.

14. Of course, in some cases a country may of its own free will, in a context of good-neighbourly relations and mutually beneficial co-operation, conclude an agreement granting freedom of navigation in its territorial waters; but, in the case of Israel, the decision taken by the United Arab Republic denies that privilege to a State which represents a threat both to it and to its Arab neighbours. Moreover, the port of Elath, in order to have access to which Israel needed this freedom of navigation, was occupied by it subsequent to and in violation of the Armistice Agreements. Since Israel itself brought about this situation by flagrantly violating the Agreements, what legal grounds can it invoke today for this demand?

15. In the course of the present debate we have learned from statements whose authority cannot be challenged that, prior to Israel's aggression, there had been some communication with the United Arab Republic which had clearly indicated that a constructive discussion of the problem was a distinct possibility. The Secretary-General himself, upon returning from Cairo, had told the Security Council that he hoped that a constructive solution would be possible in a not too distant future. Unfortunately, the surprise attack by Israel in the morning of 5 June created a new situation, the evolution of which has shown once again that Israel's true aim is to conquer and occupy more territory and to expel the Arab population to make room for international Zionist immigration. Moreover, the means used in launching the aggression, the brutality of the military operations, the hatred and hostility towards the civilian population, and the military administration of the occupied territories all show that Israel had laid its plans carefully and executed them in disregard of all legal and humanitarian considerations.

16. Withdrawal of the United Nations Force and passage through the Gulf of Aqaba were in fact mere pretexts for putting into execution a plan whose aims are now clear.

17. From the very first days of Israel's existence until the eve of the crisis, no one in Israel made any secret of the frontiers which Israel wanted to have and which, thanks to its recent aggression, it has today.

18. Moreover, the behaviour of the Israel troops, as described today by a Press that can hardly be suspected of favouring the Arabs, the expulsion of the local inhabitants, the destruction of property, the vandalism that is being practiced in the occupied territories, the administration of those territories by military governors all show that Israel, in this third phase of its history, is seeking to attain previously set objectives, namely, the formation of a State with an increasingly large territory from which all minorities would be expelled by force.

19. The treatment thus meted out to the Arab population has called forth a world-wide reaction. All humanitarian institutions, all effective organizations and many Governments have made known the measures they have taken to help the people who have been driven from their homes to meet their immediate needs. But these needs are so great and the means of aid thus far considered are so modest that we seriously doubt whether the suffering and distress of these innocent people can be alleviated, even for the time being.

20. Seeing that the maintenance of a million and a half refugees for eighteen years has been a major cause of tension in the region, it seems to us only logical, although painful, to assume that the existence of hundreds of thousands of new refugees is bound to complicate the problem still further.

21. We welcome all the humanitarian action that has been undertaken, for it is certainly extremely useful, but we must say in all sincerity that, however generous, such action can offer no solution to the population expulsion problem, either in the immediate or in the more distant future.

22. We should like to make plain, not only from the humanitarian, but from the legal and political angle, the seriousness of the situation which this occupation, itself the result of naked aggression, has brought about. We cannot conceive of its going unpunished, even as we cannot conceive of Israel's remaining in these territories any longer. The present situation has been created in violation of all rules of international law and it is an insolent challenge to world opinion and to this international Organization.

23. The condemnation of Israel and the decision that its troops must be withdrawn should not, in our view, signify any sympathy with the Arab countries or hostility towards Israel. They must be an expression of the United Nations' determination to enforce respect for the Charter and safeguard its own dignity, and a discharge of its responsibility for world peace. If the Assembly failed to take such a decision and allowed Israel's action to go unpunished it would be flagrantly rewarding aggression; that would mean an abdication on the part of the United Nations which would open the door to chaos and the law of the jungle in international relations. We would then have a precedent of incalculable import for the future of those relations.

24. Whereas the great Powers may now be safe from aggression by each other because of a certain balance of forces between them and because of their sincere desire to settle their disputes by negotiation, the small Powers would certainly be the first to suffer

if the General Assembly were to take a negative attitude towards the present situation. For if the Charter were to be flouted with impunity, there would be every reason to believe that any country which in the future thought itself in a position to attempt aggression would chance it, and would occupy foreign territory in the assurance that no authority in the world could stop it.

25. We should then be back in the old situation where might was right and where international relations were dominated and regulated by the will of the strongest.

26. We accordingly request the General Assembly to use its full moral weight in condemning the aggression and calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israel troops to the positions specified in the Armistice Agreements, for we are convinced that there is no other way to restore peace in the region and to offer some prospect of settling the problems by which the Middle East has been plagued for twenty years. If the United Nations did not unhesitatingly exercise its authority in order to make itself respected, it would forfeit the confidence of the peoples which cherish justice and peace.

27. My Government wishes particularly to inform the General Assembly of its deep anxiety and concern with regard to yet another issue—the protection of the Holy Places in Jerusalem which, unfortunately, it appears have already been profaned. No Moslem in the world could agree to Israel's carrying out its plan of annexing the Holy Places. Hundreds of millions of Moslems throughout the world share our concern, and we should like solemnly to draw the attention of international opinion and of the United Nations to the very serious consequences which would be bound to follow if Israel failed to take this consideration into account.

28. Both in its present configuration and in its future prospects, the situation created by Israel's aggression in the Middle East is fraught with threats to the peace. We know that the first days of that aggression brought us to the brink of the abyss. The fact that Israel persists in its aggression and has occupied vast Arab territories creates conditions in the Middle East which can lead to another explosion at any moment. Who among us can say with confidence that this state of affairs, if maintained, may not at any instant provoke another crisis, and this time one threatening the entire world?

29. Whether the United Nations will retain such trust as it still enjoys depends on the decisions which the General Assembly will soon have to take.

30. Mr. PACHACHI (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq): We are meeting at a time when the Organization is facing one of the most momentous tests it has ever faced: a challenge which far transcends the present crisis. Fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter are in serious jeopardy. If the General Assembly today were to shirk its responsibility and condone a clear act of aggression, or pass over in silence the open attempt to achieve territorial acquisitions at the expense of Member States, then surely the United Nations would follow the League of Nations into oblivion. For was it not the failure of the League

to deal with precisely the same kind of armed aggression and territorial aggrandizement that led to its disintegration? What is the situation we have before us? Is there any doubt in anybody's mind that a premeditated aggression has been committed against the Arab States?

31. The scale and power of the Israeli attack could not possibly be considered as a spontaneous act of self-defence. The element of surprise, which was necessary for military success, could hardly have been achieved if the United Arab Republic was on the verge of attacking Israel, as is falsely alleged by Israel and its apologists. There can be no room for doubt, therefore, that this attack was the end product of a carefully drawn-up plan of aggression, whose implementation was merely waiting for what was considered to be a congenial international climate. Such a climate was, of course, created by the exaggerated and largely artificial reaction of some Western Powers, principally the United States and Great Britain, to President Nasser's legitimate move in reasserting the sovereign rights of his country over the centuries-old Arab waters of the Strait of Tiran.

