



CONTENTS

Agenda item 5:

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

Page

1

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will continue this afternoon hearing explanations of vote. The first speaker is the representative of the United States of America.
2. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): As we approach a vote on the pending draft resolutions, the General Assembly can have but one overriding purpose in the spirit of our common Charter: a stable, enduring and just peace in the Middle East.
3. What must be done to achieve this purpose of peace? The essential steps, as my Government sees them, can be summed up in ten points:

First: without delay, armed forces should be disengaged and withdrawn to their own territories; and without delay, any claims to a state of war or belligerency should be terminated.

Second: the right of every Member of the United Nations in the area to maintain an independent national State of its own and to live in peace should be respected by every other Member.

Third: the territorial integrity and political independence of all the States in the area should be respected and assured by appropriate arrangements.

Fourth: vital security interests of all States in the area should be protected.

Fifth: all States in the area should refrain in their mutual relations from the threat or use of force in any manner whatsoever.

Sixth: the rights of all nations to freedom of navigation and of innocent passage through international waterways should be respected.

Seventh: a just and permanent settlement of the refugee problem should be concluded.

Eighth: the development of national economies and the improvement of the living standards of the people

should take precedence over a wasteful arms race in the area.

Ninth: the safeguarding of the Holy Places, and freedom of access to them for all, should be internationally guaranteed, and the status of Jerusalem in relation to them should be decided not unilaterally but in consultation with all concerned.

Tenth: international arrangements should be made to help the parties to achieve all these results, including appropriate assistance from the United Nations or other third parties.

4. It is in the light of these views that we have decided the position of the United States on the two major draft resolutions which are about to come to a vote. I wish to state that position explicitly and our reasons for it.

5. The United States will vote for the draft resolution presented by the Latin American States [A/L.523 and Add.1]. The United States will vote against the draft resolution presented by Yugoslavia and seventeen other Member States [A/L.522/Rev.3]. A basic difference exists between these two draft resolutions, a difference which no embellishments or details can obscure.

6. The Yugoslav text proposes to deal with the problem of peace and security in the Middle East by calling, basically, for one fundamental action: the withdrawal of Israel's forces "to the positions they held prior to 5 June 1967". It leaves untouched the other half of the problem, which must be immediately addressed if the demands of the Charter are to be satisfied, namely, the persistent claim by certain Members of this Organization of the right to annihilate another Member. This claim, which directly affronts the Charter and every sense of fairness, is to be left unimpaired, and those who assert it are to be left free, at a time of their own choosing, to make good on it by force. Indeed, the Yugoslav text contains no clear provision to deal with any of the long-standing grievances and causes of conflict which have kept the Middle East in a fever of tension for twenty years.

7. Let me emphasize that the successive revisions of operative paragraph 6 in the Yugoslav draft have not cured the basic defects of that draft resolution. Operative paragraph 1, concerning withdrawal, could not be more clear and definite. Operative paragraph 6, concerning "all aspects of the situation", is vague in the extreme.

8. The effect of this Yugoslav text, as revised, is obvious: it calls for withdrawal now and it leaves every other essential step to the uncertain future. In particular, it makes no connexion whatever between withdrawal and the end of claims of belligerency—claims which are among the leading causes of all the troubles in the past.

9. The Latin American text, on the other hand, treats at one and the same time both of the most vital necessities of peace. Its first operative paragraph combines, on an equal basis, the withdrawal of Israel's forces with the ending of all claims to a state of belligerency and with efforts to create "conditions of coexistence based on good-neighbourliness". It recognizes that we face a situation the two aspects of which are interdependent—that neither aspect can be solved in isolation from the other.

10. Certainly, any fair and meaningful reading of the United Nations Charter must lead to the same conclusion. If the Charter is to be invoked—as indeed it must—to require withdrawal of troops in the name of territorial integrity, then surely it must be invoked also, and equally, and at the same time, to require an end to claims of the right to wage war.

11. Unless the Governments in the area are prepared to refrain from these totally unfounded claims to belligerency, there obviously can be no peace. Cooperation to assure troop disengagement and withdrawal, and the other essentials of peace, must, by definition, be a two-way street. The Assembly can hardly endorse a formula in which one side is free to assert that there is a state of war and the other side is asked to behave as if there were not.

12. A choice must be made between the claims of war and the claims of peace.

13. Of all the claims of peace, none is more fundamental, as every Member of this Assembly must recognize, than the right of a sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations, to have its existence and its independence respected. In no other case in the history of the United Nations have Members of this Organization failed to accord this elemental right to another Member.

14. This right has been the subject of important statements during this debate, from a wide range of speakers. On 19 June, in fact, in the opening statement of the debate, we heard Chairman Kosygin of the Soviet Union declare, as "one of the fundamental principles" of his country's policy, that "every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national State of its own" [1526th meeting, para. 46]. We do not see this point referred to in the Yugoslav draft resolution. Again, at the meeting in which the general debate was concluded, on Friday, 30 June, we heard the Foreign Minister of Uruguay, Mr. Luisi, declare among the first conditions of peace "the recognition by the parties to this dispute ... of the irrevocability of their existence as sovereign States"* [1543rd meeting, para. 85]. We do not see this point either in the Yugoslav draft resolution.

15. In fact, we can search the Yugoslav text from start to finish without finding any words about respect for the elemental right of national existence, the absence of which is at the very bottom of the trouble in the Middle East. Instead, we find vague references to legal and political problems and Charter principles, to be considered at some time in the future. This fuzzy treatment stands in strong contrast to the Yugoslav draft resolution's clear and concrete call for the

immediate withdrawal of Israel's troops to the positions held before 5 June. That withdrawal—if it could be brought about at all under such conditions—can scarcely bring more than a pause between rounds in this long and terrible conflict.

16. In candour, let me say that we of the United States, and no doubt many others, would have preferred a still clearer and more explicit statement on the right of national existence than that which appears in the Latin American text. But our careful reading of that text has led us to conclude that its urgent call for an end to claims of belligerency, and the other provisions of paragraph 1 (b), clearly comprehend respect for national existence and constitute a major step in the right direction. This is one of our reasons for supporting the Latin American draft and for finding it infinitely preferable to the Yugoslav draft.

17. There are other reasons also for this preference. The Latin American text offers concrete guidelines for dealing with many of the other essentials of peace in the Middle East. Moreover, it deals with just grievances on both sides—and there have been just grievances on both sides. Unfortunately, neither of these claims can be made for the Yugoslav draft. Let me specify our grounds for this evaluation.

18. On the refugee problem, the Latin American text calls unambiguously for "an appropriate and full solution of the problem of the refugees". My Government has taken the view that a fair and lasting solution of the refugee question is vitally necessary. Indeed, it has been made all the more urgent by the events of recent weeks. Yet the sole allusion to this problem in the Yugoslav text is in the single abstract word "humanitarian".

19. On international maritime rights, the Latin American text calls for a guarantee of "freedom of transit on the international waterways in the region". This problem is not mentioned in the Yugoslav text. And yet it was this very problem that provided the spark which led directly to the explosion of 5 June. Why do the sponsors of this draft resolution glide over this vital issue with vague, evasive words and with corridor hints about a possible willingness to deal with this matter? On this crucial issue, involving not only the States immediately concerned but also vital international rights, the Yugoslav text is altogether deficient.

20. On the question of Jerusalem, again the Latin American text contains explicit language, whereas the Yugoslav text is silent. The United States view on this subject has been stated at the highest levels of our Government in the past few days and is reflected in the ten points which I listed at the outset of this statement. In particular, the United States does not recognize the recent administrative action taken by Israel as determining the future of the Holy Places or the status of Jerusalem in relation to them. We do not recognize unilateral actions in this connexion. With regard to the provision concerning Jerusalem in the Latin American text, our support is against the background of this policy.

21. On security arrangements, the Latin American text calls for measures to guarantee the territorial integrity and political independence of the States of

* Provisional English version taken from the interpretation.

the region. Among these measures it specifies the establishment of demilitarized zones and an appropriate United Nations presence. But the Yugoslav text contains nothing more on this subject than a reference to the existing machinery of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine.

22. The Truce Supervision Organization has performed, and is still performing, a valiant service, but surely we all recognize—and the Secretary-General himself has reported—that the removal of a still more substantial United Nations presence, the United Nations Emergency Force, created, in the Secretary-General's words, "a new situation"; and that situation was altered still further by the recent hostilities. It is a situation which the Truce Supervision Organization, with its present resources and structure, cannot adequately manage.

23. Finally, on the tasks of the Security Council, the Latin American draft makes concrete recommendations concerning all of the points I have mentioned, but the Yugoslav text confines its recommendations to the broadest generalities.

24. Although for all those reasons we find the Latin American text acceptable and the Yugoslav text unacceptable, I must express regret that neither of these draft resolutions touches on the major issue of arms limitation in the Middle East. This issue has been discussed during this debate by a number of speakers, including representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States.

25. On 19 June we listened with interest to Chairman Kosygin, when he warned that nations of the Middle East, "in order to enhance their security ... may embark on the path of an arms build-up and increase their military budgets ... Those who cherish peace cannot, and must not, allow events to take this course"* [1526th meeting, para. 71].

26. That statement was very much in our minds when my Government stated here, the next day, 20 June that "peace in the Middle East requires steps to avert the dangers inherent in a renewed arms race. ... The responsibility for such steps rests not only on those in the area, but also upon the larger States outside the area" [1527th meeting, para. 20]. And we proposed in our own draft resolution [A/L.520], as a first step in discharging this responsibility, a system of registration and limitation of arms shipments into the area.

27. We remain very much interested in exploring this concept, not in order to crystallize any military imbalance in the area, but rather to maintain a balance at the lowest possible security level. Our aim is two-fold: that this source of danger shall be controlled, and that scarce resources shall be devoted to a better cause than armaments—the technical and economic progress of the peoples of the Middle East.

28. I now wish to comment briefly on one specific aspect of the situation in the Middle East. We have before us, in addition to the draft resolutions I have discussed, another draft resolution, submitted by Sweden and several other sponsors [A/L.526 and Add.1], dealing with the refugee problem. Indeed, no task is more urgent than to bind up the wounds of war,

to find shelter for the homeless, food for the hungry, and medicine for the sick. To this end, the United States supported in the Security Council the draft resolution put forward by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia, which the Council unanimously adopted on 14 June [resolution 237 (1967)]. To the same end, we now strongly support the draft resolution presented by Sweden and other Members, which is now before the Assembly.

