

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1547th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 4 July 1967,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION**

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 5:</i>	
<i>Letter dated 13 June 1967, from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/6717) (continued) . . .</i>	1

**President:** Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHAWAK  
(Afghanistan).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Sandoungout (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

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

1. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland): We have arrived at the stage of this fifth emergency special session when decisions are to be taken and when each of the delegations here will pronounce itself on the way the United Nations should react to the situation with which we are confronted in the Middle East. It must be stressed with the utmost emphasis that the matter before us is of paramount importance to the United Nations as an organization, to the ways in which future international relations will develop and to the cause of peace itself. We are confronted today, as has been stressed correctly by so many delegations, with a situation in which, as the result of aggression committed by Israel, the territories of three Members of our Organization are forcibly occupied by another Member. There can be no doubt whatsoever that this constitutes a situation which must be met with full force and clarity in the form of a decision which would bar, once and for ever, even the remotest possibility of treating our decisions in a lenient way, thus opening the road to those who would contemplate acts of aggression against other sovereign States in the future.

2. We must act against creating a disastrous precedent. This is the crux of the matter, and we must view it with absolute clarity. There can be no doubt about the sentiments and the position of the overwhelming majority of the delegations here. We can judge that on the basis of the discussion in the plenary meetings during which the speakers declared themselves to be against military actions, and almost unanimously demanded the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories. With the exception perhaps of the representative of Israel alone, there has been almost no other representative who has not demanded from this rostrum the withdrawal of those forces.

3. In spite of all this, however, we are confronted here with certain activities on the part of those who would endeavour to prevent the United Nations from fulfilling its duty and declaring itself unequivocally against a clear case of violation of the Charter. The opposition comes from those who are prepared, perhaps not openly, to defend the principle of using aggression, occupation, and then dictation of conditions from a position of strength. The delegation of the United States consequently opposed even the very idea of convening this present session. We are confronted here with constant opposition from that delegation to the adoption of any resolution of the General Assembly which would in an effective way contribute to putting an end to the aggression and to helping to create a basis for peaceful and good-neighbourly relations in the Middle East. We have been constantly subjected to all sorts of procedural and tactical moves meant to obscure the very essence of the matter, to shift attention to a secondary problem, and thereby to make it possible to prolong the occupation of territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

4. In the final analysis, votes will be judged on their merits and not on the ground of formal or procedural pretexts. This should be borne in mind with the utmost clarity, especially by those who contemplate casting their votes against a decision of the General Assembly demanding immediate withdrawal of the occupation forces as a first and necessary step to any further solutions. If we want to remain true to the principles of our Organization, we cannot at the same time condone the principle of negotiations under the duress of occupation.

5. May I recall the words spoken from this rostrum on 23 June by the Prime Minister of Poland:

"As the representative of a country which in the recent past itself fell victim to a brutal aggression and cruel occupation and which considers peace among nations as the supreme value of the contemporary world, I emphatically state that the Polish delegation will under no circumstances reconcile itself to a situation in which military might and aggression become an accepted instrument for solving international conflicts, or where the success of aggression is rewarded with the recognition of the aggressor's claims." [1534th meeting, para. 56.]

6. That is why the Polish delegation will vote for the draft resolution presented by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and contained in document A/L.519.

7. We shall vote against the draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation and contained in document A/L.520.

8. We shall vote for the draft resolution submitted as document A/L.526 and Add.1-3. The Polish delegation fully recognizes the necessity of rendering assistance to the victims of aggression in the Middle East. We for our part have already done so, having sent food, medicine, blankets, clothing and other equipment of the approximate value of 430 million zlotys. These goods have been dispatched directly to Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic, thus avoiding the unnecessary delay that would have been involved in sending them through an intermediary like the Near East Agency.<sup>1/</sup> We also consider that the responsibility for making good on all the losses and damages falls primarily on Israel.

9. Bearing in mind what has been said on the very crux of the matter, the Polish delegation will vote against the Latin American draft resolution submitted as document A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2. Much as the Polish delegation is for a speedy establishment of good-neighbourly relations between the nations, much as we are for the principle of peaceful coexistence, we are deeply convinced that no basis for such relations can possibly be negotiated before a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Arab territories.

10. Finally, I should like to state that the Polish delegation will vote for the draft resolution submitted by a group of non-aligned countries as document A/L.522/Rev.3. We believe that this text is well balanced and that, when adopted, it will constitute an important instrument in introducing peace into the troubled area of the Middle East. It will undoubtedly be conducive to a prompt and complete withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the invaded territories, to establishing peace, and to creating the necessary conditions under which the peoples of that part of the world can effectively oppose any aggressive undertakings which may be brewed in the future by the imperialists in that area.

11. Mr. BELOKOLOS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The time has come for the emergency special session of the General Assembly to take important decisions on the matter under discussion. These decisions must reflect its attitude towards the aggression committed by Israel against the Arab States, and towards Israel's continued occupation of a considerable part of their territory. This is a moment of great responsibility as regards not only the work of this session, but the entire history of the United Nations.

12. We, the participants in this emergency special session, and all the peoples of the world who are anxiously and hopefully following the political struggle in the General Assembly, are faced with the question whether this international forum will prove equal to the task before it.

13. The pattern and meaning of the events which have taken place in the Middle East since Israel started its war on 5 June have become quite clear. This was a premeditated and carefully planned act of aggression against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. Israel, whose rulers are equalled in perfidy only by

the rulers of Hitler's Germany, has invaded Arab lands and is establishing its domination over the Arabs inhabiting the occupied regions. Exercising the right of the aggressor—a right negated by history and mankind—Israel has declared that the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem and the adjoining areas are its property.

14. By these acts, Israel's leaders have issued a challenge to the Arab peoples, to all peace-loving States, and to the United Nations. No number of false and hypocritical statements made by Israel and its supporters can conceal the truth here, in the General Assembly, or in the court of history.

15. Neither can the turbid flow of deliberate misinformation and slander which issues forth from the Press, radio and television of certain countries deceive or brainwash the peoples of the world. They know who is the evil-doer and who the victim.

16. Such are the principles guiding my delegation, which is aware of its great responsibility at this concluding stage of the work of this session.

17. In his statement [1532nd meeting] during the general debate on the item under discussion, Mr. Shcherbitsky, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR stated our Government's position with regard to the situation created in the Middle East by Israel's aggression against neighbouring Arab States.

