

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Official Records



FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

**1548th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 4 July 1967,
4.00 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 5:

Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/6717) (continued) . . . 1

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHwak
(Afghanistan).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Kabanda (Rwanda), 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. COLE (Sierra Leone): My delegation is making its first statement on the Middle East only now, not because of its inability to assess the trends of events in that area, not because it considers as unimportant another chapter of belligerency just written in the history of the Middle East, but because it feels that it must speak in an atmosphere recipient to objectivity and relative calmness when viewing a very grave situation.

2. The Middle East is the "Times Square" of the world. From the Middle East have radiated through the spokes of the world civilizations which have been blessings to humanity. If peace should reign supreme in that area, constituting the hub of the world, untold benefits would accrue to all humanity. If war, on the other hand, with its attendant miseries, should bestride relentlessly the confines of that area, then the scourges of war, however slight, may become the lot of all of us.

3. It is for this very reason that we are all here; and it is for this very reason that it is of the utmost importance that considerations of statesmanship and imagination should take precedence over considerations of power politics in dealing with the Middle East situation.

4. My Government has always had excellent relations both with the Arab world and with the State of Israel. The reward of peaceful coexistence is blessing, that of war or the threat of war is misery.

5. My delegation does not believe that accusations and condemnations will achieve much in the Middle East. My delegation strongly disapproves of the acquisition of territorial gains through conquest; but at the same time it is desirous of seeking reasonable, peaceful and just solutions to the dispute. Therefore, my delegation is quite unprepared to be governed

purely by sentiments and emotions per se and looks for a workable solution that would bring along with it stability and lasting peace in the Middle East.

6. Many draft resolutions have been brought before this Assembly. My delegation is grateful to those who have sponsored those draft resolutions—all of them. The principal aim is to achieve a solution to the complex problems facing us in the area.

7. However, out of all those draft resolutions, the one produced by the Latin American group [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2] appears to my delegation to provide an appropriate and reasonable basis, though not a perfect one, for operation. In my delegation's view, it brings out most forcibly one great principle of the Charter, namely, that negotiation remains the ultimate and principal means of peaceful change.

8. Also, since peace can never be the product of inhumanity, my delegation will support the Swedish draft resolution [A/L.526 and Add.1-3], whose objective is humanitarian.

9. Finally, because the spirit, temperament and objectivity of the Pakistan draft resolution are not discordant with those of the Latin American and Swedish draft resolutions, my delegation will also support that draft resolution [A/L.527/Rev.1].

10. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): During the general discussion the Byelorussian delegation has already spoken in favour of a decisive condemnation of Israel aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, and has also demanded the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of Israel's troops from the territories which they occupy and complete reparation by Israel for the damage caused to the neighbouring Arab States and their citizens. My delegation is in favour of protecting the legal rights of the Arab States, eliminating the hotbed of war in the Middle East and restoring peace in this region. These are the objectives of the USSR draft resolution [A/L.519], for which we once again declare our full support.

11. The delegations of many countries have quite correctly pointed out that the presence of the aggressor's troops on lands which they have seized from neighbouring States may at any time lead to fresh conflicts. The frequent renewal in recent days by Israel of aggressive acts in the Sinai Peninsula has entirely confirmed this assessment made by my delegation and by many other representatives of States Members of the United Nations. There can be no peace in the Middle East until the aggressor leaves the territories it has usurped and until an end is put to its hegemony on alien soil.

12. The discussion here has shown that there is a stern condemnation of the aggressive actions of Israel, which are a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and generally accepted rules of international law. The clumsy attempts of the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs somehow to justify and even substantiate the need for the piratical attacks carried out by Israel troops have completely failed. The representatives of the overwhelming majority of Member States have censured the reckless course of action embarked upon by over-ambitious Israel politicians and their patrons and have condemned the attempt of Israel and the imperialist forces to enjoy the fruits of their treacherous armed aggression against the Arab States in pursuit of their criminal designs.

13. We cannot fail to see a co-ordination of action between Israel militarists and the political circles and diplomats of the countries which are trying in every way to prevent the adoption of a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from the territory of the Arab States.

14. The entire world knows that Israel started an aggressive war. The United States of America and its allies have not even mildly reprimanded Israel for this, but, in an attempt to support the Israel militarists in their annexation designs, have been telling us at length that peace, if you please, would be endangered if Israel troops were sent back to the positions they occupied before 5 June and if they left the Arab lands they now occupy. These allegations are nothing less than absurd.

15. The United States and other Western countries have spared no words to support their claim that they are in favour of putting an end to the arms race in the Middle East; but their story is made up out of whole cloth. We can see only too well that their real aim is to put Israel in an advantageous position and to secure for the aggressor what it has gained by means of a sudden attack on the Arab States.

16. The representatives of those countries have spoken at length about the Holy Places in Jerusalem and about access to them, playing on the religious feelings of believers. But why do not the Western countries condemn Israel which, by its aggression, has created this problem and which, to the accompaniment of their utterances, has already enacted "laws" providing for the annexation of Jerusalem? Furthermore, the representatives of the Western countries applaud the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs, who has been cynically defending the annexation of Jerusalem.

17. The question has also been raised here of the care of refugees and the collection of funds throughout the world to support them and to improve their situation; but the representatives of the Western countries have said not a word about who it was that created the refugee problem and deprived more than 1 million people of their homes, their land, and their livelihood. Is it not well known that this situation was created and has now been aggravated by Israel aggression? A genuine solution of the refugee problem was outlined by the United Nations General Assembly as early as 1948, and Israel must now be required to implement resolution 194 (III).