29. Last week, the United States allocated \$5 million to help meet the urgent needs of this situation, and from that sum we are making a special contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees to help finance its operations in the immediate future.

30. There have been reports of the movement of civilians from their homes, many of them refugees from earlier conflicts. We have heard these reports with much concern. All civilians in the area affected should be assured of their safety, welfare and security in the same locations in which they resided before hostilities began. We welcome the assurances recently given, and hope that they will be implemented and that the population of the West bank of Jordan will be encouraged to remain in and return to their homes. We welcome the news that a representative of the Secretary-General is now to go to the area, and we urge all concerned—particularly the Government of Israel—to give him the fullest co-operation.

31. In conclusion, I return to the major choice which faces this Assembly. It is the key question before us. It is a choice between a tragic past and a better future. In the Yugoslav draft resolution we are asked to return the situation to where it stood on the eve of the conflict, and only in some indefinite future would we try again to cope with underlying causes, including the claimed right to do away with a sovereign State by armed force. Such a proposal cannot lead toward peace, but only toward more trouble and danger. It is unconstructive, and it should be rejected.

32. In the Latin American draft resolution we are asked to deal forthrightly with the great obstacles to peace: above all and first of all, with the withdrawal of Israel's forces and with the need for all States in the area, all Members of the United Nations, to respect one another's right to live in peace. The Latin American text treats, at one and the same time, both of the most vital necessities of peace. Its first operative paragraph combines, I repeat, on an equal basis, the withdrawal of Israel's forces with the ending of all claims to a state of belligerency and with efforts to create conditions of coexistence based on good-neighbourliness; it recognizes that we face a situation whose two aspects are interdependent—that neither aspect can be solved in isolation from the other.

33. Peace is worth sacrifices, and all must sacrifice for it. In the wake of conflict there must be readiness on both sides to acknowledge the rights and feelings of others. There must be a willingness to refrain from pressing temporary advantages and to take a long-range view. There must be an end to malice, to bitter thoughts of revenge, to vain threats to end the life of other nations. There must be on every side a willingness to accept at long last, and act upon, the admonition

* Provisional English version taken from the interpretation.

in our common Charter to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

34. Thousands of years ago it was written: "Where there is no vision the people perish". Let us, in this Assembly, in what we decide here, offer to the suffering peoples of the Middle East a new vision of peace, a vision by which all can live in peace and security.

35. Mr. CREMIN (Ireland): Speaking in the general debate on 27 June [1538th meeting], the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland outlined the views of our delegation on the subject matter of the present emergency special session and indicated how we consider that the Assembly should tackle the issue in order, in Mr. Aiken's words, "to find the road to a stable and lasting peace" in the Middle East.

36. I wish, in the light of that statement, to explain the attitude of the Irish delegation to two of the draft resolutions before the Assembly: namely, the draft contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3, and the draft contained in document A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2.

37. My delegation maintains that Israeli forces must withdraw to the positions they held on 4 June. We believe, however, that withdrawal alone which, as in document A/L.522/Rev.3, is not accompanied by other measures, will not solve the problems that must be solved if we are to have a durable and just peace, and might indeed make them more acute. We therefore feel obliged to vote against that text.

38. The draft contained in document A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2, on the other hand, is much more comprehensive and conforms closely to the views of the Irish delegation. We believe that the General Assembly, by approving it, will point the way to the achievement of a lasting settlement in the Middle East; and we consider indeed that we should all be most grateful to the Latin American States for producing it. My delegation whole-heartedly supports it, and we hope it will be adopted by the Assembly.

39. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): In explanation of vote, I wish to state that Canada will vote in favour of the draft resolution offered by a number of Latin American delegations in document A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2 because that text most closely reflects Canada's approach to the problems before us, as advanced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his statement in the General Assembly on 23 June [1533rd meeting].

40. We cannot support the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.519, A/L.521 and A/L.522/Rev.2—the latter text has been revised further [A/L.522/Rev.3] this morning. From our point of view, all of these draft resolutions, whatever other flaws they may have, suffer from the basic defect that the withdrawal of Israeli forces, vital as it is, is not related to the other basic issues involved, which, in our view, are essential to any enduring settlement and which are taken up in the draft resolution put forward by the Latin American delegations.

41. Above all, the Canadian Government believes that, with the experience of three major outbreaks of hostilities in the Middle East to draw upon, the United Nations must now make a determined effort to find a peaceful and just solution to the underlying problems of the conflict. We must not allow ourselves to be

drawn into the vicious circle of what the Prime Minister of Canada, speaking in 1957, referred to as a return to terror, bloodshed, strife, incidents, charges and counter-charges, and ultimately another explosion.

42. I have one comment, however, to make on the final paragraph of the Latin American draft resolution. Ever since the question of Palestine came before the United Nations, the concern of the Canadian Government has been for the protection of the Holy Places. In the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs here on 23 June, he included the following among the basic principles which should be part of any enduring settlement:

"... international concern for the preservation of the special spiritual and religious interests in Jerusalem—Christian, Jewish and Muslim—must be recognized, perhaps by giving the United Nations an international supervisory responsibility for the protection of these interests; nor should there be any precipitate action which might prejudice them" [1533rd meeting, para. 122].

43. We are particularly pleased that the Latin American draft resolution provides for consideration of the question of Jerusalem at the next regular session of the General Assembly. This is a clear indication of the intention of the Assembly, on the one hand, that there should be no precipitate action and, on the other hand, that all of us should have time for mature consideration of this important question.

44. In this connexion, my delegation will vote in favour of the resolution sponsored by Pakistan [A/L.527].

45. I have already explained why we are opposed to unilateral action which might prejudice the negotiation of international arrangements for the protection of and access to the Holy Places. We hope that the Government of Israel will take account of the concern which this draft resolution expresses on behalf of the entire international community.

46. With the considerations in mind which I have expressed, I wish to emphasize that we favour the Latin American draft resolution as a whole, and believe that its adoption would constitute a valuable contribution towards a settlement of the crisis in the Middle East.

47. The Canadian delegation also believes that the Security Council, building upon acceptance of its cease-fire resolutions, should as a next step, with the assistance of a special representative of the Secretary-General sent out to the area, seek a peaceful settlement of the grave problems of that part of the world.

48. Before concluding, I should also like to urge unanimous support for the draft resolution in document A/L.526 and Add.1, submitted in the first instance in the name of nineteen delegations, and introduced this morning by the representative of Sweden [1545th meeting]. Canada welcomes the initiative taken to put forward this humanitarian proposal, and has been glad to add its name to the list of co-sponsors in recognition of the urgent needs of hundreds of thousands of people whose lives have been so tragically affected by the recurrent conflicts in the Middle East.

49. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The emergency session of the General Assembly is about to reach a decision on the question of the liquidation of the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States and the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces to a position behind the armistice lines. We have been discussing precisely this question for two weeks now and a special session of the General Assembly has been called in order to settle it. The withdrawal of Israel's forces and the liquidation of the other consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States are regarded by the Soviet Union as constituting the main, most urgent task in the business of restoring peace in the Middle East. So declared the Head of the Soviet Government in his address to the General Assembly [1526th session] and such was the prime aim of our draft resolution [A/L.515]. We consistently uphold this principle and we therefore support the draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3] submitted by a group of non-aligned countries.

50. Everyone who stands out against brigandage and treachery in international relations, everyone who is really concerned about the future of peoples will be able to welcome the understanding shown by the majority here present of the dangers attendant on the present crisis in the Middle East and of the necessity of so acting as to prevent a further outbreak of war.

51. In fact, every speaker in this Assembly has condemned the use of force to settle international disputes. Israel's policy has been condemned because Israel resorted to arms and started an aggressive war against its neighbours.

52. All delegations have rejected the aggressor's attempts to make its seizure of territory a fait accompli and to derive other benefits from the armed aggression it has committed. The participants in this session have noted Israel's flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and its insolent contempt for the United Nations resolutions adopted both on the eve and especially in the course of the war, unleashed by that country.

53. Representatives of all States have laid stress on the fact of the sharp deterioration in the Middle East situation as a direct consequence of Israel's actions and on the threat that the events in the Middle East may develop into an even wider conflict.

54. No one here has assumed the thankless task of whitewashing Israel's aggression, apart from the aggressor itself, of course, and certain of its specially close protectors. Heads of State and Governments, eminent political figures and statesmen, have proclaimed from this rostrum their countries' and peoples' desire for a speedy restoration of peace in the Middle East and the importance of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories they have seized, as the first, urgent step in that direction.

55. Thus can we summarize the essence of the General Assembly's discussion of recent events in the Middle East; and such too, naturally, must be the basic content of the resolution, if the United Nations is prepared to fulfil its purpose. We consider that the proposal of the non-aligned countries meets this requirement.

56. The Soviet Government has no doubt that every State and every responsible statesman realizes what the consequences of a continuation of the aggression would be. The armed provocations organized by Israeli troops on the Sinai Peninsula on 1 and 2 July gave new warning of the danger inherent in the situation. There can be no peace in the Middle East until Israel's troops are withdrawn from foreign soil. No nation can stand idle while an aggressor commits outrage and crime in its homeland; nor are the Arab peoples bowing to this aggression.

57. Yet attempts to bedevil the path to the restoration of peace, difficult enough in any case, and to make the withdrawal of Israeli troops contingent upon the fulfilment of a whole series of preliminary conditions by the victims of aggression, do not cease. Israel, in the heady atmosphere of war, demands territorial aggrandizement. Its protectors do not go so far. They are prepared to remain content with political dividends, which must be paid out at the expense of the Arab States.

58. That is the only way we can interpret the draft resolution, imperialistic in nature, through and through, submitted by the United States delegation—[A/L.520], a resolution in which the various questions are deliberately packaged together and the aggressor is put on an equal footing with the victims of his aggression.