32. That Israel launched the attack first is admitted by Israel itself. Not only is the attack admitted, but it has become a theme for self-congratulation and glorification. Official Press conferences are held by the Israeli authorities to describe in detail the types of planes used, the routes they followed, the targets they selected. The Press of many Western countries abound with news commentaries and photographs extolling Israel's achievements and exploits, and scarcely hiding the perverse and malicious pleasure felt at the new tragedy that has befallen the people of Palestine.

33. What can the meaning of all this be? Perhaps in due course some introspective and compassionate minds in the West might invest some time in soul-searching to analyse this curious phenomenon of Western, almost tribal, jubilation at Arab agony. Can it be that the temporary triumph of Zionist arms offers emotional compensation to some sections of the Western public for the post-World War II retreat of Western colonialism before the advancing tide of Afro-Asian nationalism? Indeed, can we forget that Zionism is in fact chronologically the last wave of European demographic displacement at the expense of an Afro-Asian people?

34. But to go back to Israel's surprise attack, it must be clear by now that it was not an isolated act of war. It was in fact the axis of the whole Zionist strategy. Everything else in Israel's plans of territorial expansion hinged on this surprise attack. Israeli war plans revolved entirely around this one single concept of treachery and surprise. The conquest of the West Bank of Jordan, the devastation of the refugee camps, the second exodus of Palestinian Arabs, no less than the much-vaunted superiority over the Arab ground forces, deprived of air cover—all these things stemmed from this one treacherous attack.

35. But a most serious and urgent challenge faces the General Assembly as a result of Israel's efforts to solidify the consequences of its aggression in the

hope of permanently annexing the territories it has occupied, and to use that occupation as a bargaining leverage for securing political advantages, whether territorial or not. All this has serious and ominous implications for the United Nations, and, indeed, for the civilized international order which the Charter seeks to establish. No State will be immune from attack and from mutilation of its national territory.

36. There are so many territorial disputes among States that I shudder to think of what a state of anarchy there would be in the world if the example of Israel were followed and force were employed in order to settle disputes and gain political or territorial advantages. The General Assembly is therefore duty bound to put an end to Israel's attempts to prolong and consolidate its occupation of Arab territories. We are heartened by the fact that speaker after speaker, from this rostrum, has denounced Israel's territorial ambitions and demanded the withdrawal of its troops from the occupied areas.

37. I should like to say at this juncture to the overwhelming majority of Asian and African States, as well as to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries: Thank you. Thank you from the bottom of our hearts for the stand you have taken, not in support of the Arabs, but in support of justice and international ethics. Our people shall never forget the hand of friendship extended to them in this grave hour of our history.

38. Hundreds of thousands of human beings are today living on the hope that the United Nations will save them from the racist tyranny which has cast such a dark shadow over their lives, a tyranny made more monstrous by the unlimited support it has received from one of the great Powers. We are firmly convinced that had it not been for the constant support of the United States Government, Israel would never have dared to shatter the peace of the Middle East, and indeed of the world, in this blatant manner. There can be no doubt that Israel was provided with massive military aid in the days or weeks immediately preceding its long-planned and well-prepared act of aggression. It is now clearly established that Israel was given all the intelligence data it needed as well as valuable assistance of a technical nature before and during the fighting. Can this leave any doubt that the Arab States were deliberately misled in the days preceding the outbreak of hostilities, while Israel was completing its military preparations? It is difficult, if not impossible, for us to believe that Israel would have embarked on its reckless venture if the United States Government were really serious in its opposition thereto. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that Israel was confident of the support of the United States Government. Israel, as we all know, has available to it means which enable it to know with considerable accuracy what attitude the United States Government would likely take. But this time Israel made sure not to repeat the disastrous miscalculation of 1956. If, as it is often alleged, the United States Government was really surprised by the Israeli attack of 5 June, or if the attack was made despite its warning, why then does the United States refuse to admit to this very day that Israel was responsible for the initiation of hostilities? They must

have known this for a fact; their ships anchored in the Eastern Mediterranean must have told them the truth—that is, if they had not known it before.

39. The full implications of the attitude of the United States Government to the Israeli aggression are not confined to their alleged ignorance of who the aggressor was. A corollary of this United States silence on Israeli aggression is more than implicit United States endorsement of the territorial and demographic results of this aggression, as exemplified by the silence in the United States draft resolution [A/L.520] on the subject of the return to the status quo ante. Why alone among the great Powers has the United States Government said nothing about the necessity of withdrawing Israeli troops from Arab territories? Why alone among the great Powers did it not declare that no territorial annexation shall be permitted? This impression of endorsement of the fruits of aggression is reinforced by the recently announced authorization of financial assistance to Israel. The choice of this time to make the announcement cannot be accidental. The United States Government cannot really persuasively argue that this grant to Israel at this time is actually to pressure it in the direction of disgorging the loot of war.

40. But all this, in our opinion, is fraught with serious dangers for world peace. The outlook for humanity would be gloomy indeed if the act of surprise attack were so irresponsibly ignored—nay, condoned. This issue of surprise attack, as is well known, is directly connected with the precarious nuclear balance, a balance rendered all the more precarious by the possibility of proliferation. Surprise attack must be recognized for what it is: the greatest single threat to the survival of humanity. The practitioners of this dangerous art must not be allowed to gamble with the fate of humanity. They must not be allowed to hide behind such sophisticated terms as "preventive" and "pre-emptive" wars. Both of these terms must be struck from the political glossary of the second half of the twentieth century. Such concepts cannot co-exist with the Charter. They are concepts with which our world simply cannot afford to live.

41. If silence on the Israeli surprise attack is one of the coin on the attitude of the United States Government, the other side of the coin is the apparent endorsement of the territorial and demographic results of this aggression. The two sides are, of course, inextricably connected, the one following from the other.

42. But Mr. Eban accuses the Soviet Union of lack of objectivity in these matters. I wonder how high or low he rates the United States on his scale of objectivity. How does the agitated reaction of the United States to the return of Egyptian forces to Egyptian soil at Sharm El Sheikh compare in terms of objectivity with the bland American composure about the events since 5 June?

43. The phrasing of the American draft resolution and its silence as to the status quo ante bellum lend themselves to the interpretation that the United States is not really against territorial aggrandizement per se—not even in the wake of surprise attack—that it condones the use of territorial aggrandizement as a

means of establishing a maximal bargaining position to enable the aggressor to achieve its political and territorial objectives. This is an open recipe for aggression to all nations great and small who have either claims or designs on their neighbours.