18. We are in favour of aid for the victims of the aggression, we are in favour of humanitarian treatment

of prisoners of war and the peaceful population of the occupied areas, but we must make it plain that the adoption of resolutions on these questions cannot be interpreted as legalizing the usurpation of foreign territory. We reject the hypocritical assurances we heard today from the representative of the aggressor that it supports humanitarian principles. There is incontrovertible evidence of the crimes committed by the Israel military, at whose hands thousands upon thousands of Arabs have suffered. All the consequences of aggression must be wiped out.

19. The General Assembly has before it a number of draft resolutions, and it must scrupulously weigh their respective merits. All those who really strive for peace in the Middle East and who have a realistic view of the danger to peace in that region should frustrate all attempts to foist on the Arab States conditions which would infringe their legal rights and interests. If we do not forcefully rebuff the pretensions of Israel and its patrons today, new aggressors may appear tomorrow who will count on going unpunished if they attempt to seize the territories of other peace-loving States.

20. Our joint duty is to reject the draft resolutions presented by the United States [A/L.520] and the Latin American countries [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2] as unprincipled attempts to be of service to the aggressor while supposedly promoting a "general settlement programme".

21. The provisions of the draft resolution presented by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3] serve the interests of peace and security in the Middle East. No delegation which is guided by the lofty principles of the Charter and by a desire to remove as quickly as possible the vestiges of aggression can fail to support this draft resolution. There can be no doubt that an immediate withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from the seized Arab territories will lead to a relaxation of tension in the Middle East and create conditions in which it will be possible to take up the consideration of other questions in the interests of the countries in the region. The Arab States, which have been the victims of aggression, are fully entitled to demand an immediate and complete restitution of their rights and interests, their sovereignty and territorial integrity, and the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries is designed to satisfy these legitimate demands. The adoption of this draft resolution would enhance the role and the prestige of the United Nations, which Israel and its patrons are so anxious to undermine.

22. In the light of what I have said, my delegation will vote for the USSR draft resolution and also for the draft resolution presented by the non-aligned countries. We also support the proposal made by Pakistan and a number of other countries [A/L.527/Rev.1] demanding the annulment of all the illegal measures adopted by Israel with a view to the annexation of Jerusalem.

23. In conclusion, I should like to remind the Assembly of the following remark made at this session by Mr. Kiselev, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"The declarations of States that they are dedicated to the cause of peace, and have faith in the United

Nations, and also their ability to take a just and high-minded position, ignoring imperialist blackmail and pressure, are today being put to the test." [1533rd meeting, para. 84.]

24. We call upon all other delegations to support the draft resolutions which provide for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel from the territories belonging to the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. In so doing, we would all be demonstrating that we are deeply concerned with the preservation of peace and that we desire to restore and strengthen international security.

25. Mr. ENAHORO (Nigeria): When I spoke from this rostrum on 27 June [1537th meeting] I presented for the consideration of the General Assembly my delegation's six-point peace plan for establishing some degree of tranquillity in the Middle East. You may recall, Mr. President, that our plan envisaged, among other things, withdrawal by Israeli forces from the territories overrun and occupied by them, the establishment of demilitarized buffer zones and an effective United Nations presence in them; a new refugee resettlement scheme; the appointment by the Secretary-General of a representative with clearly defined functions, including that of making recommendations for a durable settlement, and the promotion by the United Nations itself of a Middle East peace treaty. Our plan was based on this appraisal of the situation: that we were here confronted not by a sudden aberration or a sudden spark of errancy, but by an episode in a drama that is at least older than the United Nations itself. Therefore, we endeavoured to present a view which would at once secure observance of the spirit and the letter of our Charter and provide for a foundation on which a viable settlement of the problems of the area might be constructed.

26. We have felt encouraged by the reaction to our plan by a number of delegations, and we fully appreciate why, in the nature of things, that reaction could not at this stage be translated into a response in the deliberations at this Assembly. My delegation regrets that it has not proved possible for a resolution to emerge which might go as far towards bringing tranquillity into the situation as we consider essential to eventual peace in the Middle East.

27. In the circumstances, it has become our duty to examine the draft resolutions now before the Assembly with a view to deciding which of them might approximate our proposals or at least create an opening for our proposals. In this study we have given much attention to the draft resolution of the twenty Latin American countries [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2] and the draft resolution of the seventeen non-aligned nations [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1]. We had hopes that the further consultations of the last few days and hours might produce a compromise resolution, for there is obviously much common ground in the two draft resolutions. However, faced as we are with them as alternatives, we are unable to support proposals in the Latin American draft resolution which would promote a change of sovereignty by force of arms. My delegation proposes, therefore, to support the draft resolution of the seventeen non-aligned nations, although we would have much preferred that it go further than it has gone towards meeting our position, particularly in regard to an effective United Nations presence in the area.

28. My delegation wishes to explain that in doing so it is our understanding, first, that the Security Council will address itself to the entire question of peace and stability in the Middle East; second, that the Secretary-General's representative will not be precluded from undertaking the tasks suggested in our six-point peace plan at the instance of the Secretary-General; and, third, that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution means exactly what it says, namely, that States are "to render every assistance to the Secretary-General..."; in other words, that the initiative in this matter will rest unequivocally with the Secretary-General. On that understanding my delegation supports the draft resolution of the seventeen non-aligned nations.

