

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Official Records



**1538th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 27 June 1967,
at 3 p.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

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. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation considers that the convening of this emergency session of the General Assembly was both an appropriate and a timely action. The fact that this action was supported by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership attests to the importance of the role which the General Assembly has been called upon to play in the present crisis and of the desire that this Assembly should take speedy and resolute measures in keeping with its responsibilities under the Charter.

2. It is important, however, that we should not lose sight of the purpose of this special session. This session has been called to consider the situation caused by Israel's aggression against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria and to adopt a decision designed to bring about the liquidation of the consequences of that aggression and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces behind the armistice lines.

3. When hostilities first broke out between Israel and the three Arab States, the Security Council, to its credit, worked hard to bring about a cease-fire. However, to the disappointment of many States: including my own, and to the detriment of the situation, the Council was prevented by the attitude of some of its members from taking the next logical step, namely, to call for the immediate withdrawal of troops to the positions they occupied before the start of the hostilities. That was the procedure followed in the same circumstances in the 1956 conflict and it was also used in ending the conflict between India and Pakistan in 1965.

4. Two things began to emerge with startling clarity as the success of the Israeli military machine grew more assured and as the Israeli leaders achieved their expansionist aims. One was that the necessity of even trying to establish who was the aggressor seemed to lose its urgency for some members of the

Security Council. The other was a cynical acceptance of what is usually termed "the realities of the situation". The principle of the fait accompli seemed to be taking the place of the application of those principles of the Charter which outlaw the use of armed force as a means of settling disputes.

5. If in the earlier stages of the crisis some members of the Security Council felt they had insufficient evidence to decide which country had initiated the fighting, those doubts have surely been dispelled by the additional evidence which has emerged and which has clearly branded Israel as the aggressor. The whole tenor of the Israeli stand both in the Security Council and in this Assembly has been that of an attempt to justify its aggression. The question of the Strait of Tiran, which falls exclusively within the territorial jurisdiction of the Arab people, is a case in point. The United Arab Republic's assertion of its historical sovereignty over the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba was invoked by Israel as a casus belli—although the United Arab Republic's sovereignty has never been limited by an international convention. The action taken by the United Arab Republic was not a blockade which could be called an act of war, because the bulk of Israel's trade continued to be carried through its Mediterranean ports; it was not a threat to international peace except in so far as the Israeli Government attempted to convert it into such a threat; and, under the terms of the Charter, it could never have been construed as a justification for the use of armed force. And yet, the Israeli representatives here have taken great pains to try to establish the fact that the United Arab Republic's action gave Israel justification for the use of armed force.

6. Similarly, the Israeli position with regard to the United Arab Republic's call for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force was that of one who searches for excuses for his actions. The Israeli representative's criticism of the United Arab Republic and of the Secretary-General can be described only as sheer effrontery. If the request of the United Arab Republic to have the forces withdraw was a sign of belligerence, then the refusal of Israel to permit these same forces on its territory at any time since 1957 can only be evidence of a warlike intent of long standing.

7. There is more direct evidence than this of the responsibility of Israel for starting the conflict. In the months before the outbreak of hostilities the United Nations had before it abundant evidence of Israel's hostile and intransigent attitude towards its neighbours. The brutal attack on a Jordanian village last November was followed in April this year by a large-scale air and land attack on several Syrian

villages. On 13 May the Israel Prime Minister stated that he was prepared to risk an all-out war to overthrow the Syrian régime. It was acts and statements of this nature which led the Arab States to take defensive measures to protect their territorial integrity.

8. It was openly admitted by the Israeli Ambassador in London that his country had initiated the war and his words still stand in spite of efforts to deny them. We now have irrefutable evidence of the surprise attack launched against the air forces of the three Arab States in a series of raids as precisely planned and executed as the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. Over the past fortnight the international Press has carried descriptive accounts of Israel's planned aggression, conforming what many of us had known for some time but which others had refused to admit. Some reports reveal that the decision to initiate hostilities was adopted at an Israeli Cabinet meeting on Sunday, 4 June, by a vote of 16 to 2.

9. But it is not only in the launching of the first military thrust that the Israelis have been the aggressors. They have used the threat of force equally with force itself. The image which Israel would like to present to the world of a small peace-loving State constantly threatened by its warlike neighbours is belied by the facts. This is the second time, in little less than a decade, that Egypt has been subjected to invasion by Israel; it is Israel, not the Arab States, which has repeatedly earned the censure of the Security Council for major breaches of the peace in the past ten years. Much is made of military assistance which the United Arab Republic has received, but the extensive arming of the Israeli war machine by its Western friends is glossed over.

10. One might ask what was the motive of Israel for its constant state of military preparedness if it was not for defence against the threat of Arab encirclement. The answer can be found in the following statements made by Prime Minister Ben Gurion, which are quoted from the Israeli Government Year-Book of 1951/1952. In 1951 he said that "to maintain the status quo will not do. We have founded a dynamic State intent upon ... expansion".^{1/} In 1952 he said that the State "has been established in only a portion of the Land of Israel".^{2/}

11. It was no secret to the Arab people that when the Zionists accepted the plan for the partition of Palestine they viewed it, again in the words of Mr. Ben-Gurion, as

"... a decisive step on the way to the realization of the greater Zionism. It will make it possible to realize in the shortest time an effective Jewish force that will bring us to our historical destination."

12. The meaning of that "historical destination" has been variously expressed by Israeli leaders. "From the Euphrates to the Nile" is the most radical of the claims, but the words of Mr. Abba Eban which ap-

peared in the *Jerusalem Post* of 2 May 1951 no doubt represent what the Zionists think is possible. He said:

"We are not seriously thinking of the Nile and the Euphrates, but to the Jordan river and its sources to the north we devote our most serious attention."

13. One may also ask if territorial aggrandizement for its own sake is the motive behind Israel's expansionist aims. The answer lies in the policy of the "ingathering" of the Jews of all nations which is the cornerstone of the Zionist political and spiritual philosophy. Space must be provided for the new arrivals, and if this is again to be at the expense of the Arab peoples that is not a matter of concern to Israel. A terrible mistake was made when the world community, filled with a sense of collective guilt for the sufferings inflicted on the Jewish people by the Nazi régime, agreed to the imposition of the Zionist State of Israel upon Palestine. The Arab people—so greatly wronged in that attempt to cure one evil by causing another—were then expected to accept, in addition, the aggressive and expansionist policy of Israel.

14. My delegation has seen history repeat itself in the events which have taken place in the past three weeks. The same pattern that we saw in 1956 has again appeared. Israel has resorted to violence, using as an excuse the just indignation of the Arab peoples and their measures of self-defence against patent belligerence. Anyone who is aware of the history of the betrayal of the indigenous people of Palestine and of the continued refusal of Israel to take any steps to put right the grave injustice which dispossessed and exiled nearly one million people will agree that the Arab people have had a continuing cause for their anger.

15. And now, once again, the Zionists have used the sympathy which the world has retained for the Jewish people as a cover for these aggressions. Now, as in 1956, they are attempting to hold their illegally acquired territorial gains and to use them as a bargaining point for their increasing demands. At the beginning of the present conflict the Israeli leaders declared that they had no territorial aims. However, with the passing of each day there have been new pronouncements about their intention to remain in Sinai or in Gaza or on Syrian soil. It has been stated by the Prime Minister of Israel that the Old City of Jerusalem will be taken over completely. Israeli authorities, in fact, have already started to demolish homes and important industrial projects belonging to Jordanian people in order to transform the area for the exclusive use of nationals of the Zionist State.

16. But it is not only the events of 1956 which are being repeated. In 1948 a campaign of terrorism and massacre was instituted by the Zionists in order to drive the peaceful people of Palestine away from their homes and their lands. This was done so that those homes and that land could be given to the illegal Jewish immigrants from Europe. Today we are witnessing the very same spectacle. Over a hundred thousand Arab people in the lands occupied by the Israeli armed forces have been stampeded out of their homes and villages in order to provide for the expansion of Zionism. In the space of six days the Israelis have overturned the political, economic and

^{1/} Government Year-Book, 5712 (1951/1952) (Jerusalem, Government Printing Press), p. xxv.

^{2/} Government Year-Book, 5713 (1952) (Jerusalem, Government Printing Press), p. 15.

social fabric of the region west of the Jordan river, and have caused untold human suffering by their destructive policy. We cannot allow these wrongs to be committed without condemnation and without redress. Surely no Member of this Organization is unaware of the far-reaching consequences of a further exacerbation of the Arab refugee problem.

17. If there is one point on which Member States of this Organization are in agreement with regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict, it is that a just and speedy solution must be found for the refugee problem. It is now generally accepted that this problem of the Palestine Arab refugees lies at the heart of the conflict and that peace in the Middle East is impossible without its solution. The experience of the past has proved that international charity can never be the answer to the problem, that no amount of economic aid or welfare programmes for the refugees can compensate for the loss of their homes and property and of their rights. And yet this repetition of the events of 1948 is taking place not only in Jordan but in the Israeli-occupied areas of the United Arab Republic and of Syria. It will continue as long as Israel is allowed to remain in possession of the territory which it has seized.

18. Last week, members of this Assembly were informed by the Foreign Minister of Jordan of the scope of Israeli plans for the West Bank of Jordan. The facts in that letter, which are substantiated by the pictures and stories contained in the various news media, should lend a note of urgency to the present proceedings and should give increased weight to the draft resolution of the Soviet Union [A/L.519], which demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces to the armistice lines. It is pertinent to note here the attitude adopted by President Eisenhower towards the very same problem, when Israeli designs over the West Bank of Jordan became apparent in 1956. In his memoirs, a memorandum is reproduced which reads as follows:

"I have told the Secretary of State (John Foster Dulles) that he should make very clear to the Israelis that they must stop these attacks against the borders of Jordan. If they continue them and particularly if they carry them on to the point of trying to take over and hold the territory west of the Jordan River, they will certainly be condemned by the United Nations, and not only Arab opinion but all world opinion will be brought to bear against this little country."^{3/}

19. It is impossible to disregard the fact that the Government of Israel, from its own pronouncements, intends to annex territory belonging to three sovereign States, the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria, and it is our foremost duty to ensure that this shall not be the case.