18. The people and Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic strongly condemn Israel's aggression, and call for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel troops behind the armistice line and the elimination of all consequences of the aggression.

19. This fundamental position has determined our delegation's attitude to the various draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly.

20. The USSR draft resolution [A/L.519] recommends to the emergency special session of the General Assembly that the United Nations should take very clear and definite measures under its Charter to put an end to aggression and to restore peace in the Middle East. This draft is fully in accordance with the solemn duty and obligation of the United Nations, as stated in the Charter, "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression".

21. The General Assembly must therefore take steps to eliminate all the consequences of Israel's aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. The USSR draft resolution will do just that, and as stated earlier, my delegation will vote for it.

22. The most important and urgent requirement in the present situation in the Middle East is the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel troops from all Arab territories to the positions they occupied prior to 5 June 1967. The General Assembly must take a decision to that effect; otherwise the authority of this international Organization will suffer, and the hopes of the peoples of the world, particularly of the smaller countries, that

<sup>1/</sup> United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

the United Nations will be able to defend their legitimate rights and protect them from aggression, will have been dashed.

23. For this very reason my delegation is sympathetically disposed to the efforts of a group of non-aligned countries which have submitted draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3.

24. This draft resolution suggests to the General Assembly an equitable solution to the dangerous situation created by Israel's aggression in the Middle East, a solution which is in accordance with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. The draft resolution calls upon Israel immediately to withdraw its troops to the positions they occupied before 5 June. It also recommends a number of measures which should help to restore peace in the area.

25. We are convinced that the proposal submitted by the non-aligned countries is the least that the General Assembly can and should do at this time to restore peace and justice. No one who has condemned aggression not in words, but in deeds, and who respects the territorial integrity and political independence of States should have any difficulty in supporting this draft resolution.

26. The United States draft resolution [A/L.520], however, not only proposes that the aggressors remain unpunished, but in fact approves of Israel's aggression. Hence it does not call for the withdrawal of Israel troops from the seized Arab territories; instead, it provides Israel with an opportunity to pursue its aggressive policy towards Arab countries from a position of strength. My delegation therefore considers the United States draft resolution completely unacceptable, and contravening the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

27. This draft resolution demonstrates very convincingly the collusion of Israel's rulers with the imperialist Powers. Before our very eyes, it brings the threads of that conspiracy from the battlefield in the Middle East into this very hall.

28. It is an open secret that at this session the United States delegation has been working hand in glove with Israel to prevent the adoption of a resolution which would deny the aggressor the fruits of its aggression. They have used every possible means to achieve this end.

29. My delegation considers that the draft resolution of the Latin American countries [A/L.523], like the United States draft, seeks to place the victims of aggression and the aggressor on the same footing. Unlike the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, it seems to aim at enabling the aggressor to continue to act from a position of strength, in defiance of the Charter.

30. We continue to press for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel troops to the positions which they held before 5 June 1967.

31. While we are not opposed to the adoption of the draft resolution to provide assistance to the Arab victims of the hostilities [A/L.526 and Add.1-3], we should like to state that in our view, compensation

to refugees and other victims of the Israel aggression is, first and foremost, the responsibility of the aggressor.

32. We must not forget who was guilty of the tragedy that befell these unhappy people. In his statement the representative of Israel, with the cold-bloodedness of a prosecutor, white-washed the sinister deeds of the aggressor in the occupied territories. In the mouth of such a representative of "justice" as he, the crimes of the Israel invaders against the peaceful Arab population sound almost like acts of beneficence. The Ukrainian people have not forgotten the dark days of nazi occupation which left our soil strewn with the bodies of millions of innocent victims. We can judge the true worth of the invaders' profuse assurances that they are taking good care of the inhabitants of the territories they have seized.

33. The Ukrainian delegation wishes to say once again that an end must be put to Israel's occupancy of the Arab territories which she has seized since 4 June 1967.

34. We appeal to all delegations which cherish the maintenance of international peace and security to adopt a decision which would put an end to Israel's aggression and eliminate all its consequences. We appeal to them to come to the defence of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

35. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): I thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to explain the position which my Government intends to take on the draft resolutions before the Assembly today. I would ask your permission to preface my remarks by stating at the very outset that in dealing with the present crisis in the Middle East, my Government is guided by the same spirit of conciliation and impartial judgement which characterized the whole of our contribution to the work of the Security Council during the past few weeks. We said then, and we repeat in the Assembly, that no solution to this problem will ever be lasting unless it is based scrupulously on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides clear and inescapable guide-lines for a lasting settlement of international disputes as well as for international relations based on mutual respect for the rights of all.

36. While thus giving equal weight to all principles enshrined in the Charter, we none the less admit that in a situation such as the one we face in the Middle East today, the principle and precedent of withdrawal of troops is one which has to be considered as being of the highest priority. At the same time, we know that the withdrawal of troops cannot be an end in itself, since it is the first and most essential of a number of important steps which the United Nations must take in order to secure and maintain pacification and peaceful settlement in the region.

37. The primary objective of the United Nations must surely be to see to it that the tragic events of 1948, 1956 and 1967 are not repeated, thus leading to interminable rounds of tension, conflict and bloodshed in the area. This sad and deplorable experience, which has already cost so much to the Middle East and to the international community at large, must not be given any possible chance to recur.

38. Our aim should be to find a just and equitable basis for a lasting settlement which will enable all the countries of the region to coexist in peace and in relationships based on mutual respect for all rights, including respect for each other's independence and territorial integrity. This, in the view of my Government, is the only foundation for relations based on the Charter of the United Nations, and it is the firm view of my Government that all Members of this Organization have the duty to accept this mutuality of rights and obligations towards one another.

39. I would also like to make it clear beyond any doubt that my Government cannot accept any right of conquest, nor indeed any arbitrary adjustment of international territories or frontiers. In this connexion I wish to say here and now that the steps taken by the Government of Israel with regard to the Old City of Jerusalem are unacceptable to my Government. The special status of that City and the need for freedom of worship and access to Holy Places and shrines has already been the subject of a number of decisions of this Assembly, and my Government continues to support those decisions. It is in this spirit that my delegation is prepared to lend its support to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan [A/L.527/Rev.1], and we are happy to see that the need for the internationalization of the City of Jerusalem is affirmed in the draft resolution presented by the Latin American group [A/523 and Add.1 and 2].