29. U SOE TIN (Burma): At this late stage of the debate I do not propose to make a lengthy explanation of how and why the delegation of Burma will vote on the various draft resolutions now before the General Assembly; I shall be very brief.

30. Dedicated as we are to the ideals of peaceful and friendly relations between States, particularly between neighbouring States, the delegation of Burma is sensible of the vast complications which have led to and been attendant on the outbreak of hostilities between neighbouring States in the Middle East. We have therefore closely and attentively followed the deliberations in the Assembly, and have considered with particular care the two draft resolutions submitted respectively by the Latin Americans [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2] and by the Afro-Asian nations and Yugoslavia [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1].

31. I would like to say that we subscribe to the affirmation in the second operative paragraph of the Latin American draft "that no stable international order can be based on the threat or use of force, and ... the validity of the occupation or acquisition of territories brought about by such means should not be recognized." The delegation of Burma would desire, in line with the foregoing affirmation, that the forces engaged in hostilities and thereafter in occupation of foreign territories should be withdrawn unconditionally. It is not clear to us whether this is called for in the Latin American draft resolution. We would not wish that territorial gains acquired as a result of hostilities between States should ever be permitted to be utilized for bargaining to the advantage of one of the parties to the hostilities.

32. On the other hand, the Afro-Asian-Yugoslav draft resolution specifically includes the essential call for the withdrawal of forces, without attaching conditions to their withdrawal. Moreover, we share the view of many delegations here dedicated to peace in the Middle East as we are that the mere withdrawal of forces is not an end in itself. The delegation of Burma is deeply aware of the need for a patient and highly motivated search for ways and means peacefully to resolve the complex problems which afflict the Middle East today. We are convinced that the spirit and motivation which is necessary for such a search for a peaceful solution of the problem is manifest in operative paragraph 6 of the eighteen-nation Afro-Asian-Yugoslav draft resolution, which calls for the solution of all problems "guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular those contained in Articles 2 and 33." It is the firm belief of the delegation of Burma

that consideration by the Security Council of all aspects of the situation in the Middle East with a view to seeking peaceful ways and means for the solution of all problems, legal, political and humanitarian, mentioned in operative paragraph 6, will lead to effective solutions which will ensure a stable and durable peace in the region.

33. As regards the Latin American draft resolution, while we generally subscribe to the principles enunciated therein, the provisions of operative paragraph 1 under which the withdrawal of troops is made conditional on some other contingencies, are not acceptable to us. We cannot, therefore, lend our support to that draft resolution.

34. The delegation of Burma accordingly will vote for the eighteen-nation Afro-Asian-Yugoslav draft resolution and abstain from voting on the Latin American draft resolution.

35. Mr. PARDO (Malta): On various occasions in the past we have been alone, or almost alone, in emphasizing that it is useless, indeed damaging, for the General Assembly to adopt resolutions formulating declarations or principles, however lofty, that have little prospect of being implemented in the foreseeable future, or to demand action which is unlikely to be forthcoming. In our view, a resolution which is almost certain to be disregarded does not strengthen the United Nations. The graver and more important the matter, the more damaging to the United Nations is a resolution which remains a dead letter.

36. In the present case, any draft resolution which we may adopt is unlikely to be implemented unless it is either acceptable or at least tolerable to all the parties most directly concerned in the recent conflict, or acceptable to the major Powers which through the use of moral suasion might obtain the free and willing co-operation of the parties most directly involved. A third possibility might be a draft resolution which secured the near unanimity of the Assembly. Such a draft resolution, as the unequivocal expression of international opinion, perhaps might also have sufficient moral influence to secure compliance with its provisions.

37. We note, however, that neither the draft resolution contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1 nor that contained in document A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2 fulfils at the present time any one of the conditions that would ensure a reasonable prospect of being implemented. Accordingly, we will abstain from voting on both of these draft resolutions. On the other hand, we will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.526 and Add.1-3, the objective of which is purely humanitarian.

38. In view of the sharp divergence of opinion in the General Assembly which makes it difficult to adopt a meaningful resolution—that is to say, a resolution which is likely to be implemented—and to facilitate agreement between the parties most directly concerned, perhaps it may be wise for us not to recommend any particular course of action. This may have the advantage of facilitating the free use of those means for the pacific settlement of disputes mentioned in Chapter VI of the Charter that may appear most appropriate in the present case.

39. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): As a co-sponsor of the Afro-Asian and non-aligned draft resolution contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1 my delegation's attitude towards the various draft resolutions and amendments is as follows.

40. My delegation is no less imbued than many other delegations with the desire that a permanent and just settlement in the Middle East be reached. However, it strongly believes that any measures to establish this peace cannot be based on a reality which has been brought about by flouting the United Nations Charter. Measures to promote peace between the Arab nations and Israel should have as their basis the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab areas they are occupying. Only in this way will a climate be created conducive to any meaningful, fruitful, and sincere action by organs of the United Nations leading toward a permanent solution. By not insisting on immediate withdrawal, the Assembly, under whatever pretext or excuse, would in fact condone or accept, however temporarily, the illegal occupation of the territory of Member countries.

41. In this context, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, in his statement on 23 June last, declared:

"Neither the norms of established international law nor the precepts of international justice and morality will ever condone territorial expansion through acts of aggression. ... This is an axiom governing relationships among all States which brooks no compromise or clever constructions in interpretation. The immutable fact which we face today is that Israeli troops, by force of arms, have occupied and continue to occupy certain parts of Arab soil." [1534th meeting, para. 97.]