59. It is hard to believe there can be anyone whose ears are not offended by the theory concocted by the Israel Government in justification of the "right" to fire the first shot. Just consider the meaning of the irresponsible arguments adduced by the Israeli ministers, arguments irreconcilable with the obligations imposed by the United Nations Charter. Elementary logic suggests that, if the first shot is justified and if we are to be guided by such a theory, it will be easy enough to drop the first nuclear bomb, to launch the first rocket. And then, for a certainty, nothing will save mankind from catastrophe. Yet this way of conducting international affairs is being openly preached here within the walls of the United Nations.

60. Listening to the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs, we might think that Israel, by its attack on the Arab States—the second in ten years, mark you—has performed an inestimable service to mankind and is now waiting to receive a prize for such "zeal" for peace.

61. Consider, gentlemen, the meaning of the tiresome statements extolling arbitrariness and force, and of the open threats which have been daily uttered here by Israel's representative under the pretext of the right of reply—a misuse of that right—and you will realize that so long as the aggressor is not brought to heel, so long as he enjoys open or secret support, war will be on everyone's doorstep. The prompt and complete withdrawal of Israeli troops to the positions which they occupied before the war began, that is, before 5 June, as required by the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries and our own draft resolution, is therefore the most urgent matter also from the point of view of the interests of world peace.

62. History has repeatedly and at great cost taught men that not punishing an aggressor, not to mention

encouraging him, leads to such a development of events that problems are no longer resolved at political meetings, in assemblies and in conferences. The generation which knows this from its own experience has not yet vanished from the scene. Most of us who represent our countries in the United Nations seem to belong to that generation. We remember how victory was won over the fascist aggressors.

63. Israel would like to assure everyone of its innocence, as though it were possible to combine falsehood with truth, crime with virtue. Those whom words about peace have served only as a cover for the preparation of armed aggression, those whose assurances about the absence of aggressive plans were false from start to finish, those who have for many years shown a cynical lack of respect for Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, are undertaking to lecture the States represented here and to argue about international law and justice.

64. But Israel's attempt to pose as accuser is too much of a caricature to be taken seriously. The General Assembly will pass judgement on the policy of that State, which twice in ten years has brought about the conflagration of war, the death of people and the destruction of material values. Israel's attempts to turn treachery into a virtue and to propagate the law of the jungle execrated time and time again by the nations, in international relations, are here held up to shame.

65. The delegation of the Soviet Union does not consider it necessary to answer the hysterical statements made by Israeli politicians about the Soviet Union. Those insinuations will not and cannot produce any impression on serious people. Furthermore, the nations know—and Israel's politicians, too, know it well—that the State on which the Israelis are today heaping abuse with the frivolity of a stage comic has always and will always come forward in defence of the rights of peoples, great and small, regardless of the colour of their skin and irrespective of differences of creed and political philosophy.

66. During the fifty years of the Soviet State's existence we have known too many ill-wishers, we have heard too much rubbish about socialism and about our policies, for the Tel Aviv propagandists' attempts to rehash the themes of Goebbels to arouse in us, at best, anything more than disgust. The Soviet people's heroism in the fight to preserve freedom against fascism and for the triumph of humanism and justice will not grow dim with time and its sacrifices for the victory of the United Nations will never be forgotten by the peoples of the world.

67. Israel would like to turn this high Assembly into a small-town marketplace and to distract the General Assembly from the main issue before it, the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops. Israel can sink to the political depths, if one can imagine a point lower than that which it has already reached; but we must not allow Israel and those who stand behind Israel and who clap it on the back encouragingly to drag the United Nations to the bottom with them.

68. If in Tel Aviv the passions of war have not yet completely stultified everyone, if there are still people there who think about the future, then they should realize that by its actions Israel is cutting away the

branch on which it is sitting. If Israel wants peace, it is up to Israel's leaders radically to change their policies and their methods.

69. Today, in connexion with the discussion of the specific draft resolutions which have been submitted, it is useful to emphasize that the General Assembly, if it is prepared to do its duty, must be equal to the requirements of a situation which gives no grounds for reassurance. There can be only one just solution: everything that the aggressor has seized must be promptly and fully returned to those who were attacked. This is precisely the object of the Soviet draft resolution and of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries. No proposal which leads aside from this paramount aim or can be used by the aggressor to bargain and to drag out the withdrawal of his troops is in the interests of peace.

70. The Soviet delegation expresses its support of the draft resolution sponsored by a group of non-aligned countries, the majority of which have recently freed themselves from imperialist oppression and know full well what aggression is and what foreign occupation is. This draft resolution rightly gives priority to the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories they now occupy, for the key to normalization of the Middle Eastern situation lies only in the settlement of that question.

71. The aggressor cannot count on his prize. This is a matter of principle. Today it is the Arabs who have been attacked; but where is there a guarantee that some other Government, encouraged by Israel's example will not rush into warlike ventures? Then those by whom Israel's aggression is now seen as in a distant haze will themselves seek the support of States which, as they put it, take too stern a view of Israel's policy today. Far be it from us to threaten anyone; but we say to them, think—lest it befall you to be paid back in your own coin. The Soviet Union has never tried to seek political advantage for itself in the troubles of other peoples. For us, the interests of the peoples are always paramount.

72. In the course of discussions and talks between representatives of various countries the desire has frequently been expressed that efforts be made now to build a bridge for the solution of other Middle Eastern problems. The draft resolution of the non-aligned countries responds to this desire too. But of course, neither in technology nor in politics has anyone yet been able to construct a bridge resting on nothing. Let the troops be withdrawn, and let it be done promptly, and then there will be an incomparably calmer atmosphere than there is today in which to make progress on all the other questions—I repeat, all the other questions that have accumulated on the sidelines; then would the possibilities envisaged in the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries stand out clear.

73. Any delegation which approaches the proposal of the non-aligned countries honestly, even if its approach is one of rigorous scrutiny, cannot call it other than objective and meeting the urgent aim of restoring peace. Every delegation that hopes to see the United Nations as its protector, on whose effective assistance and support it can rely in time of trouble, must refuse

to allow principles to be sacrificed today to backstairs deals and dubious manoeuvres.

74. The participants in this General Assembly must decisively reject the attempts of the Israeli politicians and those who are encouraging them to indulge here in blackmail and political disruption. The riposte to Israel's threat that it will not heed the will of the majority and, in certain circumstances may again resort to force, must be our determination to condemn the aggressor, to put an end to aggression and to abolish the consequences of aggression. By voting for the prompt withdrawal of the aggressor's troops, delegations will be voting for peace and demonstrating their devotion to the high principles for the sake of which the United Nations was created and now exists.

75. Mr. SCHUURMANS (Belgium) (translated from French): Now that the General Assembly's discussion, at this emergency special session, of the recent grave events in the Middle East is drawing to a close, the Belgian delegation wishes to explain briefly the vote it will cast at the end of this debate, when the draft resolutions that have been put forward are put to the vote.

76. The vote it will shortly cast on these draft resolutions will be prompted by considerations of two types.

77. First, it seemed to my delegation important to consider how far each of them is in accordance with the provisions of the Charter setting forth and defining the powers of the General Assembly. I had already conveyed my Government's concern on this point in the letter which I had the honour to address to the Secretary-General on 16 June 1967 to inform him of my Government's acceptance of the convening of an emergency special session. In my letter, I emphasized that the provisions of Article 11 of the Charter define the limits within which the General Assembly must confine its activities, and in that connexion I referred more particularly to the reservations concerning competence in Article 12, of which Article 11 makes explicit mention in defining the powers of the General Assembly.

78. In this respect the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2] excites no comment, since it is aimed specifically at entrusting to the Security Council the implementation of measures which, according to the Charter, fall exclusively within its jurisdiction.

79. The same cannot be said of draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3, for if we were to accept the proposals in that draft resolution it would be the Assembly itself which would assume responsibility for certain measures requiring action, while at the same time committing the task of supervising their implementation to the Secretary-General. By embarking on this course, we should be infringing the clearly defined prerogatives of the Security Council. This is the first reason why the Belgian delegation cannot support the non-aligned countries' draft resolution.

80. If, apart from these legal considerations—the importance of which should certainly not be minimized—we compare the proposals made in each of the draft resolutions for a just and lasting solution to the problems of the Middle East it seems to us, in all

objectivity, that the Latin American text offers the best prospect of arriving at such a solution.

81. The Belgian delegation was pleased to find in it a balanced and reasonable reformulation of the broad principles put forward in this Assembly on 22 June last as being capable, in my Government's view, of settling the present crisis and laying the foundation for good neighbourly relations between the Arabs and the people of Israel. In closing his address, the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs expressed the hope that this emergency special session of the General Assembly would adopt a recommendation encouraging the parties concerned to take the only way which is open to them under the Charter, strengthening the action of the Security Council and its permanent members, and indicating the broad lines of the peaceful settlement desired by all States [1531st meeting, para. 83].

82. While not denying the other draft resolutions any merit in the search for this ideal solution, the Belgian delegation felt that it could perceive in the Latin American approach an echo of its own preoccupations, and in the draft resolution which gave form to that approach a reflection of the suggestions which it had itself put forward. For this reason, the Latin American draft resolution can be assured of its support.

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

83. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, after two weeks of general discussion on the very serious situation which has arisen in the Middle East as a result of the aggressive actions of Israel, the time has come to take a decision.

84. We have a number of draft resolutions and amendments before us. Among them are some which, if adopted, would show the world that the United Nations is capable of fulfilling its obligations and coming out vigorously against those who violate peace. These are the ones that have the Czechoslovak delegation's support.

85. But among the draft resolutions there are others which aim at deflecting the United Nations from its path and assigning it the role of a defender of acts of aggression. The Czechoslovak delegation will vote against such draft resolutions.

86. The facts on which we must base our decision are clear. The serious situation brought about in the Middle East by the adventurist and expansionist policies of Israel has developed into war, the consequences of which are a threat both to the sovereignty and independence of the Arab States and to world peace. This has rightly aroused the concern of nations throughout the world and led the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations to call for a special emergency session of the General Assembly to discuss the situation in all seriousness and reach the appropriate conclusions from Israel's aggression.