40. Moreover my delegation has co-sponsored the draft resolution on humanitarian assistance [A/L.526 and Add.1-3], just as we co-sponsored a similar draft resolution when the matter was before the Security Council some weeks back. We join the other sponsors of this draft resolution in urging the Assembly to adopt this proposal unanimously.

41. Coming now to the other draft resolutions before the Assembly, I cannot but say that my delegation feels disappointed that the General Assembly has not been able to bridge the gap between at least some of the proposals before it, despite all the efforts and consultations that have taken place since the Assembly was convened.

42. When the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics called for an emergency special session of the General Assembly in his letter of 13 June 1967 [A/6717], Ethiopia was one of the countries that supported the proposal. We did so in the belief that the Assembly, being the parliament of nations, had a very important role to play in such a grave matter affecting international peace and security. At the same time, my delegation is ever mindful of the fact that the Security Council, in accordance with Chapter V, Article 24, of the Charter, has "the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security".

43. Bearing in mind the respective and complementary roles of the General Assembly and the Security Council, we had hoped that the General Assembly, after a thorough and constructive discussion of the vital and urgent issues involved, would come up with a clear, firm and forthright resolution of principles based on withdrawal, while laying down the priorities and guide-lines which would enable the Security Council

to undertake without any further delay the task of pacification and final settlement in the area.

44. We felt at the beginning of this Assembly, and we continue to feel, that the purposes of the General Assembly would be served best, as I said earlier, by striving to reach broad agreement on recommendations of principle which can serve as guide-lines for the Security Council, rather than by attempting to force through decisions which divide the major Powers as well as the general membership of the Assembly.

45. It is clearly not in the interest of the United Nations that the General Assembly should be put in a position of having to decide on issues of war and peace in, so to speak, "photo-finish" fashion, since such divided counsels hinder rather than help the Organization in getting on with the urgent job of establishing and maintaining peace in the war-torn region of the Middle East.

46. We do not consider it to be too late, even at this late hour, for the sponsors of the various draft proposals to make a final and generous gesture in abandoning rigid attitudes and stands, thus sparing the Assembly from acting in division and discord.

47. This is not the time for winning favours from this side or the other, nor is it the time for clever tactical moves on voting procedures. This, I submit, is a period of grave challenge to the authority and efficacy of the United Nations. We have before us an opportunity which calls for the highest degree of imaginative statemanship from one and all of us, and it is this serious consideration which should dictate our thoughts and our actions in this grave hour of international crisis.

48. It is with all this in mind that I have ventured to make one last appeal at this late hour in our deliberations. If, with the co-operation and goodwill of all concerned, we can find some common ground for broad agreement on principles, no one will be happier than the delegation over which I happen to preside. If, on the other hand, our appeal for moderation, reason and common sense is not heeded and the different sponsors, whose motives and intentions we fully respect, find it necessary to press their proposals to the vote, then duty will call on us to take the position that we consider to be the best under the circumstances.

49. In view of what I have just said, and in order not to undermine the chances for a last-minute agreement, I shall refrain from making any definitive announcements on the proposals now before us, and shall limit myself at this stage, as I already have done, to indicating our preferences in matters of approach and substance, while reserving my right to take a final position in the light of the policy considerations I have outlined above.

50. Taking the proposals as they now stand, and after having given careful consideration to all of the proposals now before the Assembly, my Government finds, as I have already stated, that the proposal which comes close to the kind of recommendation that we have in mind is that which has been presented by the Latin American group, contained in document A/L.523/Add.1 and 2. We regret the fact that this

draft resolution was late in coming, since in our view it could very well have proved to be the basis for the single and broadly acceptable proposal for the obtaining of which we all exerted so much effort. We believe that under the circumstances, this draft proposal of the Latin American Group, which is based on the principle of withdrawal and contains appropriate principles and guide-lines, can help the United Nations to start on the right foot in dealing with this grave and complicated crisis. My Government further believes that such a comprehensive approach would constitute a sound and practical one at this initial stage of our common endeavours.

51. We view with obvious feelings of close interest and understanding the objectives of the draft resolution co-sponsored by seventeen Member States and introduced by Yugoslavia, contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1; and while also admitting the high priority and urgency of the withdrawal of forces, my Government has some misgivings as to the wisdom and advisability of divorcing withdrawal from all of the other considerations and principles involved. Such an approach could lead, in the view of my Government, to difficulties and complications when the Security Council has to undertake practical measures to implement United Nations decisions.

52. We consider it a great pity that it has not been possible to work out an acceptable relationship of principles and priorities in a single document which would be fair and impartial when seen from all possible angles. We, for our part, have done our utmost, as I am sure many of our colleagues will testify, to try to bridge the narrow but fundamental gap separating these two approaches, and it is a matter of deep regret to us, and to all those, I am sure, who have not spared any effort in this regard, that such a rapprochement has not so far proved possible.

53. I want to make it clear beyond any shadow of doubt, at the same time, that if my delegation shows any misgivings with regard to the draft resolution submitted by eighteen Member States and introduced by Yugoslavia, it is only because we have a preference for the kind of comprehensive approach outlined in the Latin American draft and not because there is anything which we do not support in the substantive provisions of document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1.

54. Very much for the same reasons, we shall abstain on the two draft resolutions submitted, respectively, by the delegations of the Soviet Union [A/L.519] and of the United States of America [A/L.520].

55. I should also like to add that my delegation will not participate in any separate vote on any separate paragraph. We feel that we would not be true to ourselves, nor would we be serving the high purposes of this Assembly, if we were to join in the promotion of piecemeal prescriptions which we know to be inadequate in themselves to meet the urgent requirements of the present situation and to help the United Nations effort in this crisis. We shall therefore abstain on all paragraphs that are

put to the vote separately, taking positions only when proposals are submitted as a whole.

56. In conclusion, I should like to assure the Assembly that, as the presiding member of the Security Council for the present month of July, my delegation will spare no effort, be it in this Assembly, in the Security Council or in any other forum of the United Nations, in the urgent endeavour to obtain a lasting and honourable settlement based on justice for all, and an enduring peace in the Middle East region.

57. Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): In the statement he made during the general debate on 22 June of this year [1531st meeting], Mr. Tsedeubal, the head of our delegation and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, stated our Government's position with regard to the measures which should be taken at this session to eliminate the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States, and to restore peace in the Middle East.