42. My delegation will therefore support the draft resolutions which honestly and sincerely—I repeat, honestly and sincerely—seek a solution to the problem by upholding the principle on which my delegation stands and which is fully in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

43. As to the amendments to the draft resolution of the Asian, African and non-aligned delegations—a draft resolution co-sponsored by my delegation—although my delegation agrees with all or part of the ideas expressed in them, we shall vote affirmatively on amendments which will make the draft resolution of Asian, African and non-aligned States more acceptable to the majority of this Assembly.

44. This draft has been the result of intensive discussions and consultations among many delegations and thereby it has emerged as a draft resolution which is balanced, morally sound and, at the same time, forward-looking.

45. Mr. P. V. J. SOLOMON (Trinidad and Tobago): When the representative of Burundi presented the third revised text [A/L.522/Rev.3] of the draft resolution of the non-aligned States he made a plea for peace and conciliation [1545th meeting]. Today the representative of Ethiopia made a similar plea for conciliation, understanding and a movement towards peace. That plea is accepted and re-echoed by every member of the Latin American group, including my country, Trinidad and Tobago.

46. During the last twenty-four hours I have on three occasions delayed speaking from this rostrum. Three times I have postponed my address in the hope that some sort of agreement could be arrived at between what are now the only two opposing views before the Assembly: the views of the non-aligned delegations and the views of the Latin American delegations. Until just a few hours ago these discussions continued, and we still feel that at this late hour it might yet be possible to arrive at a consensus. But it must be a consensus based on an honest appreciation of the facts and an honest desire to bring peace to the Middle East.

47. The proposals of the non-aligned countries have been placed before this Assembly and we have examined them. We shall vote against them, not because we are opposed to the principal recommendation of the non-aligned draft resolution, but because that draft resolution does not go far enough. It looks at one side of the picture and completely ignores the realities of the situation in the Middle East. It asks for complete, unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Arab territory. That, we wholeheartedly endorse. But withdrawal is not enough. What good will it be to ask for the withdrawal of troops without at the same time asking the parties concerned to renounce the state of belligerency which exists? The Arab States have maintained over the years that there is a state of belligerency between themselves and Israel. The United Arab Republic has justified the closing of the Strait of Tiran and the blockading of the Gulf of Aqaba on the ground that, among other things, a state of belligerency existed between the United Arab Republic and Israel and that the closing of the Gulf was not, therefore, illegal.

48. I do not want to join issue with the representative of Kuwait over the international laws that govern action between States, but it is enough that a state of belligerency does exist and has been recognized to exist, and that in order that there should be peace it is essential—it is one of the preconditions of peace—that this state of belligerency should cease to exist. If in fact it were agreed that the forces that occupy foreign soil today should be asked to withdraw, what would there be to prevent the further outbreak of hostilities the moment either side should determine that the time was opportune? What guarantee is there, without a cessation of the state of belligerency, that hostilities, active hostilities, will not again result?

49. Let us try to put the shoe on the other foot. If, as a result of this war which started on 5 June 1967, the Arab States had invaded Israeli territory and occupied Israeli territory, instead of the reverse, and the General Assembly had asked the Arab States to withdraw their troops unconditionally from Israeli soil while Israel still maintained that a state of belligerency existed between them, would the Arab States consider such a withdrawal? Would they not feel that this was merely a device to give Israel the opportunity at the first convenient moment to renew hostilities, when perhaps it had been adequately rearmed, when perhaps Israel's enemy—shall we say—for the time being, was unaware of what was taking place? No, it is unrealistic and impractical to ask for the withdrawal of troops and still to maintain firmly and irrevocably that a state of belligerency exists.

50. And that is the greatest single difference between the draft resolution of the non-aligned States and the draft resolution of the Latin American States [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2]. No matter how long we have negotiated—and we have tried hard—no matter how often we have met and tried to exchange views, this steady refusal to accept the principle of cessation of belligerence is what has kept us divided until now.

51. The Foreign Minister of Iraq asked yesterday [1545th meeting] for good faith. We reciprocate that call for good faith. And may I tell him that as far as Trinidad and Tobago is concerned, we have nothing but goodwill towards the Arab peoples, if only because in our country, small though it is, we have almost every nation on earth represented. We have a large Syrian and Lebanese community; we have Jews also. They all enjoy the privileges of residence, and those who are citizens, of citizenship. There is no conflict between them in Trinidad and Tobago; the law does not permit it. And we have friendly relations with all their Governments. We have exchanged diplomatic representation with the United Arab Republic, and there never was and never can be between us and the United Arab Republic any feeling of ill will. We understand the problems that torment them and we sympathize with them. We should like to help. But we cannot fly in the face of reality; we cannot be impractical. Nor can we blind ourselves to the tremendous human problem which faces this Assembly and the nations involved.

52. The Foreign Minister of Iraq said yesterday that in presenting the Latin American draft resolution I offered no explanation, I merely said it was objective. Well, he and I are both politicians, and those of us who have been through the hurly-burly of politics know when to speak and when not to speak. In Trinidad and Tobago we have been brought up in a very hard political school; we have to know, we have to learn when to speak and when not to speak; we have to know what to say and what not to say. I had thought that it would be unwise to bore the Assembly with a repetition of the reasons behind every clause in this draft resolution—reasons which have been given by various representatives and argued back and forth for the past two weeks. The draft resolution speaks for itself, and I was content to leave it at that. But, lest my silence be interpreted to mean that I am not wholeheartedly behind the draft resolution, may I take a little time to point out the significance of the various clauses.