20. In his report of 24 January 1957, when the United Nations had occasion to debate another blatant act of aggression by Israel against the Arab people, the Secretary-General set forth this important principle:

"The United Nations cannot condone a change of the status juris resulting from military action con-

trary to the provisions of the Charter. The Organization must, therefore, maintain that the status juris existing prior to such military action be re-established by a withdrawal of troops, and by the relinquishment or nullification of rights asserted in territories covered by the military action and depending upon it."^{4/}

21. The majority of Members at that session supported this principle whole-heartedly. For example, the representative of Bolivia had this to say:

"The view was expressed ... that other problems relating to the conflict between the Arab countries and Israel should be solved concurrently with the problem of withdrawal from the occupied areas of Egypt. That position is untenable for the simple reason that violence and invasion cannot be recognized by the United Nations as a source of rights." [652nd meeting, para. 102.]

22. The principle which triumphed in 1957 can be best summed up in the following words of President Eisenhower, which I again quote from his book. He wrote then:

"Focusing on the Israeli argument that it have 'firm guarantees as a condition to withdrawing its forces of invasion' I asked a question of principle:

"Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions on its own withdrawal?"

"If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order."^{5/}

23. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that the principle upheld by President Eisenhower will continue to be applied by the United States in the present crisis. We express this hope in the context of the recent statement by President Johnson which reiterated the commitment of three previous Presidents of the United States to support the political independence and territorial integrity of all nations in the Middle East. But principles have no meaning in themselves unless they are acted upon. It would certainly remove doubts from the minds of many Members if the United States would support their words with deeds.

24. The specific items contained in the Soviet Union's letter of 13 June to the Secretary-General are of paramount importance in the present debate. However, it is impossible to view any phase of the Arab-Israeli conflict in true perspective unless it is viewed against the historical background of the problem. The Israeli leaders are fond of saying that you cannot put the clock back. This is, of course, a useful argument to support a policy of fait accompli and of utter disregard for the rights of others. We heard this maxim when the State of Israel was proclaimed; we heard it in connexion with the fate of the Palestinian refugees, who are expected to forget their ancestral

^{4/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 66, document A/3512, para. 5 (a).

^{5/} Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Waging Peace 1956-1961* (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Co., 1965), p. 188.

^{3/} Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Waging Peace 1956-1961* (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Co., 1965), p. 676.

homes and seek their fortunes on any soil except their own; and we have heard it again in the context of the present illegal seizure of Arab territory of Israel—its latest attempt to establish a fait accompli.

25. It is, however, a strange maxim to be continually repeated by those who would put the clock back, not ten years or twenty years, but some 2,000 years, in order to seek some basis for a spurious claim to Palestine. If the world can be asked to put the clock back 2,000 years, why can it not be asked to review the Balfour Declaration of 1917 which the Zionists use as their Magna Charta? This declaration was made by a British Minister when the British Government had neither the legal nor the moral authority for its action. It had no legal authority because Britain was not even in possession of the Mandate over Palestine when the Declaration was made. It did not have the moral authority because the British Government had already promised the Arab peoples of the Middle East that it would help to secure their independence from the Ottoman Empire in return for the part the Arabs played in the First World War in revolting against the Turks. The MacMahon letters in which this promise was enshrined constituted the first act in a tragedy which might well be called "the betrayal of the Arab people". There has never been a clearer example of the power for evil wielded by the imperialists in the days when colonial people were used as pawns in the political chess game of the imperial Powers. There were a few voices which pointed out the unwisdom of supporting the militant aspirations of the 56,000 Jews to the detriment of the rights of the 700,000 Arabs. But these voices which spoke of principle were overwhelmed by those of expediency. The men who set in motion the events whose tragic consequences we are now witnessing are long since dead, but a special responsibility rests on the shoulders of their successors to atone for the wrongs of the past.

26. Again, I would ask: If the clock can be put back 2,000 years, why cannot we reconsider the obvious mistake which was made when the United Nations agreed to create the State of Israel? No one would claim that the United Nations is infallible; and when it ignored the principle of respect for the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, when it ignored the attempt by one of the parties—the Arab people—to bring the dispute to the International Court of Justice; when it gave its rubber stamp to a State which was founded on terrorism and a disregard for the rights of others, then surely it made a mistake of terrible proportions.

27. The prophetic words of two great statesmen of the time bear witness to the gravity of that mistake. In the memoirs of President Truman, the late President Roosevelt is recorded as having said that a Jewish State in Palestine could be established and maintained only by military force. At the second session of the General Assembly, General Carlos Rómulo of the Philippines, who later became President of this Assembly, said:

"A decision to partition is a decision which is illegal and contrary to the Charter. The Arabs cannot endure such injustice. That is why I appeal to the Member States of the General Assembly not

to make this peaceful Organization an instrument of dispute, strife and bloodshed."

But that was exactly what happened. The General Assembly made itself an instrument of dispute, strife and bloodshed when it agreed to plant, not some of the Jewish people, but a Zionist State in the heart of the Arab world.

28. It is against the background of these grave and fundamental injustices which have been done to the Arab people in this century that any phase of the Palestine question must be viewed. And it will be one of the great ironies of history if the world community, having been so deluded as to turn the clock back 2,000 years, is unable to see its clear duty to right the wrongs of the past twenty years and of the past three weeks. The Israelis have said—and never has there been a more fallacious argument—that a return to the status quo ante bellum would mean a return to the state of belligerence. The very opposite is the truth.

29. There can be no hope of peace in the Middle East so long as Israel is allowed to make further impositions on the Arab world. An aggressor is not entitled to the fruits of his aggression; he has no right to dictate his conditions or to claim anything from the victim of his illegal acts. If these principles are not upheld by the world community, it will thereby ensure that bitterness and distrust and open conflict will continue to be endemic in the Middle East. A further consequence of the failure to uphold these principles may well be that other States, emboldened by the success of Israel's annexationist policy, will hope to follow her example with impunity.

30. My Government is convinced that the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria and the condemnation of this latest Israeli military adventure are a prerequisite, not only for the establishment of peace in the Middle East, but also for the firm establishment of the moral authority of the United Nations. We share the deep desire of all States to see a lasting settlement of the Palestine question based on justice for all, and we trust that the foundation for such a settlement will be laid here. It is for those reasons that the Somali delegation will vote in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution [A/L.519] now before the Assembly.

31. Mr. AIKEN (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs of Ireland): It is sometimes of political importance to find out which side fired the first shot in a situation ripe for explosion, but in view of the continuing and long-standing state of war between Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic, I wish to confine myself, firstly, to expressing deep sympathy with the relatives and friends of those who died in the recent hostilities, and with the wounded and the refugees; and, secondly, to suggesting for the consideration of the Assembly, the basis for a treaty of peace which we believe would give a fair and reasonable chance of preventing another clash every few years, or perhaps a conflict in which nuclear weapons would be used. Indeed, I am convinced that if a stable peace cannot be secured, the race for the bomb is bound to begin in real earnest—particularly if the great Powers do not agree without delay upon a treaty to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons.

32. We are in duty bound, I submit, after carefully and calmly weighing all the problems bedeviling the relations of these two great Semitic peoples, to help them, to the best of our ability, to find the road to a stable and lasting peace. Two of the essential elements in such a peace must be, the Irish delegation believes, firstly, that Israeli forces withdraw to the 4 June line in an orderly and controlled manner which would minimize the danger of acts of individual and local violence leading to further conflict; secondly, that the treaty should be legally and firmly guaranteed by the United Nations, including a majority, if not all, of the great Powers in the Security Council.

33. Speaking on 14 August 1958 [735th meeting], during the special session of the Assembly summoned to deal with the Middle East, I put forward suggestions which the Irish delegation then believed, and still believes, to be essential in order to turn the minds of the peoples of the area away from preparations for war and towards the speedy development of all their resources for the improvement of their standard of living.

34. In considering the situation in the Middle East today, let me say that the Irish people would be untrue to their traditions if they failed to appreciate the problems and psychological difficulties of a people which suffered through the centuries, and in our own day, from the cruel ill-treatment meted out to the Jews in Europe on grounds of race and religion. It would be altogether unacceptable, however, that restitution for European injustice and barbarous persecution should be at the expense of underprivileged Arab families who have been deprived of their homes and lands and are living in miserable refugee camps. Restoration of their lands, or full compensation and an opportunity to settle elsewhere with capital amounting to \$1,000 per head in family, was what we suggested for the refugees in 1958. And I am still convinced that compensation on these lines is the least that can in justice be offered to them.

35. I would urge that the necessary funds to settle the problem of the refugees should be provided by Israel and by the great Powers who played a major role in the establishment of Israel, and also by the other Members of the United Nations who have a vital interest in world peace, and consequently a vital interest in peace and harmony in the Middle East. May I add that the Irish delegation approves of the expansion of the UNRWA programme to give immediate assistance to the people displaced and rendered destitute by the recent hostilities. We whole-heartedly support the appeal made by the Foreign Minister of Belgium [1531st meeting] for generous contributions to enable UNRWA to carry out this urgent humanitarian work, an appeal which has been endorsed by other speakers and yesterday by you yourself, Mr. President.

36. During the course of this debate it has been emphasized by the spokesmen for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, Great Britain, France and other Members of the Assembly that Israel is a recognized State and a Member of the United Nations; and as such Israel is, of course, entitled to defend herself if not defended by a United Nations force. But, I submit, Israel has no right whatever to annex the territory of her neighbours,

and if the Security Council did not insist on the restoration of the boundaries as of 4 June, the very basis of the Charter would be destroyed. It is therefore fervently to be hoped that the Government of Israel will announce without delay that one of her contributions to a treaty of peace and non-aggression, signed by herself and her Arab neighbours, and guaranteed by the United Nations, including the great Powers of the Security Council, will be the withdrawal of her forces to within the boundaries of 4 June last. Anything less than a complete withdrawal would be intolerable on the part of a signatory of the United Nations Charter. Agreed adjustments of the boundaries for economic reasons, such as the improvement of road communications, would not, of course, be excluded at a later stage.

37. It is appalling to contemplate the cost per acre in blood and treasure which Israel, and indeed the world, might have to pay for any additional territory which her Government would try to hold permanently. By annexing a few acres of sand and hills beyond her 4 June line, Israel, instead of strengthening her security, would, I believe, not only add to the danger of a third world war, but would also destroy the chance of developing those fruitful and neighbourly relations which are a stronger and more permanent barrier against attack than the most highly fortified frontiers.

38. Although the possibility of establishing normal relations between Israel and her neighbours may be regarded by some as naïve, many of us have seen in our own time the most bitter enemies realize that the interests of each of them are best served by co-operation for their common good rather than by war and costly preparations for war.