44. In the Palestine context, however, the reference in the United States draft resolution to the "political independence and territorial integrity of all countries in the area, encompassing recognized boundaries and other arrangements..." does not strictly preclude the expansion of Israel beyond the pre-invasion armistice lines, and would therefore seem to be a reflection of this dangerously hazy position of the United States on territorial aggrandizement. As to the reference in the United States draft resolution to "a just and equitable solution of the refugee problem...", this is, in effect, tantamount to the scuttling of the United Nations moral commitment, affirmed repeatedly over the years, regarding the repatriation and compensation of the Palestine refugees in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly.

45. Is there any wonder that our people have given up all hope that the United States will ever act responsibly, let alone impartially, on the question of Palestine? Our people are now convinced more than ever that the United States Government will always use its vast power to serve the aims of Israeli aggression against our people. Why? Why has the United States Government chosen this path of implacable hostility to the Arab nation? Surely it is not just to curry favour with certain pressure groups in this country, as is sometimes suggested in certain quarters. The attitude of the United States Government has unfortunately confirmed our worst suspicions. It now seems the established policy of this Government that Israel shall be their trusted instrument to further American interests and ambitions in the Arab world.

46. They ask us to disarm; but if this war has proved anything, it has shown how fatal it is to depend on the assurances of the United States Government. On the other hand, the possession by Israel of such military superiority and limitless facilities has shown us how vulnerable and how dangerously inadequate have been our defence preparations.

47. The Arab people are not prepared to be forever at the mercy of the United States Government and its chosen instrument. Arab-American, and indeed Arab-Western, relations stand at a cross-road. Every act and pronouncement of the United States on this crisis will add its cumulative effect to the legacy left by the events of the last few weeks. On the quality and nature of this legacy will depend the future of the Arab-Orient, and probably of the world. Arab disillusionment with American official policy is deep, bitter and unqualified—but not their faith in the eventual fairmindedness of the American people. They know that for several reasons, not the least of which is the failure of their own efforts, the American people have been virtually brainwashed by Zionist propaganda. But they also believe that this is such an abnormal state of affairs that a great nation like the United States is bound one day, if not in response to moral imperatives at least in enlightened self-

interest, to resume the dialogue with the Arab peoples of the Mediterranean, a dialogue started by the great American philanthropists and educationists of the nineteenth century.

48. I should like now to say a few words about the policy of terror and intimidation which Israel is pursuing at present in the occupied territories. The aim of this policy is to expel the largest number of people from their homes while this debate goes on. His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan has already referred to this problem in his eloquent and moving speech of yesterday [1536th meeting].

49. The policy of Israel is substantially the same as that pursued with such success in 1948. Only now the Israelis do not dare to repeat the Big Lie of 1948, that the Arab leaders ordered the refugees to leave. The refugees in 1948, as in 1967, were the victims of the same Zionist policy whose objective is to drain Palestine of its Arab population. The same tactics which were so brutally effective in 1948 have been resorted to in 1967: massive violence against chosen civilian targets; cunning psychological warfare to exploit the fear produced by that massive violence; and finally, limited violence to keep the trek of refugees in motion.

50. While the tactics have remained the same, the means used have been improved in the case of the application of massive violence. Whereas in 1948 the principal means of attacking civilian communities was the extensive use of mines in market places and mortar and machine-gun attacks against villages, expulsion through massive violence in 1967 has taken the form of concentrated napalm and incendiary bombing, particularly of the frontier villages. Psychological warfare has taken the same form: loud speakers urging the people to flee certain destruction. In Bethlehem, when this trick failed, the Israelis asked the inhabitants to stay indoors but to put pieces of wet cloth on their noses. The implication was obvious: gas would be used. Fortunately, this trick also failed.

51. Another old Zionist means of persuasion is to select people from the streets and put them in trucks to tour the Jewish areas, where they are exposed to insults and stone throwing. The object of this exercise is thoroughly to demoralize the passengers who, it is hoped, would upon their return to their Arab quarters spread panic and defeatism. This treatment was given to the inhabitants of the YMCA Hotel in Jerusalem. The more limited violence takes the form of shooting overhead and beating up, and occasionally shooting, the prouder members of the groups in question. In 1948 this ensured that the refugee stream was kept in motion in the desired direction. In 1967 the variation has been the intermittent strafing of refugee columns. This has occurred most frequently in the Jordan Valley.

52. Two other new tactics have appeared in 1967. One is the prompt use of bulldozers to remove all traces of previous habitation in certain areas immediately after expulsion. In the Moroccan quarter of Old Jerusalem about 300 families were given three hours' notice to quit their homes. Punctually at the end of the three hours, bulldozers tore down their

ancestral homes before their eyes, with all the household and personal effects that they were unable to remove. This quarter contained centuries-old houses, sanctuaries and tombs. Whole villages in the Latrun area have similarly been entirely razed to the ground. The advantage of this bulldozing technique is that the objective of a possible return of the refugee to his home is altogether removed and with it, it is hoped, his incentive ever to return. In this way the bulldozed area is de-Arabized permanently.

53. Another tactic used is economic and food pressure. This is being used particularly to soften up Arab Jerusalem. The cornerstone of the policy is long curfew hours. In Arab Jerusalem these hours were from 3 p.m. until 9 p.m. With all public means of transport at a standstill, there was no time for food to reach the city from the countryside. Shortage is compounded by the systematic Israeli policy of looting the Arab shops in Jerusalem. About 75 per cent of these shops and warehouses are estimated to have been looted. The contents were taken away in Israeli army lorries to Jewish Jerusalem. The length of the curfew and the general disruption of life bears most heavily on the poorer classes who have no savings to fall back on.

54. The food commodity scarcity produces a price spiral. In spite of Zionist propaganda in the Western Press, no food or milk has been distributed by the Israeli authorities to Arab Jerusalem, certainly not more than a handful of loaves and milk bottles—enough for taking a photograph or two. At the same time, the Israeli authorities prevent organized communal relief. The Christian Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem a man of eighty, who tried to organize communal relief, was hastily warned to desist from such activities.

55. The result of all this is that people are threatened with starvation; and under this threat, in combination with the other factors, the refugee ranks continue to swell.

56. Yesterday [1536th meeting] Mr. Eban denied that Israel has committed any act of aggression and claimed, on the contrary, that since its establishment it has always been on the defensive. This brings me to a fundamental question: What is the reason for the Arabs' enduring hostility to Israel? This is a question which must have vexed many a mind in this Assembly, especially those who have convinced themselves that peace depends on the total submission of the Arabs to Israel's demands. I must take a few moments of the time of this Assembly to tell its Members why our conflict with Zionism is unlike anything that they have experienced.

57. This conflict arose because European Jews calling themselves Zionists planned to establish a state in a country overwhelmingly Arab in population, in land ownership, in language, and in culture. The Zionist intent to establish a state in a country already inhabited by another people is the seed and fountain-head of all the tribulations that have afflicted the Holy Land. Such an intent was bound to be opposed by the Arabs. What nation in the world gives up its homeland to accommodate another? But according to Zionist mythology, Arab resistance against the Zionist intent to take away their country is itself aggression.