58. First and foremost, this session must categorically condemn the aggressor and firmly demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its troops from the Arab territories which they have occupied.

59. As was rightly pointed out yesterday by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq [1545th meeting], the continued occupation of foreign territory by the interventionists is the surest way of causing a fresh outbreak of hostilities. The alarming news that there have been repeated violations of the cease-fire in the Suez Canal area in the last three days shows quite clearly that the great majority of delegations were quite right to be concerned about the delay in taking effective steps to eliminate the consequences of aggression.

60. In the statement I have mentioned, the head of our delegation particularly emphasized that the unconditional withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from the territory of the Arab States was the only way to prepare the ground for other measures conducive to greater stability in the Middle East.

61. In this connexion, I should particularly like to emphasize that the Mongolian People's Republic, like other socialist countries, has always been firmly guided in its foreign policy by the principles of respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems, based on friendly relations, for the purpose of strengthening international peace and security. Our Government also recognizes the principle of freedom of passage for vessels with strict respect for the rights of all States.

62. But this session has not been convened to discuss these problems, although they have an important bearing on the question of bringing the situation in the Middle East back to normal.

63. Certain representatives have deliberately dwelt on these subjects in order to divert the Assembly from the main issue before it and, by white-washing the aggression of Tel Aviv, to assist it indirectly to continue its occupation of the territories of neighbouring countries.

64. On the basis of these considerations, my delegation has expressed its full support for the draft resolution submitted by the USSR [A/L.519]. This draft resolution very clearly specifies what steps should be taken at once, as a matter of principle, to eliminate the consequences of aggression and to restore peace and justice in the Middle East.

65. The Mongolian delegation has already expressed its view on the United States draft resolution [A/L.520], which in fact extends protection to the aggressors and tries to help them to profit from their armed invasion and to continue to occupy foreign territory in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter.

66. We are also unable to accept the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries [A/L.523]. Its call for the withdrawal of Israel troops from occupied territories is made conditional on other matters which might be the subject of discussions at a later date.

67. Our delegation thinks that the decisions reached at this session on the question under discussion should leave no loopholes which might be used to encourage those who have violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States.

68. Our delegation is prepared to support the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of eighteen non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3]. Although this draft resolution, unlike the preceding one, does not directly condemn the aggressor, it provides for the immediate withdrawal, as a matter of extreme urgency, of the aggressor's troops from the territories they have occupied. It also sets forth, in sufficiently clear terms, means for implementing this important decision.

69. In supporting the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, the Mongolian delegation assumes that any action by the Security Council under operative paragraph 6 of that draft resolution would be based on full compliance with the requirements of operative paragraph 1.

70. The question of the change of status of the city of Jerusalem would not have to be discussed if the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries were adopted. However, if draft resolution A/L.527/Rev.1 is put to the vote, our delegation will support it, because its adoption will be yet another rebuttal of Israel's annexionist ambitions.

71. My delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.526 and Add.1-3, which provides for assistance to the victims of Israel aggression. Naturally, the adoption of this resolution will in no way absolve Israel from responsibility for the damage and suffering it has caused the people of the Arab countries.

72. Mr. EBAN (Israel): I have already had the opportunity of expressing Israel's views on the draft resolution originally submitted by Yugoslavia [A/L.522]. Amendments have now been introduced into the text. These are of purely verbal significance; they are designed not to change the nature of the draft resolution, but to camouflage its form in an effort to make it less objectionable to peace-loving States. But the draft resolution remains, in our view, as it

was: one-sided, backward-looking, and totally indulgent to the continuation of belligerency. It takes care not to utter a single word against the maintenance of the state of war, against hostile acts and threats, against the refusal to recognize Israel's statehood and sovereignty, against terrorist infiltrations, against maritime blockades, or against any of those elements in the policy of Arab States which has prevented the Middle East from moving towards peace since the initial Arab aggression was launched against Israel twenty years ago. In short, not a word against belligerency, not a word in favour of peace between sovereign States. The draft resolution requires Israel to act as though there were peace, while allowing the Arab States to act as though there were war.

73. If such a resolution were carried out, the Sinai peninsula would rapidly become a spring-board for renewed aggression against Israel; Syrian guns would again threaten Israeli farms in upper Galilee; blockades would be reinstated, with all the consequences arising from such acts of war; Arab Governments would again be free to carry out the declared policy of preparing the next round of conflict; and the Security Council would again be having a veto-bound discussion, as it was when the fires of war were being stoked by Nasser between 14 May and early June 1967.

74. Nearly all representatives who have spoken, apart from those uncritically aligned with the Arab States and the Soviet Union, have referred to the dangers of separating the problem of troop withdrawal from the general context of war and non-belligerency. It is clear from statements of Arab representatives that their Governments would regard the proposed withdrawal not as the occasion for the establishment of peace, but as a prelude to the intensification of belligerency in more advantageous conditions than before.

75. In short, there is nothing in this draft resolution which would prevent Israel's neighbours from developing a policy of encirclement, blockade, infiltration and encroachment, encouraged by Soviet arms deliveries now reaching Egypt and Syria.

76. The spurious assertion by some representatives of what they call "Israeli aggression" is refuted by the plain fact that between mid-May and early June the Arab States, under Egyptian leadership, organized a purposeful and perilous attempt to bring about Israel's destruction. I have referred very often these days to the dark, tense, brooding dangers which afflicted us in the last week of May, because that is precisely the situation which the Yugoslav draft resolution would reconstruct. It would also reproduce the Security Council discussion, which at the end of May strengthened the impression that Israel might be destroyed with impunity. For that discussion made it plain to Israel and to its adversaries not only that the Security Council could not act, but that it could not even speak, could not even utter a single word in a resolution against the growing threat to Israel's existence.

77. The veto-locked Council refused to countenance the mildest plea for an end to belligerent acts. And so, with Israel then surrounded on three sides by

160,000 troops and 1,500 tanks, with daily reconnaissance of its airfields by Egyptian squadrons in preparation for attack, with its southern maritime approaches entirely blockaded, Israel found nothing in the Security Council but an incapacity to act and a refusal to speak against the deadly design of politicide—the murder of a State—which was being openly and boastfully organized, stage by stage, before the eyes of the world.