39. I am convinced that, in view of the exclusion of the United Nations peace-keeping force from Israeli territory and its expulsion from Gaza and Sinai, to which the Secretary-General had no option but to agree, there is no possibility that peace can be kept in the Middle East by any force which can be mounted under present conditions by the Assembly. As I have already said, the only hope I see of avoiding another outbreak in the area is the speedy negotiation and signing of a permanent treaty of peace by Israel and the neighbouring States, and that this treaty should be guaranteed by the United Nations. I believe that it would be wise to ask our Secretary-General to assist in the initiation and conduct of the negotiations.

40. There are, of course, many other matters which require to be covered specifically by an Arab-Israeli treaty of peace. Among them: a fair division of the Jordan waters; freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba; air rights for civilian planes; way-leaves for oil and water pipelines; surface traffic rights to the Mediterranean for Arab States; prohibition of hate propaganda.

41. There is, moreover, one vitally important question which, I feel, must be covered by a special United Nations-Arab-Israeli treaty: that is, the internationalization of the Old City of Jerusalem under the direct control of the United Nations, and the guaranteed freedom of access also to their other Holy Places for Christian, Jew and Moslem. This freedom is not

only necessary for the development of those charitable and civilized human relations so nobly and energetically advocated by the great Pope John and the Heads of other religious faiths, but it is also essential to encourage and facilitate the growth in the number of pilgrims and visitors to the fabulous historical and archaeological treasures extending from the Nile to the Jordan and the Euphrates. One passport is all that should be required to visit the area if tourists are to be attracted—the fact that intending visitors needed to obtain two passports in recent years has acted as a grave disincentive.

42. I wish to repeat something I said to the Governments of the Middle East in 1958: that world trade and investment will pass them by if they do not create the necessary conditions of stability. Bigger and bigger ships will be built and alternative routes established to reduce dependence on the Suez Canal. The development of alternative sources of energy will be speeded up to reduce dependence on oil. The rapidly expanding tourist trade will be diverted to less interesting but safer parts of the world.

43. May I say that it would be altogether unjust and short-sighted to throw all the blame for the recent conflict on the States of the Middle East. Its roots spread far and wide beyond the boundaries of Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic. All of us, great and small, are responsible, to a greater or lesser degree, by our neglect to press with sufficient energy for the adoption of effective collective measures to eliminate the conditions which made hostilities inevitable sooner or later.

44. Let all of us resolve today to help deal effectively, with the requisite energy and generosity, and as rapidly as possible, with all the problems of the Middle East.

45. Let the great Powers in the Security Council live up to their primary responsibility under the Charter, which they never cease to emphasize, for taking appropriate action to maintain peace. I would appeal to them to keep their dangerous rivalry and competition within the bounds of common sense in the nuclear age; to refrain from promoting further dissension in the Middle East; to prevent another arms race in the area; and to make, without delay, a formal declaration that they are prepared, in co-operation with the other Members of the United Nations, to guarantee a treaty of peace and non-aggression signed by Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic.

46. I would appeal also to the smaller States of the United Nations to do all in their power to promote the spirit of reconciliation and co-operation between Israel and the neighbouring States, and to support all measures for the relief and resettlement of the refugees, both old and new, and the maintenance of peace in the area.

47. Finally, I beg Israel, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic to give during their negotiations an example of generosity and enlightened self-interest to other areas of the world which are the subject of great-Power tension. Let them, for the sake of their own and all our children, break the vicious spiral of ever-mounting violence and turn the cradle of civiliza-

tion into an area of peace and fruitful co-operation which will be a monument to their wisdom in times to come.

48. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): The United Nations is an open forum in which every sovereign State can and must raise its voice whenever peace is endangered. Of that there is no doubt.

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

49. Because of the universal nature of the Organization and the equality of the Member States in law, the maintenance of peace presupposes the active participation of all nations. We are not a party to the present conflict in the Middle East, for no act of ours has helped to provoke it and we are outside the area of battle. However, this does not make us immune to the dangers of a conflict which could become widespread, nor does it relieve us of the obligation to contribute, so far as we are able, to creating conditions for a stable peace.

50. States such as that I represent can scarcely be listed as military Powers. They are not equipped for war, since their military stature is negligible. On the other hand, because of the moral authority with which their long democratic tradition endows them and their legal prestige, they can play their part successfully in the battle for peace. Our strength derives from our unimpeachable impartiality in this matter. Like all the nations of our continent, Colombia is uncommitted to any of the parties involved in the military confrontation. Its only commitments are those born of respect for the rules of law, for its international obligations and its duties as a Member of the United Nations and of the American regional system.

51. We feel deep admiration and appreciation for the peoples of the Middle East, the cradle of cultures which have made a decisive contribution to the advancement of human dignity, and of the sciences, the arts and technology. Mention of the Arabs brings to mind their early contribution to mathematics, medicine, architecture and law; the Jews also awaken our admiration for their outstanding intellectual capacity, for the stoicism with which they have faced adversity for thousands of years, and for their extraordinary ability to transform barren deserts into a fertile land of promise.

52. One of the manifold distortions of war is that each belligerent considers himself to be the sole repository of truth and justice. We know of no case where those who have gone to the lengths of a military confrontation have ever recognized that their adversaries may in some slight way be right. When the situation becomes grave, the opposing countries do not treat neutral parties with the understanding and tolerance they demand so vehemently for their own cause. If only for these reasons, I venture to presume that neither the Arabs nor the Jews will be pleased with this statement, since combatants only recognize as their friends those on their side, and we are after all not their allies, although we are certainly their friends.

53. We have no intention whatever of flattering any of the belligerents; still less do we wish to hurt them in any way. In this respect I have to say that the

suffering both sides have endured over twenty years of constant international tension, added to the suffering caused by the recent fighting, make it our duty not to increase the dreadful burden of their anguish. We shall try to be objective, respectful and impartial in our approach to the situation.

54. May I say that there seem to be three well-defined tendencies in this matter. The behaviour of the belligerents accounts for two of them; the third is that of the representatives of States which, because they are not directly involved in the struggle in the Middle East and have preserved their neutrality, are in a position to seek viable methods of reducing the tension and achieving gradually, and we hope rapidly, the goal devoutly to be wished of a stable peace.

55. Colombia belongs to this third group and makes no claim to originality. However, my country will maintain that the paths of understanding do not run along extreme lines, but are to be found in the middle line of law, reason and justice.

56. My delegation is guided in this by the attitude of the President of Colombia who, referring to the crisis in the Middle East, pointed to the need to go forward toward a stable peace without pausing for an uneasy truce. The achievement of that aim demands the elimination of all the disruptive factors which have made any settlement impossible between the Arab States and the Jewish State.

57. The world rightly fears that if no progress is made through peaceful means, a recrudescence of the fighting could well be more dangerous than all the previous outbreaks. We cannot resign ourselves to letting the scourge of war become chronic, or even recurrent, in that sorely tried area of the Mediterranean. The United Nations must now pass the great test to which fate has subjected it.

58. Let me now demonstrate that if we are not allies, we are the friends of both Arabs and Jews.

59. First: as able speakers have pointed out in the course of this debate, the State of Israel is the creature of the United Nations. Colombia voted in favour of the resolution which gave Israel its juridical and political life. Its vote was as valid as those of the other States, although the great Powers doubtless exercised greater influence. The United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France fostered the creation of Israel and, consequently, cannot be indifferent to its fate.

60. In the opinion of Colombia, the persistent denial of Israel's existence as a State weakens the foundations of peaceful coexistence in the Middle East. It is a definitely hostile act against a State which from its infancy has belonged to the family of the United Nations. Within the objective framework of this statement I venture to point to that attitude as one of the major determining factors in the bitter and long-standing crisis in the Middle East. I make so bold as to address a well-intentioned appeal to our Arab friends to look again at the situation and convince themselves that the problem is not, as they believe, the creation of the State of Israel but their obstinate and futile repudiation of it.

61. The act by which the General Assembly set up the State of Israel cannot be revoked; but if, for the sake of argument, we agreed that such a procedure was feasible, can anyone seriously believe that this would be a good way of bringing about peace? Let us be realistic and recognize that that hypothetical procedure would be bound to spark off a general conflagration, because it would be unjust, impractical and arbitrary. If it is peace we are seeking we cannot possibly go on denying the existence of a State of such palpable significance in the modern world. A more objective attitude in this matter could well lead to a change in the turbulent events in the Middle East and would certainly open the way to an era of social well-being and economic development.

62. Second: another undeniable cause of the disturbance has been the Arab refugees who, through the failure to assimilate them into any State or economy, have become a powerful factor of disruption owing to the distress felt at their tragic fate.

63. Moved by a desire to co-operate and not to criticize, we venture to state that there must be a radical change in refugee policy and in the philosophy underlying the assistance given to the refugees. Colombia feels that the problem must be tackled through an economic and social approach and that a simple Red Cross attitude is not enough. Why not set in motion far-reaching plans to incorporate into the production process hundreds of idle able-bodied men who in a co-ordinated international operation could do wonders for the development of the region? If the countries of the Middle East, freed from the fear caused by insecurity, were to use for development purposes the sums they now keep aside for armaments, they would soon be in a position to set in motion a complete economic transformation which would abundantly compensate both Arabs and Jews for their sufferings in a long cruel, costly and perilous struggle.

64. May we, with all due respect and deference, call the attention of the great Powers to these aspects of the evolution of events. They could undoubtedly contribute more effectively to the progress of those nations than they have so far if they did not allow their economic aid to be diverted towards armaments. Peoples of such proven fighting ability cannot be armed with impunity. We can be sure that the weapons will not be used to guard the Holy Places and give greater lustre to religious ceremonies. Experience shows that they will be used mainly to attempt to settle their disputes in the barren fields of battle to the death.

65. Third: Colombia is bound by international agreements to full observance of the provisions on freedom of navigation and innocent passage of ships in all seas. We are signatories to the Geneva Convention on the Law of the Sea and are committed to honouring the undertakings we have entered into. These are in any case rules of long standing embodied in customary law long before the signing of the Geneva Convention. To deny any country the right to use waters freely navigated by others is a clear-cut instance of discrimination. We are being absolutely realistic in saying to the Arab States that, by blockading the Gulf of Aqaba they alienated the sympathy of many and

mobilized world public opinion strongly in favour of the cause of freedom of navigation. It is now clear that a stable peace is not possible if there is insistence on crystallizing discriminatory practices in maritime traffic. Free and innocent passage by Israel's ships through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba does not, as far as we can see, endanger the security or impair in any way the economic interests of the Arab countries. To deny such passage is to adopt a policy which in our opinion is not in keeping with the rules and practices of international law.