87. The discussion at the present session of the General Assembly has given a conclusive answer to the aggressors and those States which have encouraged and supported them in their policy of conquest. Proof has been adduced that the Government of Israel had prepared in advance extensive and detailed plans for

aggressive military operations against the Arab States; extremist circles in Israel, with support from outside, then carried out the aggression.

88. The general discussion has confirmed that Israel's actions constitute a flagrant breach of international law and the basic principles of the United Nations Charter. We consider that the results of the discussion are a moral condemnation of the aggressor and its assistants.

89. The Czechoslovak delegation continues to base its position on the belief that the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the Government of the Soviet Union [A/L.519] constitutes the best expression of the demand that an end be put to the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab countries. We therefore once again express our full support for that resolution. We consider that this draft resolution derives from the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, meets the just demands of the present situation and clearly defines the steps which must immediately be taken to put an end to aggression and restore peace in this region.

90. The adoption of this draft resolution would be a convincing riposte to the serious violation of peace and would give the United Nations an opportunity of reasserting its role as an instrument designed to preserve international peace and security and the inviolability of all its Members. We do not agree with the objections which have been advanced against the Soviet draft resolution, and we are surprised that certain delegations cast doubt on the just demands contained in it.

91. We join our voice to those of the countries which have decisively rejected the provocative territorial pretensions made by the Israeli occupiers against the Arab States. In the interest of restoring the situation in the Middle East, Israel cannot be permitted to continue occupying the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

92. The draft resolution submitted by the United States of America is aimed precisely at supporting the aggressor's territorial pretensions, for it attempts to secure for Israel the fruits of that State's aggression, plays into Israel's hands by supporting its attempts to use military occupation as a means of exerting political pressure on the victims of aggression, and furthermore tries to convince the world that this is just.

93. For the General Assembly to support such a draft resolution would signify expressing agreement with aggression and upholding the "law of the jungle" in international relations. Basing ourselves on this viewpoint, we find the draft resolution of the United States of America [A/L.520] unacceptable and in contradiction to the spirit of the United Nations Charter, and we shall vote against it.

94. Nor can we endorse draft resolutions which, although also containing an appeal for the withdrawal of Israeli troops, at the same time lay down a series of conditions giving the aggressor a chance to manoeuvre and thereby weaken the urgent demand for an end to the aggression and its consequences. The General Assembly would not be serving the cause of

peace and would hardly be enhancing its authority if it were to look favourably on the demands of an aggressor who has made use of the unlawful instrument of aggressive war to achieve its aims of conquest.

95. The Czechoslovak delegation considers such an approach to a settlement of the question to be totally wrong and not in accordance with the seriousness of the situation and the tasks which have to be fulfilled by the emergency session of the General Assembly. For this reason, the Czechoslovak delegation will vote against the draft resolution submitted by eighteen Latin American States and appearing in document A/L.523.

96. While the General Assembly is discussing this matter, Israel is continuing its aggression, in that it is occupying parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. We are witnessing provocative attempts on the part of the aggressor to annex those territories. Reports reaching us confirm once again that the ruling circles of Israel have decided not to heed warnings and to continue along a course of flagrant disregard of the United Nations Charter and the basic principles of international law. They are presenting the world with a fait accompli and are declaring in advance their intention not to submit to the decision adopted by our Organization.

97. How else can we interpret the Israeli Parliament's decision to annex the whole of Jerusalem, at a time when the General Assembly is preparing an appeal for Israeli troops to be withdrawn behind the line which existed before 5 June 1967? How else can we interpret the statement made by the Israeli Chief of General Staff, General Rabin, after inspecting Israeli contingents on the east bank of the Suez Canal, to the effect that "never in history has the Jewish State ever won such a victory and had such boundaries"?

98. The urgent necessity for Israeli troops to be withdrawn behind the lines which existed before the aggression of 5 June this year has been once again emphasized by recent events on the eastern bank of the Suez Canal, where in the last forty-eight hours Israeli troops have three times renewed military operations against the United Arab Republic. The present state of occupation of parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan by Israeli troops is the source of further violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of those States and conceals the seeds of further attacks by the aggressor. We must therefore put an end to such a situation. Israel's troops must be withdrawn immediately from the occupied areas of the Arab countries.

99. This demand is the central point in the draft resolution of the eighteen States, which appears in A/L.522/Rev.3. We see this draft resolution as a reflection of deep concern about the situation which has been created and at the same time as an effort to hasten and facilitate the adoption of a draft resolution which would express the position held by the majority of Member States. This draft resolution further calls for the necessary steps to be taken to ensure the fulfilment of the demand for the withdrawal of Israeli troops, and for proper discussion of questions relating to the situation in the Middle East. In view

of the existing situation and the arguments advanced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 1540th meeting, we agree that the draft resolution submitted by the eighteen States should have priority over the other draft resolutions when the vote is taken. The Czechoslovak delegation, in the interests of winning the widest support for a draft resolution on the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territory—and that is the point of departure for any further steps towards putting an end to the consequences of Israel's aggression—is prepared to regard this draft resolution favourably and vote for it.

100. In conclusion, I should like to state that the Czechoslovak delegation will support the draft resolution we have before us on assistance to the victims of military operations [A/L.526]. Czechoslovakia is giving substantial emergency aid to the Arab countries, on whose territory there are tens of thousands of victims of Israel's aggression. We intend to go on giving the necessary assistance, without, however, departing from the principle that Israel bears responsibility for the damage done to the Arab countries and their inhabitants.

101. We shall also support the draft resolution of Pakistan [A/L.527] on Jerusalem, since we consider the actions of Israel's rulers in regard to that city to be a gross violation of the Charter and the principles of international law.

102. Mr. President, the attitude we take towards the resolution on the serious situation in the Middle East will be a test of the attitude of the Member States and of the Organization as a whole to the basic principles of the Charter and the very aims and purposes of the United Nations. An indecisive attitude could prove fatal. It is unequivocally necessary to compel the aggressor to withdraw from the territories seized and not to allow that aggressor to use the military occupation of foreign lands as a means of imposing conditions on other States and thereby reap benefit from aggression.

103. The Czechoslovak delegation expects the General Assembly of the United Nations to adopt a definite viewpoint on this question and fulfil its obligations in accordance with the objectives and principles of the United Nations Charter.

104. Mr. RAKOTOMALALA (Madagascar) (translated from French): I should like briefly to restate the broad lines of my Government's general policy since they permanently govern its position not only on the present question but on all questions which have been or which may be submitted to this Organization.

105. First of all, my Government is in favour of free negotiations, respect for the existence and integrity of all States, and peace. It is against violence and war. As I have had occasion to say here already, my Head of State has described his foreign policy as being inspired by that great and noble figure among men: Gandhi.

106. In the present conflict, our attitude may be defined as follows: complete objectivity, for my country has sincere and respected friends in both camps. In view of the draft resolutions placed before us, that attitude must now be reflected in our vote. My dele-

gation believes that, while it is the foremost duty of the United Nations to find a just and equitable settlement for the present conflict, it is also its bounden duty, to prevent the recurrence of the events which were at the origin of the conflict. For that purpose, it would be necessary, among other practical steps, to re-establish a demilitarized zone between the present-day belligerents. It is also necessary to find a humane solution to the grievous problem of the refugees. To do this, as my delegation has been saying for seven years, it is essential to open negotiations. This is the only practical way out, for a solution imposed from outside would be only a temporary expedient.

107. Draft resolution A/L.523 and Add. 1 and 2 contains some positive elements in this respect which have caught my delegation's attention. I am thinking here, for example, of freedom of navigation on all international waterways. Because it is an island, my country realizes the vital importance of such a provision for peace. Obviously, such measures must have as their necessary and logical counterpart the withdrawal of Israel's forces from the territory of the neighbouring States which they now occupy.

108. To sum up, my delegation will be unable, whatever may be its sympathies with their sponsors, to associate itself with draft resolutions which do not take fully into account my country's general policy. It is convinced that it is the duty of all of us to seek out just and equitable, but also realistic, solutions which are in full conformity with the ideals of the Charter.

109. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (translated from French): Mr. Couve de Murville, the French Foreign Minister, stated before the General Assembly on 22 June (1531st meeting) the position of the French Government on the various aspects of the crisis which now reigns in the Middle East. In intervening today, it is not my intention to recapitulate the policy followed by my country from the outset, but merely to draw the appropriate conclusions now that we are called upon to vote on a draft resolution (A/L.522/Rev.3) submitted by Yugoslavia, India, and a number of Asian and African countries.

110. Coming after the draft resolution submitted at the beginning of the debate by the Soviet Union (A/L.519) and the United States of America (A/L.520), this new text has, as my delegation sees it, the advantage of restricting itself to what we regard as essential: on the one hand, the withdrawal of the troops; on the other, the search for a comprehensive solution to the problems that have arisen between Israel and the Arab countries.

111. Both before and after the opening of hostilities, France made no secret of its disapproval of resort to arms. My Government believes this is no way to solve problems and that in the case in point no lasting solution could be imposed by force on either side. It is therefore impossible for us to consider that the military occupation can confer any legal rights; in other words, we cannot agree that a fait accompli should be regarded as a *fait acquis*. The steps which have recently been taken with regard to the Old City of Jerusalem have—if that were necessary—reinforced this position.

112. Consequently, my delegation considers that the military occupation cannot continue. The troops must be withdrawn to their starting point, that is to say to the positions which they occupied before 5 June, which had in the course of time become genuine frontiers.

113. Having said this, we agree with several delegations that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries raises certain objections in so far as it does not seem very realistic to ask the Government of Israel to withdraw its forces immediately. If this point had been amended, my delegation would certainly have supported it. The comment I have just made, however, does not change our opinion on the substance of the matter.

114. It seems obvious to us that nothing can be done as long as the present situation prevails. What we desire—and I believe it is the desire of the great majority—is a lasting solution for the problems that have arisen in this part of the world. My Government is deeply convinced that the goal should be the establishment of a true peace which will enable all the countries in the Near East, including Israel, to live in normal and stable conditions.

115. To attain this we must above all, apart from the questions of navigation, find a final settlement for the vital problem of the refugees and at the same time establish peaceful neighbourly relations among all the countries in this region.