53. In the first place, our draft resolution emphasizes the inescapable obligation of every Member of this Assembly to preserve peace in the world. This is not an obligation belonging to the Security Council alone; it is an obligation which weighs heavily on every single one of us. And it is because the Security Council has, for one reason or another, not been able to solve this difficult and dangerous problem that it has been thrown squarely into our lap. We emphasize that we have an inescapable obligation to preserve peace, and consequently, to avoid the use of force in the international sphere.

54. I do not have to repeat that every time I come to this rostrum. Every Member has said it in one way or another at one time or another, but because it is necessary to explain, I repeat it.

55. The Security Council did one thing important, nevertheless, with regard to the situation in the Middle East: it did succeed in obtaining a cease-fire. If there is a war, if nations have gone beyond the Charter for one reason or another and have engaged in hostilities, contrary to the provisions of the Charter, the first thing that the Assembly or the Security Council must do is to obtain a cease-fire. That was achieved, and we recognize this fact as the first step towards the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East. That is reflected in the Latin American draft resolution.

56. But we maintain that that is not enough. It must be reinforced by other measures which the Assembly may take and which both parties must observe. In conformity with that view, we urgently request, first, that Israel withdraw all its forces from the territories occupied by them.

57. May I here diverge for a moment to refer to the very able and eloquent speech made by the representative of Kuwait this morning [1547th meeting]. He was very severe on the Latin Americans. I can understand that. The emotions that have been generated throughout this debate and because of this situation tend to make people severe. But we know how to take these things; we are not unduly disturbed. He feels deeply, and despite the fact that he was severe on us, I could sense throughout his speech a broad vein of peaceful intent, a broad vein of sincerity. I do not agree with all he had to say, but I am nevertheless satisfied—although he may not have been satisfied with us—that he was sincere in what he had to say and that he was a very able apologist for the Arab group.

58. However, he made one charge against us which I think is unjust and unfair. He referred to the fact that we ask for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic but fail to mention the Gaza Strip. He concluded from this that we did not know what we were doing, or that we did it in haste, or that we deliberately meant to exclude the Gaza Strip. May I tell him that we did not do it in haste, that we did know what we were doing, and that we did mean the Gaza Strip also. The Gaza Strip, after all, is under the administrative control of the United Arab Republic. But lest there be any misconception or misunderstanding of what we, the sponsors of the draft resolution, mean, may I inform the Assembly that it is our intention to introduce a revision,^{1/} so that operative paragraph 1 (a) of the Latin American draft resolution will read:

"Israel to withdraw all its forces from all the territories occupied by it as a result of the recent conflict."

In other words, we do not now specify Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic; we include all the territories, which means the Gaza Strip as well. I hope that will satisfy the representative of Kuwait.

59. Now we come back to the crux of the matter, operative paragraph 1 (b), which reads:

"The parties in conflict to end the state of belligerency, to endeavour to establish conditions of

coexistence based on good-neighbourliness and to have recourse in all cases to the procedures for peaceful settlement indicated in the Charter of the United Nations;"

60. Yesterday the Foreign Minister of Iraq posed this question: Shall withdrawal precede settlement, or is it contingent thereon? Are we going to wait until all the other things are done before the troops are withdrawn?

61. Obviously not. That is not the intention and it cannot be the intention. But it is certain that unless the state of belligerency is renounced firmly and emphatically, the other things will not be complied with. How can you talk of peaceful measures for the settlement of disputes when you refuse to renounce a state of belligerency? We know that the other things will take time, and the withdrawal is not contingent on those various things. The refugee problem, for example, has been plaguing the nations of the Middle East and the United Nations for twenty years. Can we expect that it will be solved in twenty days? Certainly not. There must be a reference to this in the draft resolution, but no such reference exists in the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries.

62. Then we were accused of providing an excuse for prolonged occupation or annexation. Enshrined in this document, the draft resolution of the Latin American group, we find operative paragraph 2, which states that the Assembly

"Reaffirms its conviction that no stable international order can be based on the threat or use of force, and declares that the validity of the occupation or acquisition of territories brought about by such means should not be recognized;"

Clearly, we have rejected any idea of prolonged occupation or annexation of Arab territory by Israel. That is not the intention of the draft resolution, and it cannot be the intention of the Assembly, to permit such a thing to take place.

63. There are four basic problems in this issue which have to be recognized if there is to be peace in the Middle East: First of all, there must be withdrawal. Every representative who has spoken here has insisted upon that. Secondly, there must be a cessation of belligerency. That is essential. Thirdly, there must be a recognition of the sovereignty and independence of all the States in the area—I repeat, all the States in the area. If we do not agree to accept the sovereignty of all the States in the area, then there will continue to be a state of belligerency and there will be no peace in the Middle East. These facts are self-evident. Fourthly, there is the humanitarian problem of the refugees. Not enough has been done to deal with this problem as it ought to have been dealt with. Let us not make the mistake of believing that the fault belongs to one side alone or to the other side alone. In this, as in many other problems that afflict human beings, there are faults on both sides. But it is time that this Assembly took a serious look at this problem and a firm hand in its solution.

64. Let us not wait until the parties concerned alone decide who will have what and who will do what. We are concerned with the human problem of refugees in the Middle East, and it is our bounden duty at this stage

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/L.523/Rev.1.

to take a firm hand in the solution of the problem. We could have made various detailed suggestions for solving this problem. But why should we? Some organization must be set up; some machinery must be set in motion; but these are details that can come later. We must accept the principle; we must accept the responsibility, and get on with the job. To debate the details here would merely delay a decision, one which has already been too long delayed.