66. Fourth: Colombia has always subscribed to the view that conquest by force cannot be regarded as legitimate, whatever the circumstances leading up to the use of force. Hence we could not accept the idea of an international organization recommending or imposing a change in the territorial boundaries of a Member State, without its freely given consent. This traditional Colombian attitude stems from juridical conviction and from the clear and irrevocable commitments resulting from the Pact of Bogotá, which established the Organization of American States. Furthermore, the Charter of the United Nations rejects the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, as being incompatible with the aims of the United Nations.

67. Fifth: it is obvious that in order to avoid increasing present international tensions and to forestall new factors of disunity in the future, elementary precautionary measures must be taken; otherwise it will be difficult to keep the peace. We refer to the establishment of demilitarized zones at various points along the border, which should serve as a guarantee of the security and inviolability of the States in the region. Naturally, a vigilant United Nations presence is necessary, either by way of mediators, or representatives of the Secretary-General, or otherwise.

68. Sixth: there can be no question that, as part of the series of measures which must be taken for the achievement of a stable peace in the Middle East, Israel's troops must not remain indefinitely in the Arab countries, but must withdraw to the lines they held prior to the beginning of hostilities on 4 June 1967.

69. We believe that this is a realistic legal position which could lead to the establishment of a stable peace in the Middle East, an area which, for its own recovery and progress, must eliminate all factors making for insecurity. Colombia feels strongly that the United Nations must act with the greatest efficiency and resourcefulness in the difficult and thankless task of preserving peace. Ideally, the United Nations should not be brought in after the event but should anticipate trouble and prevent problems from becoming critical and force from being used.

70. In the case of the Middle East, we do not believe that the General Assembly can do all this. If, as the world expects, sound recommendations are made here, their effectiveness will depend largely on the attitude of the States involved in the crisis and, more particularly, on the Security Council's determination to see them implemented. Colombia considers that the General Assembly would be well advised to make the Security Council responsible for strict compliance with any recommendations this sovereign body may

make. In addition, we believe that the four great Powers have special international responsibilities and commitments both within the United Nations and outside. They can do much to restore peace in the Middle East, to preserve it throughout the world and to enhance the prestige of the United Nations, which continues to be the refuge of all justice and freedom-loving nations.

71. If, for understandable procedural difficulties, the views Colombia shares with many other countries are not reflected in any recommendations the General Assembly may make, we will at least have the satisfaction of having expressed in this forum the opinion of a law-abiding nation which believes in the power of reason and the invincible force of law.

72. Mr. MWEMBA (Zambia): The Republic of Zambia was one of the States which supported the request by the Government of the Soviet Union for the convening of this emergency session of the General Assembly. We supported the Soviet Union proposal because we believe that the primary responsibility of the United Nations is the maintenance of peace and security in the world. My delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the delegation of the Soviet Union for taking the initiative in requesting a special session of the General Assembly to deal with the tragic situation which has developed in the Middle East.

73. My delegation should also like to assure our Secretary-General of our confidence in his untiring efforts for peace before, during and after the war. In this regard, my delegation finds it difficult to justify the criticism levelled at our Secretary-General in the discharge of his heavy responsibilities with regard to the removal of the United Nations Emergency Force from the posts which they held before the start of belligerence in the Middle East. We believe, as others do who have spoken before us, that the Secretary-General acted in the best interest of this Organization and in accordance with the terms of the agreement between the United Arab Republic and the then Secretary-General of the United Nations.

74. My Government, like all other peace-loving States, is seriously concerned about the tragedy which has befallen in the Middle East. We are concerned first and foremost because of the unnecessary waste of human life. We are also concerned because we know that war brings untold human suffering. Secondly, we are concerned about Israel's resort to the use of force in settling international disputes.

75. My Government which shed the colonial yoke only a few years ago strongly believes in the development and maintenance of friendly relations with other nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to that end my Government has maintained and enjoys friendly relations with both the Arab States and the State of Israel. The Middle East has co-operated with my country in its efforts to solve economic, social, cultural and other human problems. The Government and people of Zambia have therefore no quarrel with Israel.

76. I wish to state my delegation's stand on the question of aggression and use of force. My delegation believes in the strict adherence to the Charter of the

United Nations and particularly paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 2 which read:

"3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, ... are not endangered.

"4. 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, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

77. In adherence to the principles quoted above, therefore, aggression, in the eyes of Zambia, is inadmissible and worth nothing but strong condemnation. It should not be said that some States adhere to the United Nations Charter only when it suits them. Members of a club must stick to the rules of the club without which the club is dead.

78. My delegation's concern over the Middle East tragedy originates from our desire for a lasting peace in that much troubled region. In the opinion of my delegation, the permanent solution which we all seek for the Middle East does not lie in the military invasion and occupation of vast foreign territories. We believe that the solution lies in the recognition of and adherence to the solemn decisions of the United Nations. Israel, itself a State created by this Organization on the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, has an inescapable obligation to abide by the resolutions adopted by this Organization and to abide by the Charter of the United Nations.

79. My delegation's fears and apprehensions are genuine. Israel's behaviour from its creation by this Organization shows it has acted in disregard of some of the decisions of this Organization. For example, Israel repudiated the Protocol of Lausanne of 1949 which dealt with the United Nations partition plan as a basis for settlement in relation to the boundaries, internationalization of Jerusalem and the repatriation of Arab refugees. And indeed it was Israel which, together with two other countries, attacked the United Arab Republic in 1956 in violation of the Charter of our Organization.

80. Israel's position on the United Nations Emergency Force was as follows, and I quote Mr. Ben Gurion:

"Israel does not agree in any circumstances that a force—whether its name may be—shall be stationed in its territories or in one of those territories which Israel now occupies."

81. On the morning of 5 June 1967, Israel unleashed a surprise attack against the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. What was more deplorable was that that surprise attack occurred at a time when President Nasser was engaged in endeavours aimed at finding a peaceful settlement to the crisis. Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that, despite Security Council resolution 233 (1967) calling for an immediate cease-fire, Israeli forces continued to thrust deep into Arab territories and they only obeyed the Security Council resolution after realising their territorial ambitions. Those defiant actions on the part of Israel were and

are at variance with the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

82. My delegation is greatly alarmed by the reports that Israel has appointed or is in the process of appointing Governors in certain of the occupied areas. We are even more concerned at Press reports that Israel intends setting up new régimes in pursuance of the imperialist policy of "divide and rule". It is this Israeli policy of territorial aggrandizement and expansionism that my delegation strongly deplores and condemns. In the second half of the twentieth century, Zambia cannot and will not lend itself to the law of the jungle which can only give comfort to the enemies of self-determination, freedom and human dignity.

83. On 19 June, the Foreign Minister of Israel declared before this Assembly: "From 24 May", which was the day when President Nasser ordered the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, "the question who started the war or who fired the first shot became momentarily irrelevant" [1526th meeting, para. 133].

84. My delegation does not accept the view that a threat constitutes an armed attack. Even if we accept, for the sake of argument, that there was a threat to the State of Israel the right course would have been for Israel to bring its complaint to the United Nations which is, in fact, responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and for settling inter-State disputes. Moreover, Article 51 of the Charter, which has been quoted repeatedly in defence of Israeli aggression, does not apply in this case. The mere existence of a threat does not constitute "an armed attack" requiring "self-defence" within the terms of Article 51 of the Charter.

85. Condemnation of aggression in this emergency special session of the General Assembly is not enough. In the opinion of my delegation what is important is how to bring lasting peace to the Middle East. My delegation believes that before any steps can be taken to consider the question of how a lasting peace might be achieved it will be necessary for this Assembly to resolve that the Israeli armed forces be unconditionally and immediately withdrawn from the Arab lands they now occupy. This emergency session will have to act promptly because time is not on our side. It must be stressed that as we sit here hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees, forced from their homes, are languishing in miserable conditions. In the view of my delegation, the problem of refugees is another urgent problem which calls for urgent consideration on the part of the international community. We must all seize the opportunity and resolve this urgent issue so as to justify the faith and confidence which peoples the world over have reposed in this world Organization.

86. I wish to state on behalf of my delegation that the crisis of which we are seized at present is not only an Asian problem because two Asian nations—Syria and Jordan—are involved. Nor should it be regarded as an African problem because an African country—the United Arab Republic—is the victim. It must be realized that the crisis now under consideration concerns all mankind, particularly young nations who are most vulnerable and require the protection of this Organization and all those who believe in the peaceful settlement of disputes and who regard the rule of law as the sine qua non of their international relations.

87. Allow me to restate the position of my delegation. First, Israeli aggression is a matter of deep regret to my delegation and it should be deplored and denounced. Second, Israel should be dissuaded from the colonialist policy of balkanizing Arab lands by the creation of so-called new régimes in occupied areas, especially in West Jordan and the Sinai Peninsula. This policy can only exacerbate the already explosive situation and further isolate the State of Israel from the international community. The appointment of Israel governors in these areas is of grave concern to my delegation. It is not too late for Israel to reverse its policy. Third, in order to create a climate leading to a stable Middle East, this Assembly should, without delay, take a decision ordering Israeli forces to withdraw from Arab territories to positions behind the armistice lines.

88. It is the fervent hope of my delegation that all of us will move forward in unison in search of an equitable settlement to the tragic crisis in the Middle East.

89. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

90. Mr. HAUSNER (Israel): We have been repeatedly exposed here to a vicious word used by the spokesmen of some Arab countries—by one of them as recently as yesterday. This word is "Nazism".

91. It is well known that the Jews were the first and foremost foes and victims of Nazism. As a matter of fact, we were the only people in the world which the Nazis declared should not exist at all. We suffered at their hands a crippling blow, almost a complete national annihilation, and we lost more than one-third of our people, together with many of the centres of our national inspiration and creation in Europe. It is only natural, therefore, that in Israel we continue to pay great attention to the origins and to the methods of this movement, which represents the eruption of bestiality in this age.

92. Moreover, in the course of the trial of Adolf Eichmann, which was held some time ago in Jerusalem, we had a renewed opportunity to unfold this evil doctrine and its hideous methods before the whole world. Being called a Nazi is a burning offence for anybody. When this offence is hurled at us, it is nothing but sheer depravity—although it is perhaps not very surprising, coming, as I will attempt to show, from the strongest remaining vestige of Nazism in the post-war world.