78. This is the position that arises from the power structure and relationships within that body. Is there, therefore, not something incongruous in asking Israel to go back to the dangers from which it has emerged, placing its complete reliance in the kind of debate which gravely exposed, and therefore increased, vulnerability, little more than a month ago?

79. Those delegations which attach importance to paragraph 6 of the Yugoslav draft resolution should, in all fairness, read the proceedings of the Security Council between 19 May and the first days of June in order to understand how slender and how fragile is the reliance that Israel can place upon such a discussion in the present mood and structure of great-Power relationships.

80. Nor is there any comfort in the reference in this text to certain Articles of the Charter. The Arab Governments accept the Charter only in terms which exclude Israel from the application of its provisions. No Arab State has arisen here to proclaim that it recognizes Israel as a State within the terms of the Charter, endowed with sovereignty and integrity equal to its own. No Arab State has arisen here to proclaim that Israel is, in its view, a State Member of the United Nations with which it is their will and intention to live together in peace as good neighbours.

81. I have here a stamp just released by the Egyptian Government. It shows a smiling President Nasser receiving the plaudits of his people while Israel goes up in flames. The Sunday Times of London, in which this facsimile was published on 2 July this year, brings an expert opinion that this stamp must have been printed and designed during the period when the Egyptian aggression began to take shape in the second week of May.

82. Let me be frank with the Assembly. Israel is being attacked by its rivals in this debate not because it committed aggression, but because it succeeded in resisting aggression.

83. The Security Council, having been unable to help prevent hostilities, at last and at least revealed a responsible refusal to accept the kind of resolution which Yugoslavia and others now present to the General Assembly. Indeed, the General Assembly is now invited to endorse the precise resolution which the Security Council correctly refused to accept. Rarely has any draft resolution been presented to the United Nations so clearly directed against the security, the vital interests and indeed the survival of a Member State as that which Yugoslavia and others have now submitted. This draft stands as a barrier to peace. It is only by its rejection that the way would become clear for advance towards any constructive possibilities.

84. Israel supports the Swedish draft resolution [A/L.526 and Add.1-3]. Its humane purposes merit

understanding and co-operation. It invites us to deal with the problem of civilian populations in the area. Civilian populations, both Israeli and Arab, have suffered cruelly from the policies of belligerency and aggression conducted against Israel for nearly twenty years. Arab governmental policy has never taken the fate of civilian populations into account when facing the choice between peace and belligerency. If the fortunes of war had gone differently, there would have been no problem of civilian populations; for the policy of Arab Governments was not only to conquer Israeli territory, but also to massacre the Israeli population.

85. Amongst the military documents seized by the Israeli army are copies of Jordanian military operational orders containing instructions to wipe out the civilian inhabitants of Israeli population centres. Specific battalions were assigned to destroy specific Israeli villages and their inhabitants. The orders were to be kept secret at the brigade level until it was decided to activate them.

86. Orders in identical style were found in the top-secret files of all seven brigade headquarters—I repeat: all seven brigade headquarters—on the Jordanian-controlled west bank. Thus the orders discovered at the Ramallah headquarters north of Jerusalem, assigned the reserve battalion to destroy Moza, an Israel village of some 800 people, three miles west of Jerusalem, on the highway to Tel Aviv. I quote this operational order:

"A. The intention of the headquarters of the western front is to carry out an attack on the village of Moza, to destroy it and to kill all of its inhabitants".

"B. The reserve battalion of the brigade shall carry out an attack on the Moza village, shall destroy it and kill its inhabitants on receipt of the code signal from the brigade."

87. This macabre document should be taken seriously. During twenty years of belligerency, Arab opinion has been conditioned to the idea of extermination. Cairo is the modern centre for the publication of the Nazi classics. Egypt is probably the only State in the world whose Head has expressed his public belief in the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which played a leading role in the events leading to the Jewish holocaust.

88. We have circulated to delegations the facsimile of a soldiers' textbook, published in Syria, showing Arab soldiers physically drowning Israeli civilians in the sea.

89. The issues at stake for Israel are far vaster and more important than the exchange of arguments and texts in a debate. The national survival is supremely engaged. And the Government of Israel, although grateful for the understanding of friendly countries and world opinion, knows from experience that in the final resort the assurance of survival for the nation and its citizens lies within its sole responsibility.

90. The Arab civilian population, caught up in the war through Jordan's tragic decision, faces, and should face, no such perils. There was dislocation and

suffering in the early stages, although rarely have there been such intense military operations with so few civilian casualties and no bombardment of cities.

91. My Government, in its policy towards the civilian population, has announced three measures which are now being carried out: First, regulations were issued to make certain that people would only cross from the West to the East Bank as a result of their free will, certified by the local authority. Second, a decision was taken and published to permit those West Bank residents who crossed to the East Bank of the Jordan since 7 June to return to their previous places of residence on the West Bank, provided that their return is effected within five weeks. The Israel Government will publish this decision and the mode of its implementation in Arabic radio broadcasts and through Red Cross channels. Third, the Israel Government has appointed a team of experts, charged with the preparation of proposals relating to the rehabilitation of Arab refugees. The team consists of groups of experts in various fields of economy, agriculture, irrigation, industry, commerce and development. We are convinced that in conditions of peace the refugee problem can be solved, just as we are convinced by experience that in conditions of belligerency no solution is feasible.

92. In addressing itself to the draft resolution prepared by the Latin American States [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2], the Israel delegation will be guided by the following principles: First, disengagement of forces and the establishment of peace are integrally and inseparably linked. Second, the arrangements to be made in a peace settlement must take account of vital security interests. Third, the total and permanent elimination of maritime blockade in the Gulf of Aqaba and of discrimination against Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal is one of the essential expressions of non-belligerency. Fourth, sovereign States have the right and duty to fix their permanent frontiers by mutual agreement amongst themselves. Fifth, Israeli policy is to provide and preserve the complete unity and peace of Jerusalem and access to all its Holy Places. The just and feasible expression of the universal interest in Jerusalem relates specifically to the Holy Places, which now for the first time in twenty years are free to access by all faiths. Israel will continue to maintain a constructive dialogue on the arrangements necessary to ensure the safeguarding of the Holy Places. Israel's views on territorial internationalization are well known and have not changed.

93. The Israeli vote on the Latin American draft resolution will be guided by the principles and considerations which I have mentioned.