According to the game the Zionists want to play in Palestine, there must be two sets of rules: one set allows the Zionists to use every manner and means of force to establish themselves, and another set lays down that their victims must not resist. The Zionists want to act against the Arabs and at the same time prevent the Arabs from reacting in the only way in which, given the divine dignity of the human soul, the Arabs can react in response to the Zionist action against them.

58. War did not start in the Middle East when President Nasser recovered Arab sovereign rights at Sharm el Sheikh, thus wiping out the last vestiges of the tripartite aggression of 1956. Nor did war start with the desperate and heroic attempts of the people of Palestine to resist the Zionist occupation of their ancestral homeland. War was first declared in Palestine by the Zionists in 1897 at the first Zionist Congress meeting at Basel, at which it was decided to establish a Jewish state in a country which was 99 per cent Arab in population and land-tenure. The Zionist declaration of war on the Arabs in 1897 was a declaration in intent, word and deed. There were no fedayeen raids then, no Arab League, no President Nasser. Not even Mr. Eban was around with stories about strangulation or copious quotations from Arabic newspapers.

59. The Zionist declaration of war against the Arabs was repeated more blatantly in the great collusion with the British Government in the Balfour Declaration of 1917. For thirty years, under Zionist direction and behind the might of the British Empire the infra-structure of the Jewish state was established in Palestine in the teeth of Arab resistance. Every Jew who entered Palestine between 1918 and 1939 did so at the point of British bayonets. The Palestine Arab rebellion of that period was directed against British imperialism for its forcible sponsorship of Zionism.

60. In that rebellion, 10,000 Palestine Arabs perished out of a population of less than one million. The brutal crushing by British arms of the Palestine Arabs in that period was to pave the way for the third and most explicit declaration of war by the Zionists against the Arabs. This was the Zionist determination to bring the Jewish state into the open through a combination of international pressure and military activity. On the basis of the partition of Palestine, international pressure produced the 1947 partition resolution [181 (II)] which allotted to the Zionists 55 per cent of the country at a time when the Zionists possessed less than 6 per cent of Palestine. The Palestine Arabs put up a last-ditch stand, since nobody can be expected to accept the loss of 55 per cent of his country. Using that resistance as a pretext, the Zionists implemented their master plan for the conquest of Palestine. If this plan did not entirely succeed in 1948, it was because of the intervention of the regular Arab armies. But, by the end of the war the Zionists had 77 per cent of Palestine, hundreds of thousands of Palestine Arabs had been rendered homeless and at least another 10,000 Palestinians had been killed. Everything else followed from these beginnings.

61. The conflict in which the Arabs were caught was not of their authorship, and in this conflict any fair-

minded person must surely see that from the beginning they have always been, as they still are, on the defensive.

62. But we cannot ignore Western responsibility in the Palestine problem. At the deepest level, the establishment of Israel is a monument to the Western persecution of the Jew. But more direct Western responsibility for the Palestine tragedy may be found in the whole iniquitous mandatory role of Britain; in the American bulldozing of partition in 1947, and massive American financial aid, both private and public, to the State of Israel. Above all, there was either the solid American backing of blatantly aggressive Israeli moves or, alternatively, American acquiescence in Israeli faits accomplis. One has in mind the long catalogue of such Israeli moves which have received one or the other of such treatments: the extension of the boundaries beyond those of the 1947 partition resolution; the conquest of Elath after the cease-fire and the truce in 1949; the murder of Count Bernadotte; the encroachment on the demilitarized zones; the refusal to repatriate the refugees; the seizure and division of the Jordan waters; the confiscation of Arab properties in Israel; the treatment of the Arab minority in Israel as third-class citizens; the savage border raids; the massacres; the expulsion and maltreatment of the United Nations personnel; the boycott of the Mixed Armistice Commissions; the unilateral annulment of the General Armistice Agreements.

63. This list is too brief to be exhaustive. The record of Israel's continuing aggression against the people of Palestine will fill volumes. But now, to the Zionists we say that for the first time since 1897 the Arabs look upon the Palestine problem not only as one of a bilateral conflict between the Zionists and the people of Palestine, but also as a conflict between Zionism and the entire Arab World. The active quest of Greater Israel now stands revealed with no need for erudite proof. The kind of terms Israel is thinking of dictating are well beyond its capacity, as it must know. For Palestine is the hub of the Arab heartland, and at its centre lies Jerusalem, for which our people fought and died in centuries past.

64. In its long history the Arab nation has suffered misfortunes far greater than the one our people is engulfed in today; but its resilient and indomitable spirit enabled it to overcome its past tribulations as it will surely overcome its present agony. Over the centuries invaders far more formidable than Israel have come and gone, but our nation remained secure and free in its homeland. For over a century our people have been subjected to wave after wave of European colonial intrusion. The Zionist invasion is the last and most vicious and dangerous of these European onslaughts.

65. The Zionist invasion draws its inspiration and driving force from the dreams and aspirations of those tormented souls, the products of the European ghettos. The countless years of humiliation and oppression inflicted upon the Jewish people in Europe, culminating in the Hitlerite holocaust, have left, it seems, a deep scar in the spiritual make-up of the European Jews who today guide the destinies of Israel. All the frustrations and hatreds of centuries are now finding an outlet

in the unparalleled savagery with which the Arabs of Palestine are treated. But what a cruel irony of fate that the Arabs in whose lands the Jews found a haven and refuge from the unspeakable horrors of mediaeval Europe are today the victims of a persecution of such relentless intensity.

66. The Arab community of Palestine, a community which had survived for thousands of years, is now threatened with extinction. What an utterly insane delusion the rulers of Israel would be indulging in, if they believed that the Arab people will for ever be in an inferior position.

67. We have lately heard a lot of nonsense about the virtues and almost superhuman qualities of the Israelis as compared to the dismal state of the Arabs. It is the kind of propaganda that is so dear to the hearts of the Zionists and so eagerly and unquestioningly disseminated in some of the news media in this and other Western countries.

68. It is this intellectual and spiritual diet of hate and racial arrogance which is being constantly fed by the Zionists to their young people, poisoning their minds and twisting their spirits. Mr. Eban, who we are told has studied our history and culture, must be aware of the reserves of inner strength and the powers of resiliency of the Arab nation, and must know better than most Israelis that Israel cannot for ever continue taking the posture of a conqueror, annexing territories, expelling people and dictating its terms of peace. Unless it wishes to remain for ever an outcast and an enemy, it must first recognize that a grievous injustice has been inflicted on the Arab people of Palestine and that only through respect of their rights as human beings entitled to freedom and security in their own homeland can a beginning be made to establish conditions of peace and harmony, which will endure because they are based on justice and not on the fluctuating fortunes of war.