65. I started off by repeating the plea for peace, conciliation and understanding that was initiated yesterday, echoed this morning, and re-echoed this afternoon. If the Assembly should fail to solve this problem the future will be bleak indeed, not only for the Middle East, not merely for the other small States of the world, but for the world itself.

66. I have been oppressed throughout these last few weeks, as indeed many other Members have been, by a heavy feeling of impending disaster. If this problem is not solved soon, we may find ourselves very shortly on the brink of a third world war. Let us not think that we are scaremongering; let us keep that at the back of our minds, and let us bend every effort now to arrive at an agreement that will solve this problem and put us well on the road to providing peace in the Middle East.

67. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) (translated from French): The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania on the grave events in the Near East which are the subject of this emergency special session of the General Assembly was stated by Mr. Maurer, the President of the Council of Ministers of my country, in his speech to the General Assembly on 23 June [1533rd meeting].

68. As soon as the conflict started, the Romanian Government reaffirmed its stand that the disputes and problems between the States in that region should be settled otherwise than by force of arms. It emphasized that the forcible occupation of territories could confer no legal rights and could only make the problems more difficult and more acute. It confirmed the necessity of the withdrawal of the Israel troops from the occupied territories. The disquieting and dangerous course of events since then, which has been brought out more than once during this debate, has fully confirmed my Government's point of view.

69. The Romanian delegation is firmly convinced that the establishment of peace in the Middle East demands sustained effort with a view to arriving at equitable and constructive solutions which will take into account the fundamental interests of all the peoples of the region, their right to an independent existence, to security and to economic and social progress. The way which could lead to the realization of this objective must necessarily start from the strict observance of the cease-fire, the prohibition of the use of force, and resort exclusively to peaceful means for the settlement of the matters in dispute, free from all outside interference.

70. As we see it, it is not possible to engage in fruitful action which can lead to the establishment of peace as long as situations created by force are maintained or accepted. The establishment of a lasting peace demands the purification of the atmosphere through the

elimination of the consequences of the use of force, and through the promotion of justice and the spirit of co-operation.

71. In our view, any attempt to create the conditions for a just and lasting peace in the Near East must be given the support of the United Nations, which, by virtue of its purposes and principles, is called upon to imprint a positive trend upon events, to contribute to the reinforcement of mutual confidence between peoples and to create a solidarity of international opinion in regard to the supreme interests of the maintenance of peace and peaceful means of ensuring that maintenance, means which our Organization possesses.

72. The draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned group of States (A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1) emphasizes what we believe constitutes the essential element in a viable settlement, namely the withdrawal of any troops from foreign territory. This step will make it possible to rule out any attempt to impose solutions or to exploit advantageous military situations to that end.

73. At the same time, in the opinion of my delegation, the reference in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution to "the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular those contained in Articles 2 and 33", and the mobilization of the United Nations political machinery to ensure the implementation of the terms of the resolution and the consideration of the problems left pending, are also elements likely to lead to a peaceful settlement. We therefore consider that this resolution can create the premises for a settlement, by peaceful means, of the conflict in the Near East. To us, the provisions of the draft resolution constitute a first step which will have to be followed by effective measures to which all States are called upon to contribute with a view to a rational and lasting settlement of the situation in the Near East.

74. In the light of these considerations, the Romanian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution proposed by the non-aligned group of States.

75. The Romanian delegation's vote on the other proposals submitted will be prompted by the same considerations.

76. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation had not intended to speak, but several points which have been made from this rostrum make it necessary for me, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, to make our position very clear.

77. I should like to start by trying to point out the way in which our draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1] has been deliberately misrepresented by certain delegations. And when I say "deliberately", I mean both by certain delegations and by the United States Press, which many representatives have undoubtedly read.

78. In the first place, the draft resolution has been depicted by some delegations from this rostrum and in some of the newspapers as a Yugoslav resolution. I need not go into details with respect to this. But when one looks at the list of countries co-sponsoring the draft, including my own country, one sees that the name of Yugoslavia is next to last. Therefore, for this

draft to be called a Yugoslav draft is a deliberate attempt to try and mislead not only the Members of the Assembly but also some members of the international community.

79. If it is being called a Yugoslav draft simply because it was introduced by Yugoslavia, then I submit that this must be a new trend: to identify a draft with the delegation which has introduced it. What we do know is that if a draft resolution is submitted on behalf of the Latin American group, we call it a Latin American draft resolution; if a draft resolution is presented by the Afro-Asian group, we call it an Afro-Asian draft resolution. Since the draft resolution has been presented on behalf of the non-aligned countries, I think it only fair that it should be given the name it deserves, that of a non-aligned draft resolution.

80. Therefore, for some delegations to have suggested from this rostrum that the draft resolution is a Yugoslav draft is, I am afraid, a deliberate attempt to try and mislead certain delegations. I submit that the draft resolution is not a Yugoslav draft; it is an honest attempt by certain non-aligned countries to bring the problem of the Middle East to a settlement. I know that certain countries which have called the draft resolution a Yugoslav draft resolution do not adhere to the policy of non-alignment. But the draft resolution has been presented by seventeen countries, and I do hope that this deliberate attempt to call it a Yugoslav draft resolution will not be repeated again.