94. Finally, the Pakistan draft resolution [A/L.527/Rev.1] expresses deep concern about the situation in Jerusalem. Very little international concern was evinced when in 1947 the Arab States took up arms in violent opposition to the internationalization of Jerusalem; very little international concern was expressed when Jerusalem was shelled and bombarded and its population brought to starvation; when for twenty years there existed a situation of annexation carried out by Jordan after the signature of the General

Armistice Agreement; when for twenty years access to the Western Wall was barred; when ancient synagogues were deliberately destroyed by the Jordanian Government; when any idea of agreement with world religious interests was rejected by the occupying Power.

95. But this draft resolution expresses deep concern at a time when barriers have fallen, when Jews and Arabs move freely in their united city, when social and municipal services, including water, telephone, electricity and sanitation, are available as never before to the Old City and to the New City; above all, when access to the Holy Places for the first time in twenty years is universal and complete, guaranteed by law and open to a constructive dialogue with the universal religious interests involved. Is it really an international principle that Jerusalem must be divided, that its Jews and Arabs must be separated, that access to some of the Holy Places must be denied? The Pakistan draft resolution would have us reinstall the barbed wire and mine fields which have been removed. It assumes that the United Nations has a vested interest in division, separation and embattled military confrontation. A wall of distrust and separation has fallen. Why should the General Assembly be here invited solemnly to reconstruct it?

96. What are the "measures" taken in Jerusalem which cause the Pakistan and other delegations such concern? First, there is the law for the protection of the Holy Places. The necessity for this became evident in view of the discrimination, sacrilege, disorder and sheer neglect which prevailed before. Secondly, there is the administrative and municipal union which now enables thousands of Jews and Arabs to renew or to initiate contacts on every human level in an ecumenical spirit.

97. Surely the unity, once achieved, is irrevocable. We have conscientious objections, on grounds transcending political considerations, against allowing Jerusalem to fall under divided jurisdiction. The General Assembly would not do the United Nations service in expressing a view on behalf of division, disunity and barrier-building.

98. To the delegations sincerely concerned with the international interest, I have these words of reassurance. Consultations are now going forward, and will continue with the interests involved in order to elaborate a satisfactory arrangement for the protection of the Holy Places. Here too, the prospects are better, not worse, than before of giving dignified expression to the universal interest. The last time that this matter was substantively discussed in the United Nations was in 1950, seventeen years ago. On that occasion, in reporting to the General Assembly,<sup>2/</sup> the President of the Trusteeship Council, Mr. Roger Garreau of France, referred to Israel's "understanding and benevolent attitude" to international religious interests which, he said, to his regret had not been shared by Jordan.

<sup>2/</sup> Special report of the Trusteeship Council on the question of an international régime for the Jerusalem area and protection of the Holy Places. (See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 9, annex III.)



99. Since the Pakistan draft resolution seeks to violate the unity of Jerusalem, to disrupt its civic union and to advocate return to separation and religious discrimination, it cannot be accepted.

100. Israel does not wish to disrupt the new constructive union of life and work in Jerusalem—it cannot disrupt it—the constructive union of life and work which it regards as a great human, social and spiritual achievement. It is, however, our intention to ensure the universal character of the Holy Places and to consider any proposal related specifically to the Holy Places themselves. It is Israel's policy to place internal administration and arrangements in the Holy Places in the hands of the great religious interests to which they belong.

101. In all my comments on draft resolutions, I am guided by Israel's central purpose. We seek to pass from the cease-fire to a settlement assuring peace with security and honour to Israel and its neighbours. There are no victors. There are no vanquished. There are only peoples who stand in equal need of that peace and co-operation which are the Charter's higher ends.

102. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Today, after our long deliberations in the Security Council and in this Assembly, we come to take action. We on our part have made our purposes clear. On those purposes we believe that there is in fact a wide and growing measure of general agreement in this Assembly.

103. We shall vote for the withdrawal of Israel forces from the Arab territory they have occupied, and we want to achieve withdrawal without delay. At the same time we wish to take action here at the United Nations that will end any claims to belligerency and achieve a stable and secure settlement.

104. We wish to lay the foundations of a durable peace. We wish to bring urgent relief to those who have suffered in the conflict, and we wish to bring them justice too. We wish to bring lasting security to everyone concerned. We wish to respect the right of all the States concerned to live in true dignity and real freedom and assured peace. We wish not only to make declarations, but to take immediate steps to put those purposes into practical effect.

105. We have declared these purposes, and we are determined to pursue them. How can they best be achieved? I should first say that we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution on Jerusalem put forward by Pakistan and others [A/L.527/Rev.1]. We have just heard what has been said by the Foreign Minister of Israel, but we on our side would wish to reassert what we have said and emphasized before: that it is our contention that nothing should be done now which would be prejudicial to the future status of the City.

106. We shall also vote in favour of the admirable draft resolution put forward by Sweden and others [A/L.526 and Add.1-3] dealing with questions of relief of suffering. In particular, we support the appeal in operative paragraph 9 of that draft resolution, the appeal to all Governments and others concerned to help to solve one of the problems on which the

international community can now take practical action. Indeed, it is time for a great international effort to assist the further development of the whole region.

107. We have before us two other draft resolutions which command substantial sponsorship. Neither is fully satisfactory, in our opinion, to achieve all the purposes we have stated.

108. I take first the draft resolution proposed by Yugoslavia and other delegations [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1]. In its original form it was unacceptable to us and to many others largely because it did not take account of all the realities of the situation and thus would not contribute to the aim it set. It was inadequate to achieve its objective. Indeed, it might well have prevented the very purpose it declared. We recognize, however, that there has been an effort to make substantial improvements. In particular, the countries which sponsor the draft resolution have declared themselves in favour of the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General to make contact with the parties concerned. We have strongly advocated such a proposal. Without such a presence, it is difficult to see how practical progress can be made. It is a proposal which has our whole-hearted support.

109. We are also specially glad that this draft resolution includes reference to the principles of the Charter, and in particular to those contained in Articles 2 and 33. We do not think the importance of this can be over-emphasized. This seems to us a most valuable addition. Other important changes were proposed to us yesterday. But the draft resolution still has essential defects to which I shall return in a moment. It is still an unbalanced draft resolution.

110. I turn to the draft resolution presented to us on Friday, 30 June, [A/L.523] by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago on behalf of eighteen States. Our main criticism of that draft resolution is that it does not include specific provision for the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General. This seems to us a serious omission, though it does not of course preclude the Security Council from reaching a conclusion on that and on any other action required.