93. It was one of the characteristics of Hitler's tactics to attribute to others the dark deeds which he himself was plotting and to accuse his opponents of the sinister intentions which he himself had been nurturing. While preparing the conquest of the world, Hitler pretended that it was Germany which was the victim of aggression. And while planning and putting into effect the horrible act of genocide against my people, he was accusing us, the Jews, of an intention to bring down Germany, as well as the whole Gentile world. So now the Arabs call us Nazis.

94. One of the basest documents used by the Nazis in spreading their allegations against the Jews was a

booklet called The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. This booklet has long ago been proved to be a forged document, produced under the supervision of one Pyotr Tiranovich Radkovsky of the Czarist Secret Police, the OKHRANA, and by another functionary of this infamous body, a man by the name of Serge Milus. It is a concoction of fantasies about a secret Jewish international plot to overrun the world by dominating its Press, by controlling both finance and the trade unions, by corrupting literature and the arts. The Jewish aim, according to the Protocols, is nothing less than the governing of the whole world.

95. The document contains an imaginary series of lectures in which members of a Jewish secret inner circle expound a conspiracy to achieve world domination. Some of the darkest elements of our age were strong adherents of these Protocols. The earliest was an instigator of the pogroms in Czarist Russia, Pavolachi Kruschevan, who kept publishing the Protocols for so long that he finally succeeded in bringing about blood massacres of Jews in Kishinev in the year 1905. The anti-revolutionaries in Russia and the leaders of the various White armies, among them General Denikin and Admiral Kolchak, were great believers in the Protocols and were fascinated by them. The Nazis realized what a golden opportunity these Protocols afforded for the spreading of their propaganda. Their leaders in fact drugged themselves with this stuff for so long that, in the end, they got into a state of being completely obsessed by it. Hitler himself was such a firm believer in the Protocols that, once he had read them—and I use his own words—he "declared war against the Jew, promising to use every weapon that the human will and spirit could furnish". Even in his last testament, on the rubble of the Third Reich, when he was writing in the bunker of the Chancellory in Berlin, still ordered the German people "mercilessly to resist international Jewry, which is the poisoner of all nations".

96. After Hitler's defeat, this filthy material re-emerged in certain Arab countries. The United Arab Republic and Nazi Germany share between them the infamy of being the only two countries in the world in which this fantastic concoction was published under official state sponsorship. And in both, it was recommended for use in schools. What Hitler's Minister of Information, the late Dr. Josef Goebbels, left undone in Berlin, was taken up by the Minister of Information of the United Arab Republic, Dr. Abdel Kader Hatem, in Cairo. It was he who gave his Government's blessing to the publication of these Protocols, with a summary produced by the Egyptian writer, Abbas Mahmud Alaakadi. Moreover, the Egyptian Ministry of Information has taken on the job of spreading this invective to other countries. English and French editions of the Protocols for use in Africa were prepared, published and distributed. Nor were these the only publications of their kind. We have again found Hitler's Mein Kampf in abandoned officers' bags in Sinai.

97. When I was prosecuting in Jerusalem the arch-criminal Adolph Eichmann, I followed the reactions of the world Press to the trial. The Arab Press was the only one in the world to express to Eichmann messages of encouragement and to give him a blessing. The Times of Jordan, in its edition of 24 April 1961, addressed Eichmann in the following words: "Find

consolation in the fact that your trial will one day lead to the liquidation of the remaining 6 million Jews". After his execution, Eichmann was awarded by the Arab Press the halo of a martyr-saint "Shahid" and presented as a guide whose footsteps will be followed by succeeding Arab generations.

98. The Arab Press and the Arab information offices have been publishing for years material directly imitating, if not surpassing, the infamous Jew-baiter, Julius Streicher, who, may I recall, was found guilty by the International Tribunal of a crime against humanity. It was his incitement against the Jews which was the crime that led him to the prisoners' dock in Nuremburg, and subsequently, by a unanimous vote of American, British, Soviet and French judges, to the gallows, which he well deserved.

99. It is sufficient even cursorily to peruse similar official publications in Syria and Egypt to realize immediately that, as far as vile incitement, hatred and bigotry are concerned, they give no way to Streicher's despired vituperations.

100. I submit that this propaganda is a crime against humanity and that the people responsible for these publications are criminals against mankind. Had there been in existence an international military tribunal of criminal jurisdiction, which Israel has been advocating for years before the United Nations, these instigators to hatred and violence would have properly found their places in the dock there. Since there is, unfortunately, not yet such a tribunal in existence, we submit before this august body of the United Nations our grave indictment.

101. Perhaps we should not really be surprised that these shocking outbursts of hate closely following the lines of nazi Germany now appear in the United Arab Republic, for it is that country which has been continually offering refuge and shelter to some of the top Nazis on the run. The list of persons is long and varied. Among them was Johann von Leers, better known in Cairo as Omar Amin, one of Goebbels' principal propaganda assistants, who found conditions, until his recent death in Cairo, conducive to the continuation of the spread of his anti-Jewish material.

102. Then there is S.S. Gruppenfuehrer Alois Moser, alias Hassan Suleiman, in the capacity of an adviser on organizing Egyptian youth on the pattern of the Hitler Jugend. In earlier, probably even more glamorous, years, General Moser had been the commander of an operational unit which was responsible for the extermination of over 96,000 Jews—men, women and children. I hope that the Ukrainian representative will be interested to learn that most of Moser's crimes were committed on Ukrainian soil, and that his duties also included the combating of Partisans and of Soviet patriots.

103. I am sure that the Polish representative will be interested to know that Joachim Gleim, alias Ali Al-Nachan, committed unspeakable atrocities as a Gestapo chief in Poland; that there is an arrest warrant out for him in Poland; and that he holds a high position today in the Egyptian secret police. Since the Government of Poland has shown great genuine interest in the extradition of a nazi criminal from

Brazil, I hope that the information disclosed here may perhaps serve a useful purpose.

104. Another of these gentlemen, Dr. Hans Eisele, formerly of the Buchenwald concentration camp, is being employed in Cairo as an exclusive physician for very important persons. Among many other victims of Dr. Eisele in his nazi days there are numerous Czechoslovak patriots and fighters.

105. Foreign dignitaries calling on President Nasser may not have recognized in the efficient officer responsible for the President's safety the nazigeneral, Oscar Dirlewanger, the ex-commander of the Dirlewanger Brigade which won its fame for cruelty against Polish and Soviet Partisans.

106. I could go on and on, but let those few names suffice as representative examples. I wish to note also that Egypt has so far never extradited to any country any of these escaped nazi criminals to stand trial.

107. When all this is taken into consideration, it is perhaps not surprising that in an interview with the extreme right-wing German paper Deutsche Nationalzeitung President Nasser is reported to have said: "During the Second World War our sympathies were with the Germans."

108. To round out the picture, I should add that the fantasies of the Jewish international plot reappeared in Soviet Russia during the last years of Josef Stalin. He then believed in another version of this perverted myth, according to which Jews were the supposed centre of a capitalistic plot to destroy the Soviet Union and to assassinate its leaders. This was the tragic background of the doctors' trial held in 1953 in the Soviet Union, as a result of which innocent persons were put to death. The good name and honour of the executed Jewish doctors were posthumously restored when de-Stalinization measures were taken in the Soviet Union following the well-known Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party. May I add that since I am a firm believer in the ultimate victory of truth, there is no doubt in my mind that a day will come when another Communist Congress in Soviet Russia will completely disavow the attitude taken now by the present leaders of the Soviet Union and will dissociate itself from them, as was previously the case with some of their predecessors. The fantastic accusation of a Jewish international plot has also found its way into Czechoslovakia and was responsible there for the tragic trial of Rudolf Slansky.

109. Prejudices, however, live long and die slowly. Even in the post-Stalin period, the myth of the Jewish conspiracy prevailed and re-emerged in one way or another. Professor Kichko of the Academy of Science and Arts published a vicious pamphlet called "Jewry Without Embellishment", restating the old anti-Jewish stuff. His publication was finally withdrawn from circulation in Soviet Russia. It reappeared, however, some three years ago in Uzhgorod, Ukraine, in the form of another pamphlet called "In the Name of God Jahwe", which again seeks the Jew in every conceivable gutter and attributes to him every imaginable vice.

110. Most Arab spokesmen—and only yesterday the representative of Yemen—have painted before the

Assembly an idyllic picture of Jews and Arabs living together in harmony for centuries in Arab countries under the banner of the brotherhood of man. I am afraid that this must sound like hollow mockery in the ears of the Yemenite Jews who for centuries have been deprived of civil rights and who in Yemen have been always considered as second-rate citizens. But much more alarming and immediate are the recent reports of mob attacks on Jews in various Arab countries where the mob takes out on the Jew its wrath against Israel. According to the Italian newspaper Corriere della Sera of 14 June 1967, sixteen Jews were thrown from rooftops and balconies; a Jewish bus-driver was burned to death in his bus, in Tripoli, Libya. According to earlier reports from that city, six Jews were stoned, burned, or otherwise killed on 9 June. Jewish shops were broken into and property was looted. The Italian journalist Giorgio Fattori, writing in La Stampa on 21 June 1967, reported that the Jews of Tripoli had barricaded themselves in their homes and that those who risked leaving their abodes in search of food or medicine did so at the risk of death.

111. According to The New York Times of 14 and 15 June 1967, about 600 Jews, including the Chief Rabbi and the president of the Cairo community were arrested in the United Arab Republic. Jews are now escaping from Egypt in fear of their lives. Refugees arriving in Italy reported that they were arrested, not allowed to communicate with their families, were made to sign expulsion papers, and were taken handcuffed directly from gaol to ship, their families remaining behind.

112. In Tunisia riots broke out on 5 June and the great Synagogue of Tunis was set afire. Jewish shops were sacked and one Jew was reported to have died of a skull fracture received during the rioting.

113. According to the Turkish newspaper Adalet, fifty-seven Jews were killed by a Syrian mob in Kamishli, Syria, which, according to the newspaper, is near the Turkish border. Jews in Damascus and Aleppo were attacked in a manner reminiscent of European pogroms. In Iraq brutal administrative restrictions have been applied to Jews, even before the outbreak of hostilities. There were mass arrests of Jews there and, from May 1967, the Iraqi Jews have been subjected to discriminatory and humiliating legislation.