81. I would like to draw attention to some points which have been raised at this rostrum. I join the representative of Trinidad and Tobago in appealing for reason and statesmanship, in appealing to the Assembly today to take a decision on the problem of peace in the Middle East. However, I want to point out that the non-aligned countries which submitted this draft resolution have, since its introduction, made every effort—I repeat, every effort—to see to it that we reach some sort of agreement. But, if these negotiations have not produced results—and, of course, this is not the place to say why they have not—the blame should not be placed on the seventeen nations that produced the non-aligned draft. We have done everything within our power, we have done everything within the bounds of patience, to try and reach an understanding in order that the entire Assembly should speak with one voice on the question of the Middle East.

82. Nevertheless, the mere fact that up to this point we have not reached any agreed settlement obviously means that there are certain fundamental differences. This might not be the appropriate time to go into the details of those differences. However, I should like to speak on one point which has been touched upon so often and this relates to operative paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2].

83. The question of belligerency has been so often referred to—as though we only had to adopt a resolution stating that belligerency should be terminated and then the whole problem of the Middle East would be solved. I submit that if this is the belief of some Members of the General Assembly, then indeed it is an incorrect belief.

84. Why is the General Assembly gathered today in this emergency special session? This session was

convened because of certain events that had taken place in the Middle East. Those events were sparked by the attack of one Power against certain countries. It is true that the Security Council did the appropriate thing by calling for a cease-fire.

85. So far as my delegation is concerned, we view the events as a series of stages. First of all, there was the cease-fire—and we agree that the Security Council did the right thing at the right time. The second important question for which I consider this Assembly has been convened is that of the withdrawal of the forces of Israel from Arab territories.

86. I submit that if our own territories were occupied by other forces, very few of us in this Assembly would come to this rostrum and appeal for an end to belligerency. Therefore the question of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab territories is not only important, but paramount; for one cannot talk of peace in the Middle East as long as the forces of Israel still occupy certain Arab territories.

87. Our draft resolution endeavours to solve this problem by saying in operative paragraph 1:

"Calls upon Israel to withdraw immediately all its forces to the positions they held prior to 5 June 1967." [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1.]

We submit that if this provision were adopted and accepted, the next stage would be to examine in detail the problems of the Middle East. After all, these problems, as some speakers have pointed out, are older than the United Nations itself. Therefore, I do not think that we can solve these problems by just adopting a paragraph of a draft resolution.

88. The next stage which we believe is absolutely necessary is the examination of the problem by the appropriate bodies of the United Nations. In order to meet this point, we have said in operative paragraph 6:

"Requests that the Security Council consider all aspects of the situation in the Middle East and seek peaceful ways and means for the solution of all problems—legal, political and humanitarian—through appropriate channels, guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular those contained in Articles 2 and 33." [Ibid.]

I would like to appeal to representatives to read these two Articles to which I have just referred—that is, Articles 2 and 33 of the Charter—and they will see that all the problems which are raised in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution are, in fact, covered by those articles.

89. Therefore, if we have failed to reach agreement, it is simply because we do not believe that the question of belligerency should be coupled with the question of withdrawal. We feel that that is a problem which could be examined at a later stage. At the present moment the Assembly should be concerned only with the immediate problem of securing withdrawal, because it is only by withdrawal that the conditions for peace negotiations can be obtained.

90. I am sorry to say that my delegation will therefore not be in a position to support the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries. If we are unable to support that draft resolution, it is simply

because we think that it tries to seek solutions for problems which this Assembly has not had an opportunity to examine in detail. This Assembly has not examined the sources of belligerency in the Middle East. This Assembly surely cannot pronounce itself on the question of belligerency when we have not examined it in detail.

91. I wish to affirm once again that my delegation, for those reasons, will be unable to support the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries. However, I wish also to take this opportunity to thank the Latin American countries for the spirit they showed in these negotiations. Although we were not able to come to some understanding, we had the benefit of meeting together and exchanging views. If we differed, we, as usual, differed as friends.

92. Finally, I wish to appeal to this Assembly. The time has come to deal not only with the problem of the Middle East but with the problem of the United Nations itself. Peace in the Middle East is in jeopardy. Thousands of people in the Middle East are now in trouble. It is for this Assembly to alleviate that problem. It is only if this Assembly unanimously pronounces itself on the solution to the problems of the Middle East that the United Nations will indeed remain a United Nations. If this Assembly fails to solve the Middle East crisis, if we end this session of the Assembly without arriving at any solution of this problem, it will be another occasion when the reputation and indeed the foundations of this Organization will be impaired.

93. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (translated from French): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the various draft resolutions before the General Assembly.

94. To begin with, may I express the hope that in the circumstances, neither the General Assembly nor the delegation of the United States of America will press for a vote on their draft resolutions. In that hope, I shall refrain from indicating my Government attitude in respect of those proposals.

95. As far as the other draft resolutions are concerned, I should like first of all to reaffirm that, in the view of the delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, only respect for the Charter can guarantee lasting peace and peaceful coexistence among all the States of the region; moreover, only respect for the Charter can create favourable conditions for a fruitful discussion of all the related problems upon whose speedy solution a lasting peace in the Middle East depends.

96. We are thinking in this connexion of the problem of the refugees, the problem of access to international waters, and many other matters.

97. These fundamental principles of the Charter, respect for which should be demanded from all the parties, are in particular those set forth in Article 2 (3) and (4). The specific obligations which this Article imposes on the parties are to refrain from violating the territorial integrity of any Member State and not to threaten the existence of any State in the region. No one will deny that these principles have been violated in the Middle East and are still being violated. That is why we think that the General As-

sembly should call upon the parties to respect these specific obligations and that the Security Council, exercising its prerogatives, should take the necessary steps to ensure that they are respected.