111. We have some reservations on other sections of this draft resolution. For instance, while of course we are in favour of full freedom of access to the Holy Sites, we doubt if it will be wise to attempt to reach any conclusion at this stage on the proposal to establish an international régime for the City of Jerusalem.

112. Nevertheless, in spite of these reservations we believe that this draft resolution contains very valuable and substantial provisions and we greatly admire, if we may say so, the sincere and persistent effort to make an effective and constructive contribution which the Latin American States have made. The draft resolution provides for withdrawal from occupied territory. It provides for the end of belligerency. It provides for freedom of transit through international waterways. It states essential principles, and we warmly welcome the reference to the need for a full solution of the problem of the refugees. Throughout, it has been one of our main purposes

to assist in any way we can the international effort to deal with the widespread and acute suffering which the conflict has caused.

113. Now we have to decide which of these draft resolutions we shall support, and in reaching this decision we apply the test of effectiveness. We apply the test of which draft resolution can make progress to bringing about the purposes of withdrawal and security and durable peace. It is on that test that we decide that the second draft resolution, the Latin American draft resolution, not only conforms with the purposes which we have set, but also offers the best prospect of achieving them.

114. We believe that the first draft resolution, proposed by Yugoslavia and others, would not achieve those purposes because essential provisions are omitted. We shall vote for withdrawal, but we must vote for a balanced resolution. The draft resolution proposed by Yugoslavia and others is still not balanced. On the other hand, we firmly believe that the valuable draft resolution proposed by Trinidad and Tobago and others can contribute to a settlement. My delegation, therefore, cannot support the first draft resolution, but will certainly vote in favour of the second draft resolution.

115. We now reach the critical stage in our deliberations. What we do now or what we fail to do will have immediate and far-reaching effects not only on the millions of people directly concerned, but also on the future of the United Nations itself. It is our conviction that the draft resolution introduced by Yugoslavia might well have the effect of postponing, and indeed possibly frustrating, the very objectives which the draft resolution itself aims to achieve. On the other hand, the draft resolution we support, the Latin American draft resolution, will open the way to a realistic advance. For that reason, we earnestly trust that reservations and differences will now be put aside, that the need for positive action will now prevail, and that the second draft resolution will today receive an overwhelming majority.

116. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait): On 29 June, before this Assembly, the Foreign Minister of my country announced [1542nd meeting] the principles that guide the delegation of Kuwait in its discussions of the issue before this emergency special session of the General Assembly and also in its evaluation of the various proposals and draft resolutions presented to the Assembly. I shall not reiterate those principles or repeat the substance of his statement today, but I shall dwell upon our specific position on two draft resolutions which appear to command, respectively, sizable support and sponsorship. I refer to the non-aligned draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1] and to the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2]. These two draft resolutions represent and are respectively inspired by two different and, indeed, two irreconcilable philosophies of international action towards actual breaches of the peace. In the view of my delegation, one is the philosophy of the principles of the Charter; it is also the philosophy of the precedents and practice of the United Nations. The other sets aside or suspends the principles of the Charter and makes a radical departure from the practice of the United Nations.

117. I shall take the Latin American draft resolution and discuss its various provisions, not only because it is the draft resolution that departs from the practice of the United Nations and violates the principles of the Charter, but also because it is a draft resolution which pretends to take cognizance of the principles of the Charter, although the pretence is transparent and the disguise manifest. The Latin American draft resolution opens by paying lip service to the goal of withdrawal of the invading forces, the forces of aggression, from the territories they came to occupy. But it is not authentic withdrawal that the Latin American draft resolution calls for. In fact, it is a withdrawal that fails every single test of authenticity: the test of completeness, the test of promptness, and the test of unconditionality. The withdrawal requested by the Latin American draft resolution is not envisaged as a complete withdrawal, and I say this notwithstanding the drafting camouflage utilized by the sponsors in using the word "all" twice in sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 1 which requests withdrawal. It requests the withdrawal of all the forces of Israel from all the territories occupied, but when it specifically names the territories occupied, it omits some of the territories occupied, it omits some of the territories occupied by the invasion and aggression of Israel. It may be that this is only the result of hasty drafting, imprecise terminology, or less than adequate knowledge of and familiarity with the area about which the Latin American draft resolution speaks. If this is so, then of course we shall be delighted to see the sponsors submit a revision prior to the vote to make the withdrawal that they call for complete. If, however, no such revision is forthcoming, then the conclusion is inescapable that the Latin American sponsors do not want the withdrawal to be complete, for there is the Gaza Strip, which is not part of the territory of Jordan, nor the territory of Syria, nor the territory of the United Arab Republic. The withdrawal of the invading forces from the Gaza Strip is not called for in the present text of the Latin American draft resolution and therefore it is not complete.

118. Nor is prompt withdrawal called for. We were assured by one of the sponsors yesterday that the draft resolution does not intend to give opportunities or excuses to Israel to delay its withdrawal. But whatever the intention, the obvious fact is that there is no demand for immediate withdrawal in the text as it now stands. Furthermore, there is a built-in licence for delay; there is a built-in condition that enables the Israelis to delay and postpone their withdrawal. I refer to the linking of the withdrawal to political arrangements which even the most optimistic of observers must realize will be time-consuming. Therefore, the withdrawal requested by the Latin American draft is neither complete nor immediate.

119. Third, the draft resolution is not unconditional. It is tied to other arrangements and rearrangements and adjustments to which I shall refer in a moment. This tying of withdrawal to such arrangements and rearrangements is precisely what leads one to assert that the Latin American draft resolution tosses to the winds the principle of the Charter that aggress-

sion shall not pay and that States shall not resort to force against one another, because it makes aggression pay, pay in kind, pay by enabling territories occupied as a result of aggression to be utilized in bargaining for political benefits.

120. The second defect and shortcoming of the Latin American draft resolution is the envisaged post-withdrawal or concomitant-with-withdrawal arrangements that the draft resolution makes. It would appear from reading sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 that the Latin American sponsors of the draft resolution have not heard of the armistice system. It would appear that they do not recognize the armistice régime. This is strange, because it is the United Nations that called for the armistice in resolution 62 (1948) of the Security Council of 16 November 1948. The United Nations participated in and facilitated negotiations for the armistice. The United Nations endorsed the armistice arrangement in Security Council resolution 73 (1949) of 11 August 1949. And above all, the United Nations, in resolution 114 (1956), adopted unanimously by the Security Council on 4 June 1956, endorsed the view and the considered judgement of the Secretary-General after his prolonged study and visit to the area, saying in paragraph 4 of that resolution that the Security Council:

"Endorses the Secretary-General's view that the re-establishment of full compliance with the Armistice Agreements represents a stage which has to be passed in order to make progress possible on the main issues between the parties".