114. According to The New York Times of 15 June, the Jews of Morocco live in constant fear following the murder of a Jew in Meknès and the stabbing of another in Rabat. Some of the worst excesses occurred in Aden, where terrorists attacked Jewish places of worship, Jewish homes and Jewish shops. The British Government has facilitated the evacuation of the remaining Jewish community. They were flown out by chartered plane from the British military airport. Only two Jews, both in hospital, remain in Aden.

115. Mr. Philip Jacob Samuel, Chairman of the Aden Jewish community and one of the refugees airlifted to London, is reported to have said:

"I have never seen such hatred and deliberate destruction. Even the young Arabs were screaming out that they wanted to kill us. It was terrible. Had

it not been for the troops, they probably would have. Three Jews trapped in the Crater district were attacked by an armed mob. Two of them were beaten to death and cut into pieces."

This marks the end of the ancient Jewish community of Aden which had existed in the area probably for nineteen centuries, since the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. These cowardly acts should receive the immediate attention of the General Assembly.

116. In conclusion, I would say this: in view of all these facts, let candid world opinion judge who deserves to be branded as a nazi: Hitler's faithful disciples in the Arab countries, or those who fight back the strongest remaining nazi element in existence today, by whatever progressive names they may call themselves.

117. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I now call on the representative of Syria, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

118. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): If I were to summarize the statement on the Eichmann trial to which we have just been subjected, I would very briefly and simply put it this way: Eichmann, the face in Israel's mirror of crimes. For the prosecutor of Eichmann forgot one thing: to prosecute the criminals of the terrorist gangs, the Irgun, the Herut, and so on.

119. Let us suppose that a newcomer appeared in the General Assembly and listened for more than thirty-five minutes to details about the Eichmann trial—Eichmann, the nazi criminal—and how he was brought to Israel, what would this newcomer to the General Assembly think? He would think that the Prosecutor-General of the Jerusalem Tribunal was indulging in an exercise in casuistry, to say the least.

120. For what is the subject under discussion? What is the item on the agenda of the General Assembly? The item on the agenda of the General Assembly is an aggression committed by the Israeli regular armies against the neighbouring Arab States of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. The Eichmann trial is not on the agenda of the special session of the General Assembly.

121. But surely this grave diversion must have an aim; and the aim in bringing here the prosecutor of Eichmann is indeed to divert the attention of the General Assembly, to divert the attention of world public opinion, and American public opinion, from the subject under discussion, namely, the Israeli invasion and aggression to which the Israelis themselves have confessed. But this invasion was accompanied by many acts which have been brought into relief here: the use of napalm bombs by the Israeli invaders, the killing of civilians and refugees who were ousted and expelled from Gaza, from Qalquliyah, from Jerusalem, from Kuneitra, from all parts occupied by the victorious invaders of Arab territory. War crimes have been very clearly defined in the Nuremberg Statutes and Laws: unprovoked aggression, attacks on other people's territory, the killing of civilians, the expelling of inhabitants from their territories. These war crimes were actually committed by the Israeli invaders during the infamous week of 5 to 14 June 1967, which the General Assembly is discussing at the present

time; and it is into these details that we are looking. To make us forget about the victims of the napalm bombs, who can be found in the hospitals of Jordan, of the United Arab Republic and of Syria, to make us forget about the killing, the raping, all the fascist atrocities that have been committed during the last two weeks, the prosecutor of Eichmann has been brought into the picture. But the picture that we have to look at is the picture of Israeli war crimes and crimes against humanity.

122. Surely it is no mere coincidence that the very prosecutor of Eichmann should be brought to the General Assembly. Why was he? Because the accusation that zionism is synonymous with nazism has been made so often and demonstrated with such decisive proof that the Israelis and the Zionists have found it necessary to bring into the picture someone who published a volume of 700 pages on the Eichmann trial. And all this to divert the attention of the Assembly from what I have said is the specific item on the agenda, namely the Israeli aggression against Arab territory.

123. I need not go very far to prove the complete identification of zionism with nazism. The hero of Israel, Dayan, used a certain word to describe the war against the Arabs; the term he used was the word "blitz". As we all know, "blitzkrieg" is one of the terms that were used by the Nazis to describe their war in Poland and in other parts of Europe. Dayan describes his invasion of Arab territory as a blitzkrieg. That is typical nazi terminology.

124. Eichmann's prosecutor himself has been here addressing the Assembly. Certainly he should remember an article published in The New York Times in January 1960, in which the Prosecutor-General of the Nuremberg Trial criticized very sharply, and on the basis of and in terms of international law, the conduct of the trials and the way in which Eichmann was taken out of Germany and tried in Jerusalem. The Prosecutor-General of the Nuremberg Trials in that article to which I refer stated very clearly that if what was involved was a crime against humanity, then the whole of humanity should be conducting the trials, and not the Jews alone; because the victims of Eichmann were not only Jews, they were also Poles, Russians, Soviet citizens, citizens from countries all over Europe, from all the places that the nazi and fascist armies had overrun. But of course, Eichmann's prosecutor could not remember that.

125. Now, he made insinuations about co-operation between nazi leaders and Arab leaders. This lie, which has been disseminated since the very rise of nazism and zionism, especially by zionism during the last twenty-five years since the start of its forcible occupation of Arab Palestine—this lie about co-operation between Nazi and Arab leaders has been repeated time and time again by a man who now professes to represent the law. But I should like to refer to one of the pages of the Eichmann trial, the page concerning the assassination in Tel Aviv of a Hungarian journalist named Kerstner. Why was Kerstner assassinated? He was a Hungarian Jew, a newspaperman, who came to settle in the land of milk and honey, in Palestine, in Israel. He was assassinated in a very mysterious manner, and the

reason he was assassinated, very briefly, was that he revealed the secret talks and secret deals that had taken place between Zionist leaders and Nazi leaders. And I challenge the prosecutor to disprove this and tell us what were the real reasons behind the killing of Kerstner. If he had been able to tell everything in his article, he would have proved that there was co-operation, secret co-operation between the zionist and the nazi leaders.

126. Again I shall go to zionist sources for this shameful page in the history of zionism and its co-operation with nazism. Such co-operation was again revealed by a zionist writer in the United States, a writer named Ben Hecht, in his book Perfidy.^{6/} And what is that whole book, Perfidy, about? It concerns exactly this co-operation, between the zionist and the nazi leaders.

127. And I would refer the speaker who preceded me to another book on the Eichmann trial by Hannah Arendt.^{7/} Hannah Arendt is a United States citizen of the Jewish faith, a professor of philosophy at Princeton University and a well-known writer. One of her books, The Revolution,^{8/} was actually translated into the Arabic language. Hannah Arendt disclosed in her book—and regrettably, I was not expecting to deliver this great lecture so I did not bring all these documents with me—but Hannah Arendt disclosed in clear and unequivocal terms, after she left the United States and attended the Eichmann trial, what were the political motives of the Zionist leaders and of Israel behind the Eichmann trial. Certainly there was nothing but Zionist demagoguery, nothing but political expediency, nothing but what we have been subjected to for the last thirty-five minutes before I came here to speak.

128. I will say nothing more except to advise those representatives who would wish to compare my words with the words of the previous speakers, to go back to those two sources written by people of the Jewish faith, one of them a Zionist, Ben Hecht, in his book Perfidy, and the other, Hannah Arendt, who is not a Zionist, in her book Eichmann in Jerusalem.

129. I had expected a man who professes to represent the law to have real respect for the word. For the word is a sacred thing, and to profane the word is in itself a crime, and one who indulges in profanation of the word should be brought to trial. He spoke about The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, saying that they were published in the United Arab Republic; but I will tell the speaker that there are at least three or four places in the United States, that have been and that are publishing The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Why, therefore, did he not speak about those places in the United States where The Protocols of the Elders of Zion are published and re-published, edited and re-edited, in the English language, and places in England, and places in France where they are published in French, and places in many other European countries?

^{6/} Ben Hecht, Perfidy (New York, Messner, 1961).

^{7/} Hannah Arendt, Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil, rev. ed., 1965 (New York, Viking Press).

^{8/} Hannah Arendt, On Revolution (New York, Viking Press, 1965).

130. Who was it who wrote about the war of liberation and the war of independence, describing the Zionist leaders in approximately the following terms:

"We were conspirators outside the law, but obeying a law of our own"?

That sentence, using even more shocking terms, is to be found in the book on the Haganah.

131. What is the revolt written about by Menachem Begin, now a member of the Israeli Cabinet? The revolt is a description of the crimes committed by these terrorist gangs, the Stern gang, the Irgun, the Herut and others, against the Arab inhabitants of Palestine. In the last passages of the book, Menachem Begin, the hero of Deir-Yassin, describes, how the orders were given, after agreement with the Haganah, to carry on their War of Liberation and their War of Independence by undertaking a "defensive-offensive". Those two words, "defensive-offensive" occurred in the book written by Menachem Begin. Now what is an "offensive-defensive"? God knows. But it is something like what happened in 1956, what happened on 5 June 1967 when the perfidious Pearl Harbor sort of attack was perpetrated against the Arab territories.

132. But in dealing with all this, we are really dealing with the modalities of the problem. We have not even touched the essence of the problem. The essence is this: does the Zionist doctrine lend itself to an interpretation similar to that of Nazism? I submit that the answer is "yes" because they both profess their belief in race, that there is a chosen race, that being the "chosen people" they have the right to do everything, to disobey any law, to obey laws only of their own making, to justify their crimes, to rationalize everything that is rejected by civilized humanity. Surely to take 350 people in Deir-Yassin and massacre them in cold blood, piling their corpses one on top of the other, is a war crime. Surely, to attack Tiberias in 1955 under the cover of darkness and to kill about 200 people who had nothing to do with any attack against Israel is a war crime.

133. Need I go on to enumerate all the crimes that were committed in Gaza, in Qalquiliyah, in Kibya, in Tiberias, in Holah and on all the armistice lines that were destroyed by Israel on 5 June? To enumerate them would take a very long time and the patience of the Assembly has been taxed time and again by an enumeration of all the resolutions and condemnations by the Security Council and the General Assembly of aggression by Israel.

134. Aggression in itself is a war crime that was committed only by the Nazis. Unfortunately, we are living in a world in which the saying of the French thinker, Pascal, "Verité en deca des Pyrénées, erreur au-delà"—"what is true on one side of the Pyrenees is a mistake on the other side"—applies.

135. We are living in a world of double standards, and this world of double standards has been very late indeed in pointing the accusing finger at Zionism and the Zionist leaders and saying to them "You are war criminals". For if there were no double standard, the man who came and spoke here as the Prosecutor-General would have been tried in the dock himself as one of the war criminals.