116. My delegation considers that the consideration of these matters should not be postponed and that discussions to that end should start at once. They would, of course, take place at the United Nations, in the Security Council or under its auspices. Moreover, it seems essential to us that the international community should be called upon to play its part by endorsing—if not guaranteeing—any settlement which it may be possible to arrive at.

117. Bearing in mind these comments, my delegation welcomes the amendments to paragraph 6 as they appear in the third revision of the text. It congratulates those who proposed this new wording. At the same time it thanks the sponsors of the draft resolution for the spirit of conciliation which they have shown. We should like to hope that this mutual understanding will help to improve the climate between the parties directly concerned.

118. If this draft resolution is adopted, the Assembly will have taken a constructive step, in particular by recognizing that the present situation in the Near East requires that the Security Council should start at once on any discussions or studies of the future—a future which, I must repeat, my Government cannot dissociate from the question of evacuation.

119. These are the comments which my delegation thought it necessary to make to the Assembly in connexion with the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries. The text, as it now stands, could have been improved still further, but it has the virtue of sticking to essentials. Therefore, in the light of the observations I have just made, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution. On the other hand, it will be obliged to abstain on the amendments submitted by the delegation of Albania (A/L.524) and of Cuba

(A/L.525) neither of which move in the direction desired by the French Government.

120. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): I have already made the views of my delegation clear in my intervention on 26 June. I then made the following observations, among others:

"The most urgent question is ending the occupation. Withdrawal should take place immediately. Belligerency from all sides must be terminated." [1535th meeting, para. 14.]

121. My delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.522 which called upon Israel to withdraw all its forces behind the armistice lines established by the General Armistice Agreements between Israel and the Arab countries. Specification of such a withdrawal would have helped us to know the exact positions to which the occupation forces of Israel were expected to withdraw. But the first, second and third revised texts of document A/L.522 call upon Israel to withdraw immediately all its forces to the positions they held prior to 5 June 1967. Now, my delegation is not aware that the contending forces in the Middle East have informed either the Security Council or the Secretary-General of the respective positions of their forces on or before 5 June. In such circumstances, my delegation is unable to support the idea of asking Israel to move to positions about which we were not informed before and about which we are not clear even now. My delegation continues to maintain that Israel should immediately withdraw its forces from the Arab territories under its occupation.

122. Regarding the Latin American draft as contained in document A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2, I wish to state that it appears to be in conformity with most of the views of my delegation. However, operative paragraph 4 attempts to separate part of the question from the entire question of ending the occupation and ending the belligerency. In the opinion of my delegation, the question of Jerusalem cannot be separated from the entire question of achieving an enduring peace in the Middle East. My delegation wishes to record its strong disapproval of Israel's recent action in attempting to change the status of the City of Jerusalem.

123. For the reasons I have just explained, which do not help in guiding us to support the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.522/Rev.3 and A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2, my delegation will abstain on both of them.

124. Mr. PIRZADA (Pakistan): The Assembly is now reaching, in the words of the President, "the moment of decision". There are, among others, two draft resolutions before us: first, A/L.522/Rev.3, which is the draft resolution of the Asian, African and non-aligned countries and which Pakistan has the privilege of co-sponsoring; and second, A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2, which is the draft resolution sponsored by the Latin American countries.

125. Before I comment on the latter draft resolution, I must say at the outset that we, the Asian and African nations, have always felt a deep affinity with the countries of Latin America. They have been our allies in many battles fought for justice and equality

of rights, and I would hope that they will remain so in the future also. It is therefore a matter of deep regret for us that on the transcendental issue confronting the Assembly today their views should be so different from ours.

126. The sponsors of the draft resolution of the African, Asian and non-aligned countries, for their part, did everything in their power to seek a wider consensus for their draft resolution, in particular from the delegations of Latin American countries. One has only to compare the original text of our draft resolution with the one now under consideration to appreciate the lengths to which we have gone to meet the viewpoint of our Latin American colleagues. It is but natural that we of Asia and Africa should have borne the impact of the aggression in the Middle East with greater depth and intensity than the Latin American peoples. We still hope that our collective exposition will succeed in persuading them to see the elementary justice embodied in our draft resolution.

127. In evaluating the Latin American draft resolution, the Assembly has first to remind itself what exactly, in terms of the Charter—and the terms of the Charter are the only terms we know—is the issue confronting it. The issue is that force has been used by a Member of the United Nations against the territorial integrity of three Member States. This has been done in violation of the Charter, which, under Article 51, permits the use of force only in self-defence against armed attack, and subject to action by the Security Council.

128. The question arises, what is the first and foremost duty of the United Nations in the face of this situation? It is plain that there is only one answer to the question. The violation of the Charter must immediately be rectified; coupled with the cease-fire, there must be an immediate withdrawal of the invading troops behind the positions held prior to hostilities. Such withdrawal, to have any meaning, must be unconditional. This is the minimum prerequisite to any peace settlement. All other issues relating to the conflicting claims or rights and interests of the parties can be taken up only after aggression has been vacated and the territorial integrity of the victim States has been duly restored.

129. I venture to say that this is the vital principle of our draft resolution. It is the principle of the sequence followed by the United Nations in all situations involving fighting: first, a cease-fire; second, a withdrawal of troops; third, a settlement. And it is this basic principle which is not reflected in the draft resolution submitted by our Latin American colleagues.

130. If we feel strongly about this matter, it is not only because of our feelings about the events in the Middle East, deep and profound as they are. We feel strongly because the issue transcends the present crisis and extends beyond the problem of Israel's territorial expansion through the use of force against its Arab neighbours. The issue darkens the prospects for the peace and security of all the smaller States of the world, particularly the newly independent and developing countries of Asia and Africa. We, the smaller countries, have placed our hopes for defence against aggression and conquest in the willingness and

the ability of the Security Council and the General Assembly to uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter, to condemn aggression, to get it vacated whenever it occurs, and to preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of the Member States of this Organization.

131. By our decision on this issue, we will in fact answer the question whether the United Nations is to survive by upholding its principles and acting in accordance with them, or whether it is to wither away as an instrument for a world order based on the renunciation, and not the use, of force.

132. The issue was put by President Eisenhower on 20 February 1957, in a situation exactly parallel to the present one. He stated:

"It [Israel] insists on firm guarantees as a condition to withdrawing its forces of invasion. . . . 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. We will . . . have countenanced the use of force as a means of settling international differences and . . . gaining national advantages. . . . If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the Organization, and our best hope of establishing a world order."

President Eisenhower's warning is as timely today as it was on the occasion of Israel's aggression in 1956. We deeply regret that this warning has not found an echo in the Latin American proposals.

133. The Latin American draft resolution links the question of the withdrawal of Israeli forces with other questions at issue between the parties. By doing so, it rejects the Charter principle which I have just recalled. It also denies justice to the Arab States.

134. Let me discuss how this draft resolution does not mete out even-handed justice. We all know what are the questions in dispute between the parties. By their very nature, they involve varied and important moral and juridical issues. There are at least two views about the rights and wrongs involved therein. Israel's claims and demands are sought to be conceded in the Latin American draft resolution, which would require the Arab States to forswear non-recognition and to guarantee the freedom of passage of Israeli ships through the Gulf of Aqaba, not to speak of the Suez Canal. On the other hand, there is no national interest of the Arab States which is promoted by the provision for the withdrawal Israeli troops, except the elementary interests of the vacation of aggression. The two kinds of interests are not equal. The vacation of aggression on a Member State is in the interest not only of that Member State, but of the entire membership of the United Nations.

135. Even the vacation of aggression is not provided for in the Latin American proposal in clear and unmistakable words. We fear that the wording of operative paragraphs 1 (a) and 3 (c) may be so construed as to justify the territorial expansion of Israel after its successful recourse to force. Moreover, the draft resolution assumes that non-recognition of Israel by the Arab States has arisen independently of the Zionist

aggression and expansion in 1948 and the expulsion of a million Arabs from their homeland, Palestine.

136. I might parenthetically observe here that we have noted the provisions in the Latin American proposal regarding the grave and important question of the Holy City of Jerusalem. My delegation is sponsoring a separate draft resolution on this question, which has been circulated as a document [A/L.527], but which I shall formally introduce on a later occasion.

137. We realize that some words have been dexterously used in this debate in order to produce an impression of a parity of interests where none exists. Mr. Eban spoke of withdrawal from territory and withdrawal from belligerency and non-recognition. The two are not comparable. In maintaining its troops in areas under the jurisdiction of other Member States, Israel is continuing to use force and to violate the Charter. But in withholding recognition from a State which has not fulfilled the conditions attached to its establishment by the United Nations, the Arab States are not violating the Charter.

138. Some may think—we do not—that they are wrong in doing so. But, in making them renounce what they deeply and passionately consider their national rights, the Latin American draft resolution would subject them to coercion. Can, and should, recognition be coerced, extorted or imposed by military occupation of the territories of non-recognizing States? That is the question we have to answer. The Latin American draft resolution, we fear, lends its authority and sanction to the imposition of recognition.

139. The question which this Assembly has to answer is this: should it be reduced to a rubber stamp for legitimizing the gains from the use of force? Should it enforce the claims of the party which has committed the aggression by linking the satisfaction of those claims with the removal of its occupation forces?

140. Great issues are at stake here. References have been made by Mr. Eban to the pronouncements of some representatives about the imperative necessity of a peace settlement in the Middle East. We do not dispute the necessity. But the question is: Is it to be an imposed settlement? When these distinguished personalities talk of a territorial settlement, they all make it absolutely clear that what they envisage is a freely accepted settlement—"freely negotiated and accepted" and "based on consent and co-operation of the parties". Such are the expressions they use. How can the Arab States be considered to have the freedom to negotiate a settlement when the condition for the withdrawal of the invading forces is their submission in advance to Israel's demands? Certainly, these recommendations for a freely negotiated peace settlement based on consent and co-operation of the parties make it imperative that the question of the withdrawal of Israeli troops be given absolute priority. That is precisely the objective of the Asian-African draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3].