121. The Latin American draft resolution now tries to follow a short cut instead of passing the stage that the Security Council has ruled, and that the Secretary-General has considered, indispensable before progress towards different political conditions and different political arrangements can be made.

122. It will be said that the armistice system and the armistice régime did not leave the area without strains and tensions; and it will be asked: Why go back to it? The answer is that the armistice system failed to work because one party was committed to frustrating and subverting it from the very outset. If the armistice system did not work, it is because Israel did not want it to work, because Israel methodically and systematically throughout the years adopted attitudes in practice that frustrated the Armistice Agreements and made them not work. The fact that the armistice system did not work is itself the reason why the system must be returned to with emphasis on Israel's making it work and not destroying and frustrating it by demanding as the price for withdrawal the political arrangements that Israel wants as a substitute for the armistice system.

123. I come now to operative paragraph 3 of the Latin American draft resolution, which speaks about the catalogue of issues that the Latin American sponsors would like to see the Security Council deal with. My observations on this paragraph are twofold: first, this paragraph is selective in what it includes and in what it excludes; and secondly, this paragraph is discriminatory in what it prescribes for the various items it lists. I say it is discriminatory because there is a manifest difference between

sub-paragraph (b) and sub-paragraph (c) of operative paragraph 3 of the Latin American draft resolution. In sub-paragraph (b), the Security Council is asked to

"Guarantee freedom of transit on the international waterways in the region".

The scrupulously observed traditions of Latin America of respect for international law and observance of the principles and norms of the law of nations appear to have been given a vacation when this sub-paragraph was drafted, because the Latin American sponsors have made a prejudgement of the issue. They have made a summary political judgement of an issue that can be resolved definitively only by a competent and impartial judicial tribunal which has had a chance to listen to all of the points of view. The Latin American draft resolution commits itself to what it considers to be the fact that there are international waterways in the region. But there are States which maintain that the principles and norms of international law must be applied in the examination of whether the waterways of the region are in fact international. The Latin American draft resolution, therefore, prejudges a legal issue by making a summary political judgement.

124. On the other hand, when it comes to sub-paragraph (c), the Latin American draft resolution ignores the judgements already competently made because with regard to the question of refugees this draft only asks for what it calls "an appropriate... solution". What is "an appropriate solution"? In the spirit of the Latin American draft resolution, "an appropriate solution" can be nothing other than a euphemism for the sorry fate of life-long exile for the refugees. And yet a judgement on the fate of the refugees was made by the appropriate organs of the United Nations as early as eighteen and a half years ago. It was not a judgement made and forgotten, but a judgement which has been made and repeated every year since 11 December 1948. In fact, there were fourteen occasions on which this Assembly expressed "regret" or "concern", or "deep regret" or "grave concern", or "deep regret and grave concern" because that judgement had not been put into effect. Yet the Latin American draft resolution completely ignores this judgement and asks only for a colourless "appropriate solution" to the problem.

125. On the one hand, they prejudice one issue; on the other hand, they ignore the judgement already made concerning the other issue. The selectivity of the Latin American draft resolution also applies to what it excludes. For surely in any catalogue of the causes of tension in the Middle East there are at least three causes that should be mentioned, but these are ignored in the Latin American draft resolution. There is first the racist policy of the settler community in Israel towards the natives of Palestine. I say it is a racist policy of discrimination because in the hierarchy of the society in Israel the European and American Jews are given top place; the oriental Jews are given second place; and the Arabs, the natives, the indigenous population, are given third place. Surely the Middle East cannot be tension-free as long as Arabs living under Israeli rule continue to be discriminated against and persecuted and on

occasion subjected to pogroms, as at Kafr Qasim in 1956.

126. Secondly, there is the well-known fact that Israel, in the view of every one of its leaders and every leader of the Zionist movement, is still an unfinished enterprise; that before Israel there lies a programme of further territorial and demographic expansion. Even with all the expansion accomplished last month, the Israeli programme has not been completed and there are still territories in Syria, Lebanon and Jordan that will be the target of further conquest and annexation if the blueprint of Israel has a chance of success. There can be no tension-free Middle East as long as one State considers itself an unfinished enterprise, as long as one State considers that there are still territories which are part of its patrimony and its national homeland.

127. Finally, there is another element in the catalogue of causes of tension which the Latin American draft resolution ignores completely; that is what one may call the Israeli addiction to violence. It is not an addiction to violence that we surmise. It is an addiction to violence that is recorded in documents of the United Nations itself. What State has been the subject of as many condemnations and censures for resort to violence against the territories of its neighbours as has the State of Israel? Need I take the time of this Assembly to cite Security Council resolutions 93 (1951) of 18 May 1951, 101 (1953) of 24 November 1953, 106 (1955) of 29 March

1955, 111 (1956) of 19 January 1956, 171 (1962) of 9 April 1962, and 228 (1966) of 25 November 1966?

128. The Latin American draft resolution has all these defects and all these shortcomings. We shall therefore vote against the whole resolution and against every individual provision or portions of a provision contained in it. We should like to say that for all States in this Organization the adoption of the Latin American draft resolution would mean that no small State from now on could go to sleep with a clear mind thinking that should its neighbour attack it, should its neighbour seek to annex part of its territory, the United Nations would step in to remedy the situation and to protect the invaded party.

129. There has been much talk before the Assembly in this emergency special session about prescriptions. This draft resolution is said to be a prescription for this and that draft resolution a prescription for that. May I indulge in this spirit of sloganeering of the session and add my own label. The Latin American draft resolution, from the standpoint of the United Nations, is a prescription for abdication and for suicide.

130. For the bitter truth is that whereas one or more constructive resolutions, consistent with the spirit of the Charter, are not of and by themselves sufficient to sustain indefinitely the structure of world order, unfortunately one resolution inconsistent with the spirit of the Charter is of and by itself sufficient to destroy the edifice of world order.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*