136. Public memory is short. But when did this crisis that the General Assembly is now dealing with start? It started on 7 April 1967. On that day, the Israeli military machine unleashed its inner hatred, a hatred beyond its power to control, against the Syrians on their borders across the armistice lines. Seventy sorties of jets and bombers attacked civilians and villages where no military targets whatsoever existed; they destroyed houses, killed civilians and burned people with napalm bombs. That was the point of escalation of the present crisis. In my address to the Security Council on that particular aspect, I cited the report of the Mixed Armistice Commission, a United Nations body, which proved beyond any doubt that the Israelis provoked the Syrians, attacked them, attacked civilian targets, killed some of the civilian population and destroyed private property.

137. But the chain of events proceeded at such a pace as to make it difficult to go back to that day of 7 April. But neither 7 April nor 5 June 1967 nor 30 October 1956, nor Deir Yassin nor Qalquiliyah nor Kibya, nor Geshar, nor Tiberias, nor any other place where crimes were committed by so-called civilized people who use that word and proclaim it will ever be forgotten. They will be remembered because those who have great control over the mass media of communications, who think they can mislead people and deceive millions, can do it some of the time to all the people, but not all the time to all the people. And the truth will dawn one day, the truth that will show the whole world that the Arabs were the victims of an aggression by the same people who were given hospitality by the Arabs.

138. But I would not be doing my duty in this brief intervention if I did not state that what the preceding speaker said about seventy-five Jews being killed in Kaweshli in northern Syria is a complete lie because there are no Jews in that region, no Jews whatsoever. He cannot answer this and I challenge him to prove it. This is just one instance of the theatrical performance—I would even say the very poor and very cheap theatrical performance—which the Israeli Zionist speakers are indulging in one after the other in order to divert the attention of this Assembly from the very grave matter it is considering—that is the Israeli invasion of Members States of the United Nations, the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria.

139. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of the United Arab Republic, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

140. Mr. HILMY II (United Arab Republic): My colleague, the representative of Syria, has fully answered the accusations of the representative of Israel. I am here only to stress the point of view of my Government in regard to those accusations. I totally deny the accusations the representative of Israel has levelled against my Government. No one believes that we are anti-Semites. It has been stated time and again that we cannot be anti-Semites for the simple reason that we are Semites ourselves. If he says that we are "anti-Jew", that also is not true because he cannot prove it.

141. The representative of Israel thinks that he is here for the purpose of a trial against the United Arab Republic. The United Arab Republic is not being prosecuted here. It is Israel that is being prosecuted. It is Israel that is the aggressor. We state here that Israel is the aggressor. It is seizing land that does not belong to it and we want Israel to withdraw. Therefore, the issue is the withdrawal of Israel, and not anti-Semitism or synagogues or how the Jews have been treated.
142. In my country, and I am sure in all the Islamic countries, there is no synagogue that has been disturbed or attacked. At least, we do not go on top of the minarets of mosques and hoist a flag as Israel has done with respect to the mosque in Kantara. We never did that. We respect all religions, and the Jewish religion is not excluded.
143. The Jewish community in Egypt has always enjoyed complete freedom in every respect. President Nasser, in his capacity as the President of the United Arab Republic, sends a special representative every year to the Chief Rabbi to congratulate him on any Jewish religious occasion.
144. It is true that we have put some people under custody. We have arrested some Jews. But we have arrested some Moslems, too, when they have broken the law. Jews are not immune simply because they are Jews. For instance, if the Jews of Egypt throw bombs at the United States Embassy, they are liable to be arrested and prosecuted. When they killed the British Lord Moyne, no one expected us to give them medals for that. We arrested them and prosecuted them. When there is a war and Israel is attacking us, you do not expect us to give a cocktail party for the Jews; we take measures. But that does not mean that we are anti-Semites.
145. As for Mein Kampf and the imaginary things that the Eichmann prosecutor said we had done, on behalf of my Government I totally refute this and deny it categorically.
146. Before I leave the rostrum, I should like to ask the Israeli prosecutor this: if he has such a sense of justice, what has he done to those who assassinated Count Folke Bernadotte, those who killed the Arabs in Deir Yassin, those who acted as they did in Gaza in 1956, and those who did what they did in Kaffer Kassem in 1956 when all the inhabitants of the village were murdered by machine-guns? It is true you tried the captain, but after two months he was released even though he killed sixty-four innocent persons. To those members of the Assembly who are not familiar with that incident I should like to recall that the Jewish Military Governor issued a curfew order and forgot to pass it on to the Arab inhabitants—the owners of the land. So, when those farmers returned at sundown to go to sleep, they were met with machine-gun fire and were wiped out. The captain was tried, and after two months he was released because his conduct was very good. Is that a sense of justice?
147. I would reserve the right of my delegation to elaborate further if that becomes necessary.
148. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Saudi Arabia, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.
149. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I listened in the lounge to part of the Israeli Prosecutor General's speech. About twenty minutes later I came into this Hall and I had planned to keep silent, until he engaged in further diatribes against the Arabs as a whole. As I said during my last reply, any attack, whether it is military or verbal, against any Arab, is an attack on us all. Let there be no mistake, lest the Western Powers think they can divide us by regarding us as being separate States; any attack on a single Arab by an aggressor is an attack against the Arab nation and the Arab homeland.
150. I do not see why Mr. Eban should have chosen the prosecutor of Mr. Eichmann to exercise the right of reply, unless his arsenal of eloquence is empty as a result of repeating the same arguments about the right of Western Zionists to establish a colonial régime in the Arab homeland.
151. I should like to take up Mr. Hausner's complaints and remarks about the brutality of the Arabs to persons of the Jewish faith in Arab countries. I presume that the prosecutor of Eichmann is a lawyer, and he should have known, because of his legal background, that Eichmann was abducted in contravention of all the rules and principles of international law. I remember the Security Council meeting that was held at the request of none other than Argentina to protest against the abduction of Eichmann by Israeli desperadoes from inside a sovereign State of the United Nations.
152. There was a great furor in the Council then, but the Israelis seemed cool and collected because they knew that they could apply all kinds of pressures, through certain western Powers, on Argentina and others. Sometimes they push certain western Powers into bringing pressures to bear on the Arab world, so why should they not do it on Argentina. There was silence after the furor in the Security Council about the irregularity and about the flouting of the principles of international law.
153. So it seems that the Israelis can get away not only with murder, they can get away with the flouting of international law and with the flouting of the resolutions of the United Nations of 1947. They can get away with it by saying that no matter what this Assembly decides, even if 121 nations vote for their withdrawal from the Holy Land and from the usurped Arab territories, they will not obey.
154. Why is this? Perhaps, as my friend from Syria has just said, they have repeated to themselves again and again "We are the chosen people of God, and we should have privileges in this world and therefore we should have our way". If God discriminates, then I do not know; there must be something wrong with the Deity, the God of all of us, not one one sect and one religion. He is the God of the atheists, too, because he is the author of the universe. But anyone who repeats to himself day in and day out that he has privileges, as the Israelis do, finally, affects his subliminal mind and the subliminal minds of others and believe that the Gentiles should be their slaves, should be at their behest, and remember, a Gentile is anyone who is not a Jew.

155. Eichmann was a war criminal, and he should have been tried by an international court for war criminals. I do not think the international court of war criminals has been disbanded in Germany, which is still trying to chase some Nazis, wherever they may be, in order to bring them to trial, just because Israel is waging a campaign against Germany to this day I and the Germans bear a sense of guilt. I think that anyone who wages war bears a sense of guilt, but Germany will remain a guilty nation until Doomsday because the godless Zionists believe so. Isay "godless" judiciously, because Judaism is a religion of mercy and passion and forgiveness.

156. My Soviet colleagues will bear me out, the German observer, if he is here, will bear me out when I say that many Germans, many Frenchmen, many Soviet citizens were victimized and were killed by the Nazi régime. But they have stopped crying. They have buried their dead and licked their wounds and have started life anew. But not the Israelis, they always want to confront the world with a sense of guilt, but when they kill others, they have no sense of guilt. Why is this? It is because they have convinced themselves that they are the chosen people of God. I pity them because they believe it, not in a religious manner but in the sense that they believe that whatever they do is right.

157. Time and again I have said that we Arabs have no quarrel with the Jews as such. Many of them lived in Arab lands in peace. My colleague from Iraq will bear me out that, in pre-war days, there were in Baghdad alone eighty thousand Arab Jews who spoke Arabic. Perhaps they knew a few words of Hebrew just as the Catholics know a few words of Latin because of the Liturgy. But those Jews in Iraq, in Morocco, in Algeria, in Egypt, in fact wherever they were in the Arab countries, were treated as the citizens of those countries. They were not molested. They had their department stores and their little shops, depending on how successful they were. In Cairo, in Beirut, in Damascus, nobody accosted them or persecuted them. Noboday called them kikes, as they do in this very country.

158. Yesterday I was on the sidewalk in New York, after having had dinner with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Pakistan, who treated me and my colleagues to a dinner of curry. I became thirsty and on taking a cab at 10.30 p.m. I passed by a cafeteria on the corner of Park Avenue and 28th street. I decided to eat some watermelon to quench the thirst caused by the curry, because it was so delicious that I ate a lot of it. Someone recognized me with my tray as I was waiting my turn to buy a piece of watermelon, and he said to me, "you are Mr. Baroody, are you not?" I said, "Yes, I am Baroody." He said: "I love your oratory. I listen to you whenever I can, but you know I am a Jew". I said: "So what? God bless you if you are a Jew". He said: "This is my daughter and this is my wife". This is a lovely family. He said: "I know that what you have said is true. Many Americans here think that we are not full-fledged Americans". I do not know whether he had read that article in the Sunday New York Times, but evidently he was talking from his personal experience. He said: "They do not consider us to be full-fledged citizens, in attitude if not in rights—perhaps because of that Zionist movement". I said: "Well,

you expressed it for me". And then there were hands pointing at me and saying "This is Baroody, the fellow who speaks on television".

159. I paid by bill and went out. I was surrounded by twenty-five persons at midnight. It was midnight. Most of them were Jews. I was calm and serene and they were interested in what I had said, until a policeman got worried, thinking there was some commotion. I said to the policeman: "It is all right; I am from the United Nations and these are common people of the street. I am at a level with them. I do not like to speak only from the rostrum. They are my brothers. These are Jews. And I am an Arab. Do not worry, I will be all right; do not worry about me; do not worry about them".