141. We are told that our draft resolution would be a prescription for renewed hostilities. When this argument comes from Israel, what is it except a threat to use force again? The draft resolution follows the precedents established by the United Nations in all situations of armed conflict, notably that between

India and Pakistan in 1965 and the Israeli aggression on Egypt in 1956. Can it be said that the course of action decided by the United Nations in those situations was a prescription for renewed hostilities? Mr. Eban himself freely admitted that "the Israel-Egyptian frontier had been relatively tranquil for ten whole years" [1536th meeting, para. 85]. This admission, and its supporting realities, should show that no renewal of hostilities need be feared if a United Nations presence is established on both sides of the armistice lines between Israel and the Arab States. Therefore, there is not the slightest justification for this Assembly to permit the least delay in demanding the withdrawal of Israeli troops.

142. The Asian-African draft resolution contains, in our judgement, sufficient safeguards against renewed tensions in the area. It calls for strict observance by all parties of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreements. It provides for the assistance of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization for this purpose. It requires the Secretary-General to designate a personal representative to be in contact with the parties and to help the Secretary-General in security full compliance. It requests the Security Council to consider all aspects of the situation in the Middle East. These include issues relating to armistice lines, national boundaries, repatriation of refugees, the establishment of a peaceful atmosphere, the question of passage through the Gulf of Aqaba. To hold that in their totality these provisions still do not provide an insurance of peaceful conditions is, in reality, to assert that Israel's militancy is insatiable and that nothing will end it except the fulfilment of all its demands. I do believe that such an assertion cannot be sustained in this Assembly.

143. I have so far dealt with the questions of principle involved in the two draft resolutions. May I now invite the Assembly's attention to the inescapable practical reality that the danger of resumed hostilities will remain grave as long as Israeli troops remain in areas which were under the jurisdiction of the Arab States. If the Assembly links the removal of these troops with the satisfaction of Israel's claims and ambitions, it will fail to act with effectiveness and clarity to restore the territorial integrity of three Member States which have been the victims of force. This link cannot be a prescription for peace.

144. Finally, I would speak, with great deference, of the argument advanced against the Asian-African draft and in favour of the Latin American text. It is that the Asian-African draft has been rejected by Israel and therefore will not be implemented. But if the Assembly were to heed this kind of argument, then the Assembly should never dare to raise its voice against any aggressor. The Assembly should never have the courage to call for an end to apartheid. It should never touch the questions of Rhodesia and South West Africa. The Assembly, instead, should brush aside the Charter. It should agree to wait on the pleasure of the successful aggressor and ratify its terms for peace.

145. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): The result of the more than two weeks of discussions in the General Assembly on the question on our agenda, namely the liquidation of the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States

and the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli troops, has been to clarify the positions of countries towards the various aspects of the question before the Assembly.

146. During the recent debate in the General Assembly, the overwhelming majority of delegations expressed the opinion that it was impossible to allow aggression to become the rule in international relations. On the contrary, in their statements they strongly emphasized the need to outlaw aggression as a method of settling disputes between nations and to condemn aggression, as indeed they did in their speeches.

147. It has been proved quite categorically during these discussions that in flagrant violation of the General Armistice Agreements, the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the rules of international law, Israel committed a premeditated act of aggression against its Arab neighbours. The direct consequences of the aggression are the losses of human life and the material damage that has been caused, and the occupation of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, while the people of the occupied territory are subjected to torture and persecution.

148. A second point which has emerged from the discussion and which has also been strongly emphasized is that the occupation of another State's territory on the basis of the threat or use of force cannot be allowed.

149. Nevertheless, the international community is faced with the fact of the presence of Israeli occupation troops on territories belonging to the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. This state of affairs is at the root of a constant state of hostility, tension and insecurity as far as peace in this part of the world is concerned. From the moral, political and juridical point of view, the continuation of the occupation would signify the awarding of an undeserved prize to an aggressor who has perpetrated a grave international crime against peace and security. The aggressor would interpret it as an opportunity to profit in the future from the crime he had committed, drawing from it political, territorial and material advantages. This cannot and must not be allowed. Armed aggression cannot be a source of territorial and political gain. The United Nations cannot remain indifferent towards the arbitrary acts of Israel extremists laying down the law in the occupied regions and subjecting their peoples to persecution. They cannot pass over in silence and without taking any steps to refute the Israel expansionists' attempts to legalize the pillage of other States' lands and the taking of prizes of war.

150. There is no need to recall that the practice engaged in by certain Powers in the Security Council of dragging out the steps leading up to a cease-fire has helped Israel—its protectors know that well—and given it the chance to penetrate far into the interior of the Arab countries and to enlarge its territorial expansion. Israel would also benefit from the fact that certain parties are seeking to link the question of the withdrawal of the occupying troops to preliminary conditions, or any other conditions, for such a practice

would prejudice the interests of the victims of the aggression.

151. What is more, such attempts may stir up and are already stirring up the aggressor's ambitions, fostering those expansionist passions which are, so it seems, in the ascendant at the moment in Israel.

152. As we have already noted, these considerations were the basis of all the statements made before this Assembly by the vast majority of delegations. It is in the light of these same considerations that the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is authorized to take its position on the draft resolutions before us.

153. On the basis of these considerations, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria will vote against the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America [A/L.520] if it is put to the vote. By placing the aggressor and the victim of the aggression on the same footing, this draft resolution in fact acts as the spokesman for the old practices and the policy of imperialist pillaging and armed intervention everywhere.

154. The draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2], despite its appearance of objectivity, has one main defect, which lies in the fact that it seeks to solve the problems of the Middle East—and above all the problems which the aggressor has caused and is causing in the Middle East—in the light of Israel's aggression, and thus offers a reward for aggression. It completely ignores the fact that no question can be discussed, still less settled, while the aggression and the occupation of Arab territories continue. The People's Republic of Bulgaria is forced to vote against this resolution, which seeks to solve the problems that have arisen in the Middle East, and particularly the problems raised by Israel, in favour of Israel's aggression.

155. The Soviet Union's draft resolution condemning the aggression (A/L.519) seems the most likely to remedy the situation with which the General Assembly is at present concerned. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria will therefore vote in favour of this draft resolution.

156. Though aware of the limited nature of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3], the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria will vote in favour of it, in the deep conviction that it is the first step towards the implementation of the most urgent and direct measures for liquidating the effects of the aggression. Indeed, the immediate withdrawal of Israel's troops behind the lines from which they launched their attack, as also the strict observance of the General Armistice Agreements, constitute the most direct and essential conditions for the subsequent normalization of the situation in the Near East.

157. We also support the appeal to all States in paragraph 4 "to render every assistance to the Secretary-General in the implementation of the present resolution". In our view, all Member States are under an obligation, in virtue of the duties incumbent upon them under the Charter, in particular Article 2 (5), to contribute to the implementation of the resolution in

question, for which the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria intends to vote.

158. The General Assembly must take action immediately, or the consequences will be very dangerous for our Organization. The United Nations and the whole international community must, through this resolution and all the others which we are certain must and will be adopted, recall the Israeli authorities to reason. The occupation of the Arab territories must end immediately; this is vital and the General Assembly must bring it about. Without it there will certainly be no peace in the Middle East. It is because we want peace in the Middle East that we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries and for all the other draft resolutions which call for the immediate withdrawal of troops and the condemnation of aggression in the Middle East and throughout the world.

159. Mr. GARCIA SAYAN (Peru) (translated from Spanish): In its statement in this Assembly on 29 June, my delegation expressed its views on the present crisis in the Middle East and outlined the points which in its opinion could serve as guidelines for the resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly. Subsequently my delegation reaffirmed those points in the Latin American group, with which it has co-operated in the same impartial and objective spirit that has prevailed there in the drafting of a text that might gain the approval of this Assembly.

160. My delegation is not, however, among the sponsors of the Latin American draft resolution, because my Government would have liked certain aspects of the complex problem of the Middle East to be mentioned in the operative part, such as, for example, the establishment of demilitarized zones on either side of the armistice lines simultaneously with the withdrawal of Israel's forces from the territories that they are occupying. Similarly, we should have liked the operative part to include a specific decision by this Assembly on the appointment of a commissioner or commissioners for the region, and to place somewhat more emphasis on the need for the belligerents to recognize the legal existence of all the States in the area of conflict, since otherwise the resolutions of the United Nations are not respected. Lastly, we would have suggested an immediate, although only partial, solution to the problem of Jerusalem, restricting its international status under the authority of the United Nations to the old walled city for the time being.

161. We understand the difficulty of including those points, as we proposed them, in a group resolution which has of necessity required not a few concessions and compromises in the position of each country. At the same time, we realize that the draft resolution finally produced by the group does in some way cover some essential parts of our ideas and that the terms in which the request made to the Security Council is couched allow us to hope that that august body of our Organization, co-operating directly with the parties and relying upon the presence of the United Nations—according to the terms of the draft resolution—will be able to implement the resolution adopted, in order to find a way of peace for the Middle East based on the

principles and resolutions of the United Nations and commanding the respect of the States in conflict.

162. In the light of those considerations, my delegation wishes to state from this rostrum that, imbued as always with a spirit of solidarity with the other Latin American countries and noting at the same time that the draft resolution of the group is the most balanced and the most appropriate of all those submitted, we shall express our support for the draft resolution by voting in favour of it. This decision of my delegation will consequently preclude its voting in favour of any of the other draft resolutions on the substance of the question, even though we may find some paragraphs in them which coincide with our own point of view.

163. I am sure we all realize the gravity of the forthcoming vote. It would be a tragedy for the world and for faith in our Organization if this Assembly did not adopt a resolution which would be a first step on the road towards an effective formula for peace, based on justice. I therefore think that, if the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, which has to be put to the vote first, is not adopted, those who supported it should endeavour to waive some of their ideas and vote in favour of a proposal like the Latin American, which respects both parties to the conflict and which has but one aim: that peaceful coexistence should be established in the Middle East once and for all.

164. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) (translated from Spanish): The situation created by the outbreak of hostilities and the expanding war in the Middle East since 5 June has aroused the concern of all States Members of the United Nations, especially the small countries, since the situation at present prevailing is a violation of purposes of the Charter such as the maintenance of international peace and security.