69. Mr. ENAHORO (Federal Commissioner for Information and Labour of Nigeria): It was with a deep sense of responsibility that the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria concurred in the request of the Soviet Union to convene this emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly. The overwhelming positive response to the summons is a clear and unmistakable expression of world-wide concern for a viable peace in the Middle East and in the world.

Mr. Ortiz Sanz (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

70. We believe that the effort to deal with the current crisis through the machinery of the United Nations is a renewed symbol of hope for mankind that affairs between nations may yet come to be ordered by the will of the international community, and this session is evidence of how far we have travelled along that road. It is therefore, in our view, the challenge of this session, in so far as it lies within our power, to translate our common concern for tranquillity and normalcy in the Middle East into reality.

71. Events and historic places in the Middle East conjure up the deepest human emotions in the hearts

of my countrymen and women, Moslems and Christians alike. We have maintained and are determined to maintain on a continuing basis gainful relations with countries in the Middle East. The Federal Republic of Nigeria shares common hopes and interests with many of them.

72. In the momentous days before the tragic outbreak of hostilities, therefore, the Government and people of Nigeria followed the deliberations of the Security Council on the Middle East situation with increasing anxiety. We profoundly regretted that the "breathing spell" for which our distinguished Secretary-General called in his report to the Security Council^{1/} could not be realized. In this connexion, may I pay warm tribute to the energetic endeavours of our Secretary-General U Thant, on behalf of peace in the Middle East. In the considered view of my Government, no blame attaches to the Secretary-General for the tragic events of the last few weeks, and we believe that he must regret, as we do, that the peace he sought eluded us. Thus we are faced today with an already complex situation made even more complex by the resort to gambits outside our Charter provisions.

73. None the less, a cease-fire has been achieved and the question which now confronts the General Assembly is: What next? As the representative of Nigeria stated before the Security Council on 14 June 1967 [1360th meeting], the Government of Nigeria takes the view that a cease-fire having been secured, the United Nations should now proceed to consider the substantive issues relating to the restoration of peace in the Middle East. The circumstances immediately or remotely preceding the outbreak of hostilities, the strong motivations and the compulsions under which the Governments of Middle Eastern countries and others have acted, will form the subject of examination and argument for many years. Claims and counter-claims, evidence and rebuttal, can, have been, and will be urged on behalf of each contending party.

74. The Government of Nigeria believes that the time and energy of our Organization can be more usefully directed at this stage to exercises more meaningful, more pressing and more relevant in terms of the suffering and misery of the multitudes in the Middle East. This parliament of nations must not permit itself to be led into labyrinths of contentious definitions and interpretations of events, thereby becoming ineffective in vital issues of war and peace. Rather, my delegation submits that it must be our common commitment here at the United Nations to ensure that recurrent upheavals in the Middle East should be brought to an end, and that the ancient lands of the Middle East should cease to present the United Nations with periodic threats of a world war.

75. Believing this, and consistent with the stand of the Federal Republic of Nigeria in the discussions at the Security Council my delegation has addressed its mind to the operative part of the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.519]. Arising from that draft resolution and from the draft resolution submitted by the United

States of America [A/L.520], various proposals have been advanced in addresses by representatives to this Assembly and canvassed in the corridors as possible solutions to the difficulties which have assembled us here, although, in the nature of things, there would appear to be a common appreciation of the reality that the Middle East problem does not lend itself to easy resolution in the General Assembly.

76. In considering the suggestions so far urged, my delegation has been confronted by what would appear to be inescapable realities. The first of these realities is the difficulty of bilateral talks between the principal contending parties in the atmosphere of emotional and psychological upheaval which has occurred in the Middle East. The second reality is the difficulty of contemplating a complete return to the *status quo* as it existed on the eve of the outbreak of hostilities, with hostile forces drawn up at swords' length along frontiers from which the prophylactic influence of the United Nations presence had unfortunately been removed. The third reality is the common desire of Member nations here—indeed, the demand by the peoples of the world—for a durable peace in the Middle East, and the necessity therefore of deliberating here not only upon recent hostilities but altogether on the wider spectrum of matters antecedent to, and resulting from, the hostilities.

77. These realities and difficulties were summarized in the Security Council last October when the position of my Government was stated by the Permanent Representative of Nigeria. If I may reaffirm our position, as stated by our Permanent Representative, it is this:

"... to bring stable peace into the Middle East it will be essential to tackle the Palestine problem as a whole... we realize that a number of attempts have been made in the past to tackle the problem. We realize also the delicate and complex nature of the problem. Nevertheless, we consider that another attack should be made upon it. For such an attack to succeed, two things will be essential: first, the readiness of the great Powers to deal with this problem outside of the cold war context and purely with the future happiness of the parties to the dispute in view; the second essential requirement, of course, is that the parties themselves should manifest a disposition to settle for something consistent with the justice of their case, not as seen only by themselves but as adjudged by a commission whose composition would be approved by all the parties. The fact that this course has been tried before, without success, is, in our view, not a justification for not trying it again, especially in the new kind of atmosphere that we recommend and pray for. Incidentally, we do not think much of the suggestion usually made in certain quarters that the solution lies in the two parties entering into a dialogue on the matter. We do not consider this to be a case susceptible to that kind of proceeding."^{2/}

78. In commending these ideas to the General Assembly for its consideration, I wish to say that we do so in full awareness of the present political and military situation in the region; we do so because the uneasy peace of "cease-fire" which the region has occasionally enjoyed is too fragile to endure and is

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7906, para. 14.

^{2/} Ibid., Twenty-first Year, 1309th meeting.

liable to be exploited for the partial gains of remote parties; and we do so because neither the Arabs nor the Israelis, nor yet the community of nations, can stand to gain from the unhappy situation which has prevailed in the Middle East for the past nineteen years.

79. Based on the realities and difficulties which I have outlined, and the ideas which I have restated, my delegation presents for the consideration of the General Assembly the following six-point peace plan.

80. First, Israel should withdraw its forces from the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and the Kingdom of Jordan which they have overrun and occupied. This proposal rests not only on the fact that the Government of Nigeria supports the cardinal principle of the United Nations Charter that no rights or territorial gains can flow from military conquest, but also derives from the obvious dangers to world peace, which would otherwise arise from the inevitable quest by the Arab States for a reversal of the recent fortunes of war.

81. Second, the United Nations, true to its purposes and responsibilities, must have the perception, the strength of conviction and the courage urgently to identify, to isolate and to defuse the combustible elements in the regional life of the Middle East. Accordingly, an international commission should be established for the Holy Places, with a United Nations guarantee of free access to them by all who so desire; demilitarized buffer zones should be established between Israel and its neighbours in the areas of primary conflict, and a United Nations presence should be established in each buffer zone concurrently with the withdrawal by Israeli forces. There should be an immediate ban in these areas of any forces other than those of the United Nations.