160. I spoke to them and we had a discussion for half an hour. And it seems that there were some who were not Jews, and they were listening to our conversation. I do not have to repeat to the Assembly what I told them. Some of them were taxi drivers, having a late dinner. I saw their coin receptacles, and that is how I knew that they were taxi drivers. Others seemed to be well-dressed, and others were in shirt-sleeves. They were Jews, 80 per cent of them; twenty out of twenty-five. I spoke to them and I told them what I thought, that there was no enmity between the Arab and Jew, but that those Western colonialists are an incursion in our midst. Ethnologically they could be anything but Semites. But they have a semitic religion, like a Christian who is from Scotland, or from England, or from Norway, or from Sweden. Ethnologically, he is not a Semite, but Christianity is a Semitic religion and he follows his religion.

161. Our coloured brothers from Africa ethnologically are not Semites. But if they are Moslems, they are the followers of a semitic religion, for after all Judaism, Christianity and Islam are all semitic religions and worship the same God.

162. And they heeded what I was saying to them. One of them told me: "You are not such a monster". I said: "Thank God that I am human like you. I am glad that a Jew says that Baroody is human like any other person".

163. But this was not the climax. They wanted to argue with me. I said: "I have been arguing the whole day in the United Nations and I think that I have spoken enough; I must go and have some rest". One of them said: "Now be merciful to that gentleman. He is right. Do not let us keep him on the sidewalk". Then I turned and I was accosted by three persons. Evidently they were non-Jews, and they said: "We heard what you said to those kikes. We do not want them and the Communists in our midst". I said: "Please, for heaven's sake, they are your brothers; they are Americans". They said: "America is for the true Americans".

164. This is what I have been warning my Jewish friends, many of whom are against zionism, who are loyal Americans, who are loyal Frenchmen, who are loyal Egyptians, who are loyal Syrians, who are loyal Arabs of the Jewish faith.

165. But the Zionists are committed to that frenzied dream, a disturbing dream, which time and again I

have said might turn into a nightmare. They seem to be like those horses that pulled the carriages in my younger days, with blinkers. They see only the path they are following. Anyone on the wayside does not count. They do not see him. They have eyes and do not seem to see; and they have ears and do not seem to hear. And if I address them in this Assembly, through you, Mr. President, it is because, in humanity, I pity those Zionists who are the victims of this nightmare that started as a dream.

166. I was sitting in the Café des Ambassadeurs in Geneva one day—now it is the headquarters of some watchmaker, perhaps Rolex or some other name—sipping a cup of coffee, unknown to those sitting beside me. They were Iraqi Jews. I knew this from their Arabic and from the pockmarks on their skins left by a certain parasite which seems to flourish on the skin of some Iraqis and others in the Euphrates basin. And they were talking to one another and saying: "Oh, those days of Baghdad. We are living now in exile in Geneva". So I wondered, Geneva is a beautiful city. And I spoke to one of them in Arabic without introducing myself. I said: "I am an Arab and you seem to be in exile. Why is it you consider yourself as being in exile?" He said: "No matter how beautiful Geneva is, Baghdad has been our homeland; Iraq is still our homeland". I said: "But why?" He said: "We are the victims of the Zionist movement. We had to leave because Arabs have been fomented against us, Arab crowds. We had to leave. We love Baghdad."

167. Whose victims are they? The victims of the Arabs amongst whom they had lived for generations? Or are they the victims of Western Zionism, the colonial incursion into the heart of the Arab homeland? I leave it to you to answer, gentlemen. Whose victims are these Iraqi Jews who spoke Arabic and ate Arabic food? The only difference between them and their fellow Arabs was that they worshipped in the synagogue and the others worshipped in the mosque. It was the same God. They dressed alike. They spoke alike. Their traditions were alike.

168. And our colleague from Israel, none other than the prosecutor of Eichmann, has the temerity to speak of Arab atrocities. Has he forgotten Deir Yassin, when a Palestinian village was surrounded at dawn and the people terrorized—not terrorized but machine-gunned—and even the animals were killed? And as I said, during Joshua's time—I refer him to the Bible—the trees were cut down. He has the courage to talk about Arab brutalities. Who started all this tragedy? None other than the Western Zionists, who wanted to establish a colonial State in the midst of the Arab countries. Talking about war crimes, were the Germans the only war criminals, or only the Germans produced the war criminals? Or was it the fate of the defeated countries? Do you mean to tell me the victorious nations were all angels in the Second World War? Who threw the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki when he knew the war was over? I am talking as a humanitarian now, not as an Arab. Who destroyed Dresden when they knew Dresden was not a military target but in order to terrorize the German people to submit likewise? Who destroyed Coventry? None other than the German people. These Westerners, the blood-thirsty Westerners, most of whom claim to be Christians. Hypocrites. Christ is the Prince of

Peace. Christ has preached to love one's enemy. You cannot be a Christian by going to pray on Sunday and then the next day cut each other's throats.

169. And now you plant amongst us none other than one of your profusions in the Arab homeland. I am not angry. This is my way to get across to anyone who may have been nagging me.

170. Christians. Christ. The Prince of Peace. Do they follow Christ? In business they cut each other's throats. In wars they cut each other's throats. Why should they not cut out throats by proxy through the Israelis? It stands to reason; it is logical. Who do they think they are fooling? Arabs? Only the Arab and Latin tradition of the Mediterranean is truly Christian and truly Moslem and truly Judaic. They follow Isaiah the oriental Jews; they follow Micah. The Zionists do not follow these prophets. They are cut-throats like the political Western Powers who sent them and planted them in our midst. As we say in Arabic, let the Zionists put incense and the Western Powers put more incense in their mouths before they pronounce the name of an Arab. The attitude of those colonial Western Powers has not changed. We know it. I have lived amongst them for long periods—for many, many years—not long periods of time, but many, many years. They snub one another. Why should they not snub? Their arrogance is noted in their literature—snobbery, arrogance, ridicule, making fun of one another in some of their literature. Why should we expect more of them?

171. Stand aside so that they might colonize us now by proxy? Whom do they think they are? Let them wake up. There are good people amongst them. I am talking of the politicians; I am not talking of the Western peoples. The Western people are sane, the Western people are human as any other human beings. The peoples will rise one day against the politicians, the demagogues, and they will be trodden under their heels. The peoples are greater than their Governments.

172. Did the Western Powers constitute courts to try the war criminals of the victors? No. The victors were angels in the Second World War. Only the defeated produce war criminals. What a double standard. What a deviation from justice. In 1946 I happened to be in Spokane, Washington, addressing either the Lions' Club or—I have forgotten; I used to address many clubs—and the next day the Rotary Club met with the Lions' Club in Spokane, Washington, to listen to Mr. Taylor, who was the prosecutor of—what was that gentleman's name?—General Yamashita, in the Philippines, Bataan. And it seems, glorying in discharging his duties of prosecuting Yamashita, he addressed the members of both those clubs in one of the hotels, and I was the only Arab present among Americans, nobody knew that an Arab was there; he does not write his name on his front; I wore American suits. And I listened. He said that Yamashita in his private life was a straightforward man, he was a family man, he loved his family, he was honest, but he allowed the troops to maltreat the Americans in Bataan, the march of Bataan. The prosecutor forgot the atom bombs on Japan or the bombs on Dresden, or conversely the German bombs on Coventry, European bombs in fratricidal war. They did not exist. These were not inhuman—on civilians,

mind you. And then there was a time for questions and I raised my hand—1946—and I said: "Did the defence counsel of General Yamashita adduce in his defence that there might have been war criminals amongst the victors—for example, those who ordered the atom bombs to be dropped on the civilian people of Nagasaki and Hiroshima?" He said, "Yes, somebody mentioned that in the defence." And I said, "Did the court take this into consideration?" He said, "This was a surgical operation, throwing the bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to spare so many lives". He was confusing the issue, the prosecutor, Mr. Taylor. As we say in Arabic, "You can place the holder of a jar wherever you want". What a double standard. Might is right. When will right triumph over might? Here in the United Nations, in the corridors and in Committee rooms? I have been here twenty years—twenty years—and I know what goes on. Most of us—not myself, thank God, I do not have a strait-jacket; look at my jacket—have a strait-jacket of instructions from our Governments although our conscience tells us of our rights. Are we here as human beings with a conscience, or are we the automata of instruction from our respective Governments? I think it is the latter.

173. No doubt there were excesses by the mobs in some Arab lands when, no doubt, some Jews and non-Jews, in a time of crisis such as this, were killed or maltreated. But the Arab Governments never instigated them. Mobs sometimes get the upper hand over Governments. How do you expect Arabs to act docilely when the Zionists hoist their own emblem over the places of worship? Religion means a great deal to Muslims and Christians alike in the Arab countries; it is part of their life. Do you think that they should accept such sacrilege? As I said yesterday, there were soldiers in the court of the Mosque of Omar. Of course they have an answer: they are there to see that no vandals get in. We know that argument. It is a Western argument. The whole argumentation, the whole behaviour of Western zionism is one of colonialism.

174. There is no enmity between us and the Jews, no enmity between Arabs and Jews. The Western Zionists are creating enmity.

175. I can go on and on citing from my experience, not from books, having lived all through that tragic era, having observed the motives which were made evident by dastardly acts. I have seen the perfidy, not only of Zionists, but of colonial Powers which, of course, because of their poor taxpayers who can no longer afford to sustain armies as of yore, now use all kinds of methods in order to lodge themselves, today in Palestine, tomorrow may be in the heart of Africa; another day they will pounce on other small States. And they flex their muscles, the politicians of the Western Powers, of the colonial Powers—not all Western Powers are colonialists—and they say: "Whether you like it or not, this is our policy." Reason is no longer in the market-place of negotiations. As we say in Arabic, on the tip of his tongue are sweet words, but in his heart he aspires to get out of you what the fox does. But the poor fox contents himself with a chicken whenever he can have one, while those colonial Powers want to enslave the world through their designs, by their machinations, through political movements, by proxy. If slurring the Arabs is something that anyone thinks he can get away with—or slurring any others for that matter—let him beware. One day the people of the world, including the Western world, will cleanse themselves of the demagogues amongst them and of those who consider themselves to be their statesmen. Indeed, these are not statesmen, but cheap politicians misleading people.

176. Arab and Jew will live in peace if the Zionists clear out of our area. Today the Arabs have been defeated on the battlefield. There is always hope when there is a tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.