165. Considering that the Security Council had taken the first essential steps, such as ordering a cease-fire in the region, and that that firm step enabled the General Assembly to discuss and recommend more concrete measures, we came to this emergency special session, not to discuss propaganda proposals by one party or to justify aggression by the other, but with the highest sense of the duty of Member States in the task imposed upon them by the Charter, in all calmness and objectivity.

166. The countries which form what is informally known as the Latin American group have been resolutely meeting in an effort to find a just formula in keeping with the situation and to submit it, as we have done in the draft resolution before the Assembly [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2]. I may say, on behalf of my delegation, that in working out the text of the draft resolution there were serious discussions on the problem, having agreed to an exchange of ideas, and that, without abandoning the essential bases of international law and the principles of the Charter, we considered appropriate and urgent measures to cope with the situation created by the conflict in the Middle East. And what happened within our own group—geographically far distant from the region, though we are linked to it by history—gave us a prospect of getting as close as possible to the consensus of the majority of the Assembly, knowing that this consensus is essential

to enable the Security Council to take the most rapid action and to ensure that its decisions are carried out.

167. My delegation takes a special interest in the matter because of its close links with the countries of the region, in particular the Arab countries, whose citizens in my country have co-operated in the work and progress of our nation.

168. Both because of its contribution to Western culture and because of its geographical and strategic importance, the Middle East weighs on the conscience of all sectors of the world and it is essential that the United Nations should adopt measures that will be fully complied with, for it would be deplorable if this Assembly failed to give precise directions and thus, by indecision, opened the door to the spectre of a future war the consequences of which are unforeseeable.

169. In view of the international responsibility for the situation, the United Nations cannot shirk the problem and leave the parties to a suppositious dialogue, which the history of the last twenty years has shown to be, unfortunately, impossible to carry out, nor are there at the present time any of the indispensable factors for a direct understanding, such as that of mutual respect and equality of conditions for a settlement between the States in conflict. The only course left is that of urgent and immediate action by the United Nations organs.

170. If the representatives in this Assembly will give the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American group their serious attention, they will find in it elements of equity and justice for practical solutions by the United Nations. Paragraph 1 (a) contains a provision that reflects the wish of nearly all the Members of the United Nations, since it urges Israel to withdraw all its forces from all the territories of Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic which it has occupied as a result of the recent conflict. This is an essential first step for the solution of the problem, a *sine qua non* to enable the parties to the conflict, free from compulsion and the rule of force, to begin to consider the other provisions that the Assembly and the Security Council adopt in conformity with the Charter.

171. There is no question of allowing for the possibility of academic discussions, in which the parties may try to avoid complying with the resolution by protracted discussion of what is concrete and definite in objectivity, which could give rise to tardy interpretations or procedures. Our draft resolution is perfectly clear. I think that it lies with this Organization, and not with the parties, to interpret the content of this resolution in time to see that it is complied with in all urgency.

172. My delegation wishes to stress this point, for the term "belligerency" has been used here in such a broad sense that it seems to have been far removed from the correct meaning that it should be given in the United Nations, which is none other than that laid down in the Charter and in the rules of international law. Acts of belligerency are fully defined and they are described in all legal texts, in the chapters devoted to international war.

173. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter states as an inviolable principle of peaceful relations that Member States shall refrain 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. To change a State's title to territorial sovereignty by force of arms is an act contrary to the Charter, according to which military occupation is an act of war which does not end with the cease-fire but only when the territorial integrity of the State in question is fully restored in accordance with law.

174. In the 1955 edition of the work entitled An Introduction to the Law of Nations,^{1/} Svarlien explains this situation, which is relevant to the present conflict. So far the Security Council has only succeeded in halting the hostilities. Sometimes, the author says, hostilities end without peace treaties and leave the belligerent in permanent occupation of the territory which belongs to another State. In that case there are two ways of looking at it. In the first case the victor has his title to the territory through a peace treaty and in the second through a fact, i.e., the firm control of the territory which he has obtained in the war and has maintained to such a point that the loser has to postpone any hope of recovering the lost area to an indefinite future.

175. A *de facto* situation contrary to the United Nations Charter cannot be a matter for the unilateral will of States, since no State can be given discretionary powers of decision over territories seized by force. The draft resolution calmly asks all the States involved in the recent conflict in the Middle East to put an end to the state of belligerency.

176. I am referring to the substance and the spirit of the draft resolution that we have submitted, based also on historical antecedents. When Japan occupied Manchuria by force, the League of Nations submitted a draft resolution in which it refused to recognize the consequences of that act of war, on the basis of Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Moreover, the United States condemned it as a *de facto* situation whose validity it denied.

177. The Second World War unleashed a series of such acts, by reason of the excessive nazi policy of Lebensraum, a policy which the Charter has proscribed.

178. Besides asking both parties to put an end to the war, the draft resolution asks for efforts to establish coexistence based on good neighbourliness and that recourse should be had in all cases to the procedures that the Charter provides for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

179. There has been, and there still is, concern to bring about a radical change in this important region of the world, but so far this has proved impossible. I am convinced that all the countries of the world, and especially the small countries, as we have said before, have a deep and abiding interest in peace. The work of the United Nations would perhaps be more effective if the great Powers would take more interest in the

^{1/} Oscar Svarlien, An Introduction to the Law of Nations, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1955.

problems of underdevelopment, with its attendant hunger, poverty and disease, than in the existence of warlike attitudes in the various regions.

180. A careful study of paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution will show, without prejudice, that the parties are asked in all equanimity to fulfil the purposes of the Charter, with the assistance that the United Nations can offer to ensure strict compliance. Paragraph 2 states a definite principle of international law, accepted by all States, which reflects the purposes of the Charter, which no State can with advantage refuse to accept unless it has expansionist designs.

181. The draft resolution expresses once again the conviction that no stable international order can be based on the threat or use of force and declares that there can be no recognition of the validity of the occupation or acquisition of territories gained by such means.

182. The juridical system of the Organization of American States provides useful examples of this principle. There is, for instance, the Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, signed on 26 December 1933 at the VIIth American International Conference. Article 11 states:

"The territory of a State is inviolable and may not be the subject of military occupation nor of other measures of force imposed by another State directly or indirectly or for any motive whatever even temporarily."^{2/}

183. We could cite the Declaration by American States of 3 August 1932, in Washington, the Anti-War Treaty (Non-Aggression and Conciliation) signed at Rio on 10 October 1933, the resolutions adopted by the International Law Association at its 38th Conference, held at Budapest in September 1934, the VIIIth American International Conference, held at Lima in December 1938 and, of course, the Charter of the Organization of American States, signed at Bogotá on 30 April 1948, which has so often been quoted here by distinguished representatives from various parts of the world—in particular article 17.

184. Lastly, as stated in the Charter, the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. That is the object of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, in which the Security Council is asked to take immediate action on the problem of the Middle East, using the means available to the United Nations, and of course with the collaboration of the parties, to ensure compliance with the general lines of action that this Assembly lays down for the implementation of the aforementioned measures. There is also the duty of devoting careful consideration to the tragic and insoluble problem of the thousands of refugees upon whom the whole world is turning its compassionate gaze; ensuring the territorial inviolability and independence of the States of the Middle East and the establishment of demilitarized zones with the help of both parties, so that the collaboration will not be one-sided, since they cannot throw the blame on the genuine efforts for peace made by the high officials of the United Nations, in particular the Secretary-General, if they do not first comply with

the resolutions adopted by United Nations bodies and if they refuse to collaborate in any way in the establishment of a stable peace.

185. Lastly, the draft resolution of which my delegation is a sponsor attaches great importance to the establishment of an international régime for Jerusalem in order to preserve the Holy Places which are to be found both within and outside that city, to which end it reverts to the wish expressed by the General Assembly in resolutions 181 (II) of 1947, 194 (III) of 1948 and 303 (IV) of 1949. It was that last resolution which considered the establishment of Jerusalem as a corpus separatum under United Nations administration.

186. As this problem has strong religious roots, consideration is given to the advisability of its being studied in greater depth by the General Assembly at its next session.

187. My delegation appeals to all representatives to consider the draft resolution which we have submitted in concert with most of the Latin American delegations and to give it their support as a genuine contribution towards the cause of peace in the Middle East.

188. The Latin American draft resolution is not, nor has it been, designed to encourage aggression or territorial annexation in the area, for that would be a betrayal of the legal institutions established by the Organization of American States, nor does it seek to establish any delay in the withdrawal of Israel's forces from the territories which it has occupied by force of arms in the Arab countries of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. It considers this withdrawal to be essential, but as a first step and in harmony with other steps which are essential for peace in the Middle East. The resolutions of the United Nations and hence the draft resolutions, are not, nor can they be, casuistic. It is therefore deplorable that they are interpreted in a way that runs counter to their objectives, for it is only those who do not wish to comply with the provisions of the Charter who find arguments with regard to their interpretation.

189. I should like to announce that the Chairman of the Latin American group will make a statement in due course on behalf of all the countries of the group.

190. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): My delegation has very carefully examined the draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly. While taking into serious consideration the different approaches and the problems facing our Organization, we have come to the conclusion that the reason why there is constant tension in the Middle East lies in the history of nineteen years of Israeli aggression in that area. Israel has threatened its neighbours verbally and militarily, committed provocations against the Arab countries, launched so-called preventive attacks, oppressed and persecuted the Arab nationals within its boundaries and expelled them from its territory, displaying a chauvinistic policy that we have only seen before during the Hitler-Nazi régime. Most recently we have witnessed Israel's attempt to annex areas of neighbouring countries.

191. I do not want to go into the details of these questions since my delegation has already dealt with the problem in the general debate [1534th meeting]. I

^{2/} League of Nations, Treaty Series, vol. CLXV, 1936, No. 3802, p. 27.

should like to say, however, that today the Assembly has under scrutiny the most recent aggression committed by Israel, the conquest of foreign territories by armed force, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

192. If we consider the problem from this angle we cannot ignore the schemes expressed in certain draft resolutions that seek to find a solution to the Middle Eastern crisis on an unacceptable basis. In fact, some of these draft resolutions try to render assistance to the aggressor. The Hungarian delegation, however, is aware that the solution of all present and future problems in that area of the world greatly depends upon the proper assessment of the situation.