82. Third, the refugee problem must now be treated with greater urgency and effectiveness. Relief and succour must be provided on an emergency basis for the latest wave of refugees. The great Powers should set a lead in the provision of funds for indemnification and resettlement of Palestinian refugees. Israel should provide homes and opportunities of existence for those refugees who would return to Israel. For such others as cannot be so repatriated, the great Powers and Israel should provide the funds, the Arab States the land, and the United Nations the technical assistance, for resettlement.

83. Fourth, the United Nations must make an urgent contribution in two other areas: (a) the United Nations, in sacred and abiding duty to itself, must uphold its own previous decisions and reaffirm and revitalize its previous resolutions designed to promote peace and justice in the Middle East; (b) my delegation is in favour of the proposal that the Secretary-General should depute a representative or agent to the area. We consider that the functions of the representative or agent should include recommendation of terms for a permanent peace settlement in the area, in particular proposals relating to a limitation on arms and the reconciliation of international maritime needs and interests with the undisputed sovereignty of Arab States; administration of areas of United Nations presence; supervision of the international commission

on Holy Places; recommendation of suitable guarantees for stability in the area to be given by the United Nations or the major Powers; and direction of refugee resettlement operations.

84. Fifth, the United Nations presence in the buffer zones must be operationally effective and must subsist in its own right on both sides of the inflammable borders for a guaranteed minimum period, whereafter it could be terminated either by the Security Council or by a resolution of the General Assembly.

85. Sixth, the United Nations, realizing that temporary respite and cessation of hostilities is no peace, should itself actively promote a Middle East peace treaty, based on the recommendations to be submitted by the representative or agent, to which the nations in the area should be invited to subscribe.

86. These proposals are not exhaustive but I hope they are sufficient to indicate the general lines along which my delegation believes that a viable solution may be sought. For while, as I have stated, the Government of Nigeria in common with other Governments supports the view that Israel must immediately withdraw its forces from the Arab territories which they have occupied, we are equally concerned about the vacuum which would be created thereby and the questions and dangers which the transitional period between withdrawal and the establishment of peace must inevitably pose.

87. Accordingly, the effect of our proposals, if I may summarize, is that this transitional period would be taken up with the establishment of an effective United Nations presence in the areas of conflict, the appointment of a representative or agent with duties and responsibilities, including those which I have outlined, the resettlement and rehabilitation of refugees, and the search for a durable peace settlement.

88. My delegation believes that this is an enterprise which confronts us all, as is evidenced not only by the time and effort which various organs of the United Nations have devoted in this past two decades to the many aspects of the Middle East question, but even more by the presence at this special session of so many heads of State, heads of Governments, foreign ministers and distinguished delegates torn at such short notice from their onerous duties in distant lands. While, therefore, we warmly welcome efforts by secondary parties to find a solution, it is my duty to say that the Middle East problem has ceased to be a purely regional matter—otherwise we would not all be here—or indeed a matter merely of mutual accommodation of the economic, strategic and cold war interests of secondary parties.

89. The Government of Nigeria hopes that the time may come when the peoples of the Middle East, whose humanity and ingenuity have given the world patterns of thought and spiritual leadership based on love and compassion, tolerance, understanding and universal brotherhood, can achieve an identity of interests and pursuits and who, using their abundant human and natural resources for their material upliftment, can demonstrate the will and the capacity to exercise their sovereignty without resort to violence, with increasing independence of external

influences, and with greater regard for the provisions of the Charter of our Organization.

90. Mr. COSTA MENDEZ (Minister for Foreign Affairs and Worship of the Argentine Republic) (translated from Spanish): Before I begin I should like first to pay a tribute once again to Mr. Pazhwak, who has already demonstrated his outstanding qualities during the General Assembly's twenty-first session and at the fifth special session. He has displayed them once more today in this Assembly of great significance because of the matters it has to deal with and the calibre of the delegations which the Members of the Organization have seen fit to send to it. Qualities such as his are highly appreciated by my Government, and I therefore offer to Mr. Pazhwak my very special congratulations on its behalf.

91. I would also draw attention to the outstanding contribution to world peace made by the Security Council in connexion with this crisis. Its deep concern and its long-drawn-out meetings, the efficacy of its work and the rectitude of its decisions, warrant the respect and esteem of all States truly desirous of peace.

92. My delegation has taken part in all the Council's activities with the most dispassionate zeal and the utmost willingness to co-operate. Furthermore, together with the delegations of Brazil and Ethiopia, we have introduced a draft resolution, which was unanimously adopted, designed to draw the attention of the States in conflict to the Council's concern for the fate of all the human beings who have become involved in the dispute, sometimes against their will.

93. My delegation cannot miss this opportunity of expressing its gratitude to all the delegations represented in the Security Council for the immediate and spontaneous approval of the draft resolution.

94. My presence at this special session of the Assembly reflects the express instructions of the President of my country who wished thereby to indicate the vital importance it attaches to the role of the United Nations in the present crisis. Argentina could certainly not have remained aloof from the conflict.

95. While it is true that warlike action has been restricted to an area of the globe geographically remote from my country, it is equally true that this has not lessened either our concern about the outcome of the conflict or our interest in the work of this meeting. We are well aware that in today's circumstances no hostilities, however remote, can be a matter of indifference to the nations striving to establish an international order based on peace, justice and the faithful, permanent application of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

96. My country could not remain aloof from a conflict which threatens the very authority of the Organization and the validity of its guiding principles—in short, a conflict which challenges its ability to establish and maintain world peace.

97. Argentina is also greatly disturbed by the fact that this conflict has embroiled and caught up in it States for which we have great affection and to which we are bound by close ties of friendship.

98. The Arab community living in Argentina has formed bonds within the country and has become integrated into it. Its contribution to the country's progress has been on a par with its patriotism. Moreover, we are drawn closer together by the ancient spiritual heritage which has come down to us through our mother country, Spain, and is reflected in our language, our customs and our traditions.

99. The Jewish community in Argentina deserves the same respect, equal esteem and admiration. It has contributed its energy to the colonization of the country and, with signal ability, has rendered outstanding services to the development of the nation and its economic, financial and cultural advancement. The sources of its beliefs and its most ancient traditions nourish many of our own.

100. Thus there are ample reasons why we feel deep concern at the fate of the Arab countries and the State of Israel, and at this time of critical importance for their future we are anxious to make ourselves available, to give our views and to do all that can be done to help them—always impartially and with understanding—to achieve an ordered, stable existence.

101. Already in the past, we have given frequent proof of our willingness to collaborate with the Organization and of our independence of judgement in studying the problems and suggesting solutions. By our action in the Council, we have tried to avoid a worsening of the crisis and to induce the parties to abandon the confused and fanatical attitudes which can only lead to desperation and violence.

102. My delegation has drawn attention time and time again to the necessity for strict adherence to the rules of law governing relations between States and has supported every resolution making for their ratification and application. On various occasions also, and with equal vehemence, it has expressed its belief that a permanent and acceptable solution to international disputes in the world today can only be achieved through peaceful means.

103. My delegation was not originally in favour of convening this Assembly. It felt, and still feels, that the Security Council has sufficient competence and authority to deal with the matter and to set up the necessary machinery to lessen the effects of the conflict and to find a valid, lasting solution to it. Nevertheless, now that the Assembly has been convened and is in session, my delegation has endeavoured, and will endeavour, to contribute as vigorously as possible and without reserve to enable it to achieve real, concrete results.

104. At the same time, we will firmly oppose any initiative, any proposal or any step which would detract from the essential purpose of this meeting and divert it from its specific, clearly defined task, namely, to put an end to the warfare and to make peace.

105. This is no time to launch an ideological propaganda campaign. Any attempt to do so would be a rebuke to this meeting and a flagrant violation of the principles guiding it; even more, such an attitude would be tantamount to ignoring those who come here with the purpose—or should I say the hope or even the illusion—of establishing principles, working out proce-

dures and drafting resolutions to bring peaceful conditions to the Middle East.

106. Bearing in mind the atmosphere in which the Assembly is meeting, the expectations which its convocation has aroused both among those participating actively in it and in world public opinion, the magnitude of the problems it has to deal with, and the fact that basic principles of international coexistence are at stake—this is undoubtedly an exceptional occasion.

107. We neither expect nor insist that this Assembly should achieve a specific, positive and prompt solution to the various aspects of the conflict. What we do expect and insist upon is that this Assembly shall not have a purely political bias. We expect and we insist—and we have every right to do so—that its purposes shall not be distorted and that it shall not lose sight of its principal task—that of bringing peace to the Middle East as soon as possible.

108. We could feel well satisfied if this Assembly achieved the maintenance of the cease-fire, the suspension of hostilities and the disengagement of the opposing forces. But we must aim at something more. We must aim at the establishment by this Assembly of the structural basis for such peaceful coexistence by drawing up and crystallizing certain general principles.

109. We must ensure that this Assembly reaffirms yet again the basic principles of the Charter, that it provides the belligerents with a proper framework for negotiation, that it entrusts the Security Council with the specific task of reconciliation, and that it recommends other international organs, whether subordinate to it or not, to tend and care for the victims of the war.

110. Such are, such must be, in my delegation's view, the major goals to be sought by this extraordinary session of the supreme organ of this Organization.

111. Without sufficient proof, Argentina will not vote to condemn Israel any more than it would vote to condemn the Arab States, if such a vote were requested. It did not do so in the Security Council when a similar proposal was submitted to that body, and it will not do so now. The reasons for its stand in the Council are still fully valid today, and I need not repeat them, although perhaps they need to be crystallized and brought up to date.

112. As my delegation has already pointed out, before responsibility could be apportioned impartially and justly, there would first have to be an investigation to determine what facts have been definitely established, followed by an examination of those facts against the general background of the situation. It would, moreover, seem to be obvious that the state of belligerency cannot be invoked in order to accept only part of the logical consequences stemming from the principles governing it. If it is invoked in order to provide legal justification for certain circumstantial and specific limitations of general principles then all its consequences must also be accepted.

113. If we are to bring back peace to this area we must weigh, by means of a thorough objective analysis, the historical background, the economic circumstances, the geographical conditions, and the religious

and political factors motivating all the peoples concerned—in short the reasons which have brought them into the present conflict. If we do not do so, if by inaction or vague decisions we simply allow the cause of the misfortunes now endured by those peoples to continue, knowing as we know now and always have known that they cause strife which is subsequently very difficult to check and whose ultimate consequences we are still reluctant to face squarely, we shall be the ones who deserve the censure we are asked to place on others.

114. In view of what has been said so far, my delegation wishes to outline its position.

115. First, we have come here to support the maintenance of the cease-fire, to uphold the Security Council's action and to establish the broad, structural basis of peace.

116. Secondly, we believe that this session will not have been in vain if the Assembly draws the attention of the parties concerned to the Purposes and Principles set forth in Chapter I of the United Nations Charter, to which they have all duly expressed formal adherence and which are definitely applicable to this conflict. The peaceful settlement of international disputes, respect for the political and juridical personality of States, without which coexistence and properly ordered dialogue are impossible; the rule requiring States to respect each other's territorial integrity and political independence; and that prohibiting the use of force or the threat of force to impose solutions at variance with the principles of the Charter—these are principles which Argentina has proclaimed, observed and practised at all times and which are the foundation of international coexistence among States. This session will have been useful if it reminds the parties concerned that the principles inspiring those purposes and the norms expressly stated in Articles 2 (3) and 2 (4) embody provisions and rules to help them to find true peace, and if at the same time it reminds them of the norms embodied in Article 33 (1) and (2). On this occasion, the Assembly should also stress once again the principle of freedom of passage through international waters.

117. Thirdly, we consider that, once the general principles have been affirmed in this way, the Security Council should undertake in a resolute and enlightened manner an analysis of the present situation and its immediate and remote causes such as seem to us an essential basis for peace.

118. Fourthly, my delegation considers that the Security Council might entrust a person—or, if it prefers, a group of persons—with the task of maintaining contact with the parties, hearing their claims, getting to know their views and striving to bring about a real rapprochement among them so as to be able to discharge more effectively the task described in the previous paragraph.

119. Fifthly, my delegation believes that, in present circumstances, the mere withdrawal of forces will not, of itself, bring about peace. It believes that such a withdrawal must be accompanied simultaneously by the termination of the state of belligerency, if it is to have a truly logical meaning and a sound legal basis. The parties would thus be able to seek solutions free

from any constraint, and to agree spontaneously to any commitments they might make. These arrangements for a withdrawal which we propose today would represent the application, in this specific situation, of another fundamental principle of Argentine diplomatic tradition which is set forth in article 2 of the Anti-War Treaty (Non-Aggression and Conciliation) signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1933 at the instigation of Mr. Carlos Saavedra Lamas, the then Argentine Chancellor. This principle, which we reiterate today, reads as follows:

"They declare that between the High Contracting Parties territorial questions must not be settled by resort to violence and that they shall recognize no territorial arrangement which has not been obtained by peaceful means, nor the validity of an occupation or acquisition of territory brought about by armed force."^{3/}

120. Sixthly, my delegation believes that, in order to discharge effectively the difficult task before it, the General Assembly should also deal with other problems which, although not directly connected with the cessation of hostilities or the re-establishment and organization of peace, are of major importance in regard to the principle established in Article 1 (3) of the Charter.