193. In considering the different draft resolutions, we find that the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.519] is the clearest of all in its formulation. It embraces the most essential aspects of the problem in the Middle East. It is definite in its language and, if implemented, will provide the basic solution to the main problems before us. At the same time, it is unequivocal. It tries to liquidate the results of aggression. That is why my delegation holds that the best settlement of the problem is envisaged in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union.

194. On the other hand, the United States draft resolution [A/L.520], which is also very clear but in the opposite direction, represents the interests of the aggressor in the Middle East. This draft resolution simply forgets to mention the responsibility of the international criminal ruling circles in Tel Aviv. It tries to satisfy in a subtle way the objectives of the aggressor. For these reasons, this draft resolution is completely unacceptable to my delegation.

195. The draft resolution in document A/L.526, originally submitted by nineteen Powers, follows laudable humanitarian aims with regard to giving assistance to the persecuted population of the Middle East. We feel that besides the methods mainly emphasized in this draft resolution there are other substantial ways to deal with such problems. Assistance can be given on a bilateral basis too. My country did not wait for any appeal from the United Nations or for a resolution by the General Assembly, but, after the cease-fire, immediately sent medical aid to the Arab countries in the amount of several million forints. Besides the Government action, popular Hungarian organizations also organized large-scale collections. But all relief projects are only of temporary value. My delegation is convinced that the Arab peoples need not charity but a restitution of their lawful rights. Thus the substantive question we have to put before the Assembly is: Who is responsible for violating the basic rights of the Arab population? In reply to this question, my delegation holds that the Israeli Government should pay reparations and compensation to the refugees, to the dispossessed Arab population. Until that is done, we will not achieve a basic settlement of this problem. We will only be treating it superficially. At the same time, I think such attempts shift the responsibility from the guilty party to the whole Organization.

196. Coming next to the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries [A/L.523 and Add.1

and 2], my delegation found, in speaking with a number of Latin American delegations, that their goodwill was evident. Nevertheless the text of the draft is contrary to those intentions. I quote only a few examples. For instance, the second preambular paragraph refers to the cease-fire accepted by Israel. If we take only the most recent news, we find that Israeli artillery, as late as yesterday and today, local time, was shooting across the Suez Canal to the territory of the United Arab Republic. If nothing else, this violation of the cease-fire already outdates the draft resolution. We see that the words expressed here by the representative of Israel and the deeds of the Israeli army in the Middle East are contradictory, and this most recent news is proof of new perfidy.

197. The draft resolution mentions other different measures contributing to the peaceful settlement of the Middle Eastern problem and thus diverts attention from the main problem—that is, the withdrawal of forces from the occupied areas, from the territories of the Arab countries. The draft resolution sets conditions for this withdrawal. In its operative paragraphs, it also speaks of belligerency, but it does not expose the Israeli aggression. It speaks of peaceful settlement, but it does not say that Israel negates all peaceful settlement every day and repeatedly. Operative paragraph 3 tries to give a prescription to the Security Council on how to deal with the problem when it appears on the Council's agenda. This prescription complicates and postpones the withdrawal of forces. Territorial inviolability is mentioned, but the draft resolution does not state who is violating the territories of other countries. It also speaks of the well-being of refugees, but what kind of refugees? Who are these refugees? Why are there refugees? Why have they been expelled from their homeland? And why are they suffering? The draft resolution does not answer any of these questions. Its operative paragraph 4 speaks about imposing an international régime in Jerusalem. In the view of the Hungarian delegation any such decision would constitute a violation of the sovereignty of Jordan.

198. For those reasons, the draft resolution is unacceptable to the Hungarian delegation.

199. Having already enumerated a number of documents that are partly intended to confuse delegations and public opinion as a whole, I have to state, regretfully, that sometimes it is difficult to get objective documents reproduced in this Organization.

200. The Hungarian delegation submitted on 22 June, at the request of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, a statement in which that Government exposes the collusion and military cooperation of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany with Israel in perpetrating an aggression in the Middle East. At the conclusion of this document the opinion of the German Democratic Republic is very clearly explained. I quote from the document:

"The United Nations Organization will fulfil its obligation if it . . .

"1. Condemns Israel as an aggressor;

"2. Ensures by appropriate measures that the Israeli troops immediately withdraw to their original positions held before the aggression;

"3. Secures the unconditional territorial integrity of the Arab States;

"4. Imposes on Israel the obligation to pay immediate and full reparation for the damage caused to the victims of the aggression;

"5. Guarantees the return to their homes of the Arab refugees expelled by the aggressors;

"6. Imposes on Israel the obligation to adhere strictly to the Geneva Conventions on the treatment of war prisoners, the protection of wounded and ill persons in the field, and the civilian population in times of war, and the Convention on the prevention and punishment of genocide."

201. The Hungarian delegation, as explained in the general debate, fully shares those views and conclusions. Therefore, we requested that this document be distributed as an official document of the General Assembly. But a high official of the Secretariat, Mr. Stavropoulos, called my action a trick. I must protest against such an intolerable, abusive and offensive language and attitude, widely transgressing the authority of and unbecoming to an international civil servant.

202. As a result my delegation had no choice but to turn to the Secretary-General; and, on his direct advice and on the personal instructions of the President, the document was distributed as document A/6728. But because of all this wrangling, the distribution was delayed one week. Such a delay is unacceptable when such an important question is dealt with in a document. On the other hand, a reply to this document [A/6737], submitted by the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations on 29 June, was promptly distributed the next day.

203. My delegation considers this as a clear case of discrimination against a Member State of the United Nations. We demand the prompt and equal co-operation of all functionaries of the Secretariat in all administrative and other matters.

204. Finally, my delegation wishes to express its views on the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3]. The general debate has clearly demonstrated that a great number of delegations—in fact, the majority of the speakers from this rostrum—supported the ideas incorporated in this text, couched in very objective language and deserving therefore of the widest possible support.

205. I would draw the attention of our Latin American colleagues to the fact that this draft resolution contains all the positive elements of their draft resolution as well. However, there is one striking difference, namely, that the draft resolution of the non-aligned States does not contain any conditions that should be fulfilled before the withdrawal, conditions on which the withdrawal would depend. And certainly this draft resolution would not permit the aggressor to enjoy the spoils of his aggression. Therefore, the Hungarian delegation recommends that the General Assembly should adopt this compromise proposal, which contains the minimum terms for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict, constituting a basis for a future consolidated peace. At the same time, such a settlement would mean a significant success for the General As-

sembly and would enhance the authority of the United Nations.

206. Therefore, the Hungarian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/L.522/Rev.3.

207. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) (translated from French): Since the beginning of the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, we have been overwhelmed by an avalanche of draft resolutions. Some of those draft resolutions clearly seek to divert the Assembly's attention from the purposes of the Charter. The delegation of Guinea wishes to make it quite clear, however, that it will not allow itself to be over-awed by this flood of oratory which is being poured forth for the benefit of the Press rather than for the purpose of assisting the General Assembly in its search for a solution to the Middle East tragedy.

208. My delegation wishes to state once again that Israel has committed a clear act of aggression. To refuse to recognize this means deliberately to dull one's ability to appraise objective historical facts unless, of course, there are more obscure and mysterious reasons for such an attitude.

209. Whatever the truth of the matter may be, the United Nations and, consequently, the General Assembly, cannot fail to decide in favour of the draft resolution sponsored by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3], of which my country is a co-sponsor. If the General Assembly, for one reason or another, were to do the opposite it would be proving that it no longer had any *raison d'être*. In rejecting this draft resolution, the General Assembly would be acting contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and would be sanctioning the principle that force, aggression and violence are henceforth to be the only means of resolving conflicts between men and States. Such an action would have dangerous consequences, especially for the small countries, and more especially for the African countries, which know all too well and have themselves experienced what is happening in Rhodesia, South Africa and Mozambique, and also in the Middle East, Aden and elsewhere.

210. Moreover, any legal technicalities that may be adduced here regarding the competence of the General Assembly or the Security Council are an imperfect disguise—at least as far as my delegation is concerned—for unpardonable, nay, criminal designs and for a complicity which is all too apparent.

211. Last weekend we were informed by the Press that fire had been exchanged in the vicinity of Suez. This demonstrates once again the need for an immediate withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Arab soil, for as long as they remain there no peace of any kind, however tenuous, can be expected in that region. In other words, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab soil is a pre-condition for peace in the area.

212. At the beginning of my statement I said that my delegation had the honour of co-sponsoring the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries. I should like to add that this draft resolution represents but a minimum, a strict minimum, for if it depended on my delegation alone—and this, I am sure, applies to

many other delegations—the Assembly would now have before it a draft resolution that would be equal to the seriousness of the existing situation in the Middle East.

213. I should now like to say a few words about the draft resolution submitted by our brothers and friends from Latin America [A/L.523/Add.1 and 2]. My delegation believes that, rising above the contradictory conditions—brought about by others, it should be pointed out—in which the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America are at present living, our Latin American brothers and friends ought to march in step with history, in the sense that they should be much more concerned with the future than with the present.

214. We believe that a negative attitude towards the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, which, as I said, represents a minimum, can only jeopardize a future which we feel should be very bright for the peoples of Latin America, Africa and Asia. I wish, therefore, to appeal to our Latin American friends that, after the adoption of the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, they consider the possibility not of withdrawing their draft resolution, but of falling in line with our common objectives. Whatever may be the fate in store for our draft resolution and for that of the Latin American countries, we are convinced

that history will see to it that the true facts about the Middle East situation eventually come to light.

215. The PRESIDENT: It should perhaps be mentioned at this stage that there are fourteen more speakers on the list for explanations of vote before the vote is taken.

216. I call on the representative of Austria on a point of order.

217. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): I understand, Mr. President, that contacts among the sponsors of the various draft resolutions have taken place and will perhaps lead to further consultations. I therefore believe that it might be helpful to adjourn this meeting in order to allow these consultations to take place. In accordance with rule 78, I therefore propose that this meeting be adjourned until tomorrow.

218. The PRESIDENT: Under rule 78 of the rules of procedure, a proposal for an adjournment of the debate must be put immediately to the vote. I would therefore ask Members if there are any objections to the proposal of the representative of Austria. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Assembly has approved the proposal of the representative of Austria.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.