121. As already stated, my delegation sponsored and supported in the Security Council a resolution designed to alleviate and improve the lot of the refugees, the wounded and the prisoners of war. In doing so, it was guided by a humanitarian ideal and a profound respect for the human personality. I reaffirm that position here and now stress that the Assembly should adopt a specific resolution on that question, recommend the Security Council to pursue the measures it has already taken along those lines, and urge the Member States immediately, and as generously as possible, to furnish the necessary funds so that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East can discharge its function.

122. Finally, again in the context of its respect for man, his beliefs, his faith, his traditions and his moral and spiritual stature, my delegation wishes to express its concern about the Holy Places. I have to state that my delegation endorses and supports the declaration of the Holy See on this matter and would like to see the General Assembly take up, as soon as possible and with especial attention, all the problems arising from the question of the access to and the maintenance and preservation of the Holy Places.

123. It also feels that at the appropriate time, when the process of establishing peace allows, the Organization should take up the question of Jerusalem under the terms of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

124. The Arab States and the State of Israel deserve the utmost understanding on our part. The gravity of the circumstances they are experiencing and of the events which have occurred call for complete sincerity in our endeavours and the highest degree of altruism in our actions. No one has the right to use this dispute as an instrument for other purposes.

125. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): The Government of Finland may be permitted to claim a degree of detachment with regard to the problems of the Middle East, a detachment born out of freedom from political engagements or ambitions in the area. Detachment but not indifference; the Finnish Government and the Finnish people are acutely aware of the danger to world peace arising from the conflict in the Middle East and of the urgent need for international efforts to prevent that conflict from causing a world-wide disaster. As was pointed out by the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kosygin, a week ago, the task of creating peace in the Middle East concerns every nation. None, however distant from the scene, can stay aloof. In this spirit the Finnish Government supported the request for the convening of this emergency special session and we are prepared now, as we have been in the past, to do our part in constructive efforts for the preservation and strengthening of peace.

126. We believe that Finland can best contribute to such efforts through strict and consistent adherence to our policy of neutrality which, while it enjoins us to refrain from taking sides in the disputes between the great Powers, enables us to maintain good relations with all States across the dividing lines of ideology or military alignments, and thus to work wherever possible for the cause of conciliation, peaceful settlement of disputes, and international co-operation. In times of tension and conflict such as these, when the very fabric of international relations is damaged and many Governments find themselves unable even to communicate with each other, neutral States have, we believe, a special obligation not only to themselves but to the international community as a whole to conduct themselves with objectivity and restraint, so as to retain the confidence of all parties and thus their ability to perform such peaceful services as may be required, including the modest yet indispensable service of maintaining contact between States that have broken off diplomatic relations. This is an obligation which the Finnish Government is accustomed to assume.

127. It would be clearly inconsistent with the fundamental position of Finland, as I have outlined it, for my delegation to attempt to put before this Assembly concrete prescriptions for the solution of the specific issues that confront the United Nations in the Middle East. But we can and must state the principles which in our view should be applied in the settlement of these disputes. They are the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. All Members of this Organization have pledged themselves to settle their disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State: in brief, in the words of the Charter, "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

128. It follows from our commitment to the principles of the Charter that the legality of territorial changes achieved by the use of military force cannot be recognized. This means that Israeli troops now occupying territories of other States must be withdrawn. We must reject the use of force or the threat of force for the purpose of imposing solutions of political issues that involve the vital interests of other States

^{3/} League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXIII, 1935-1936, No. 3781, p. 405.

or the international community as a whole. Solutions for the contested issues in the Middle East must be sought by peaceful means, solutions that are acceptable to all the States in the area and take into account the special interests of the world community.

129. Until a lasting political settlement is achieved, the United Nations, in our view, continues to have a vital role in the Middle East. It is in fact inconceivable to us that peace could be kept in the area without United Nations participation. Although one of the consequences of the present crisis was the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization has remained, and its services, performed under the most difficult conditions and with minimal resources, proved indispensable to the Security Council in the process of establishing a cease-fire. In the present circumstances it may be expedient to leave it to the Security Council to decide whether the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization should be strengthened and what other forms of United Nations action may be required. The Finnish Government is prepared, as it has been in the past, to contribute personnel for such United Nations activities, should its services be desired.

130. In this connexion it should be emphasized that the kind of United Nations operation that could be envisaged at present must of course be based on the voluntary consent and full co-operation of the Governments concerned. This is an indispensable prerequisite of a United Nations intervention, not only from the point of view of the Governments whose territory is involved, but, also for those who will be providing the personnel. And here I should like to recall that Finland was among the first countries to provide troops for the United Nations Emergency Force and that we continue to provide a contingent for the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus. We would not wish to have our troops remain on the territory of a friendly country without the consent of the host Government.

131. The most urgent task confronting the United Nations and each of its Member States is to deliver assistance to the helpless victims of the war. We in Finland have some experience of the human and material problems arising from a large-scale displacement of population. We also know that these problems need not be insoluble. It is natural, therefore, that Finland has responded to the appeal of the Secretary-General and the Commissioner-General of UNRWA for funds and other aid for the new wave of refugees that the fighting has set in motion. I am confident that the new appeal made yesterday by the President of the General Assembly will receive the most serious consideration in my country.

132. While each Member of the United Nations attending this special session must recognize its share of the collective responsibility for the maintenance of peace, the fact remains, in the words of Prime Minister Kosygin, that "much depends on the efforts of the big Powers" [1526th meeting, para. 81]. The Foreign Minister of France expressed the realities of power with characteristic precision when he said the other day that "nothing will be done without those Powers nor... against them or against one of them." [1531st meeting, para. 106].

133. The one hopeful fact that has emerged from the tragedy of the past weeks is confirmation of the evident desire of the great Powers, in spite of their profound differences, to work together to avoid an even wider and more disastrous conflict. The unanimous decision of the Security Council on a cease-fire was the concrete expression of that common desire.

134. We welcomed the meeting of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union and express the hope that the great Powers, either through the Security Council or by other means, will now find a common language for a search for peaceful means to solve the problems of the Middle East. Obviously, they could not impose upon the States of this area solutions that are not acceptable to the parties concerned, but there are steps that the great Powers themselves could take which would materially contribute to reducing the risk of renewed hostilities. The need for effective measures to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons is more urgent than ever. But recent events have provided a vivid demonstration of the fact that it is also necessary to agree on a balanced reduction and control of so-called conventional armaments. For this, an agreement between the great Powers would be essential.

135. In his report of 26 May 1967, Secretary-General U Thant expressed the hope that a breathing spell could be created to allow the Security Council to deal with the underlying causes of the crisis. Instead of a breathing spell we have had war; and in its aftermath a political settlement, which has eluded the United Nations for eighteen years, appears to be more difficult to achieve than ever before. Yet the United Nations cannot abandon its task. We must, in the words of the Secretary-General, "continue to seek, and eventually to find, reasonable, peaceful and just solutions".^{4/}

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

^{4/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7906, para. 19.