98. These are the principles which will guide our delegation in its attitude towards the two substantive draft resolutions that have been submitted to the Assembly.

99. We believe that we have found an affirmation of these fundamental principles and the need to respect the obligations which ensue from them in the two draft resolutions in documents A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1 and A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2, although our delegation has certain reservations in regard to their formulation.

100. In point of fact, we think that both draft resolutions could gain, one by being made decidedly more balanced, and the other by being less detailed as regards the solution to be found for the problems which are still pending. However, we are ready to accord both our support.

101. As regards the draft resolution in document A/L.526 and Add.1 to 3, it goes without saying that my delegation will support it. Indeed, it expresses the humanitarian concern of my delegation, which has decided to make an immediate contribution of U.S. \$20,000 to assist the Palestine refugees.

102. With regard to the draft resolution of Pakistan on the status of Jerusalem (A/L.527/Rev.1), my delegation would like to say that at this stage it intends to confine itself to the views which it will express through its vote on the two draft resolutions appearing in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1 and A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2.

103. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Our deliberations in the General Assembly have shown that the United Nations is anxiously concerned about the grave situation in West Asia. A great number of delegations have clearly supported—and none has challenged—the cardinal principle of the Charter that force shall not be used in settling disputes and that the United Nations will not recognize any advantage, territorial or otherwise, gained through force.

104. We are deeply interested in bringing about conditions for the establishment of a just and durable peace in the entire region of West Asia. My delegation is aware of the existence of a number of serious problems and issues in West Asia and does not minimize their complexity, but we are not pessimistic about the possibilities of a peaceful resolution of those difficulties. It is our firm belief that these problems can be dealt with on the basis of first things coming first. We have been accused of giving a prescription for renewed hostilities; on the contrary, what we have been proposing is a recipe for the restoration of peaceful conditions and the establishment of a durable peace. As we conceive it, there should be reversion to the Armistice Agreements, respect for which should be ensured by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine.

105. We are convinced that once the central issue of withdrawal is tackled, all other problems will fall into their proper perspective and will be dealt with in their turn. However, to make withdrawal conditional on the

settlement of long-standing and complex disputes, in an atmosphere of tension, can only place an intolerable strain on the efforts at peaceful settlement and will come in the way of the establishment of lasting peace.

106. As representatives are aware, India is a co-sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1. We co-sponsored this draft resolution because, in our view, as was explained by the Foreign Minister of India on 22 June 1967 [1530th meeting], the first and most essential step to bring about peace and stability in West Asia is the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces to the positions they held prior to the outbreak of the recent hostilities. That is the one and only step which the General Assembly can take, leaving the rest of the issues to the Security Council for solutions and adjustments.

107. My delegation's attitude to the other draft resolutions and amendments will be governed by the principle I have just mentioned.

108. My delegation appreciates the concern of our Latin American colleagues and their sincere efforts in putting forward draft resolution A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2. Nevertheless, we must frankly state that the Latin American draft falls short of the accepted principle and the primary objective which I mentioned earlier. It couples withdrawal with the settlement of complicated issues, and it thus becomes a formula for bargaining from a position of strength by Israel.

109. We have given very careful consideration to the draft, and our view is that it would lead to a deadlock because it does not give primacy to the central issue of immediate withdrawals. No State Member of the United Nations, particularly no small State, could ever agree to negotiate so long as alien armed forces remain on its soil and it is subjected to duress.

Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan) took the Chair.

110. We have in the last twenty-four hours tried hard with our Latin American colleagues to find a basis for a common approach, but regrettably we have failed because of a profound disagreement on the necessity of bringing about immediate withdrawals before consideration could be given to any other issue. This is an issue of principle for us, and therefore my delegation will vote against the Latin American draft.

111. A few moments ago the representative of Trinidad and Tobago said that our draft resolution does not go far enough. I hope that what I have just stated proves that ours is a much more practical and step-by-step approach. Our complaint is that the Latin American draft resolution ignores the history of the Middle East during the last twenty years. If the Arab States have refused to change their attitude for the last twenty years, is it fair to ask them to do so now when alien armies occupy vast chunks of their territory? Is it right for the Assembly to tell the Arab States that Israel need not withdraw its armed forces so long as the Arabs do not, side by side, recognize Israel, do not end the state of belligerency, do not agree to maritime passage—in fact, do not agree to a host of conditions?

112. The approach of the Latin American draft resolution, if approved by the General Assembly, will have far-reaching and deleterious consequences for most

Member States, to whichever part of the world they might belong.

113. I now come to the two sets of amendments to our draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Albania [A/L.524] and Cuba [A/L.525], respectively. My delegation stands solidly behind the non-aligned and Afro-Asian draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1] which it has co-sponsored. This draft resolution has been hammered out after the most careful consideration, and it is consistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In our view, it provides a chance towards a just and peaceful resolution of the very difficult and dangerous situation prevailing in West Asia. What we are anxious for is to move constructively towards finding a way for the re-establishment of peace on the basis of the principles and purposes of the Charter. We cannot, therefore countenance any move which thwarts our draft resolution by bringing in all kinds of amendments thereto. The amendments before the Assembly do not represent a constructive approach which can find broad support. My delegation therefore cannot support either of the two amendments submitted by Albania and Cuba.

114. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker, the representative of Yugoslavia, I should like to apologize to Members for not having been at their service in this Hall this morning and for some time this afternoon. I was engaged in services to them elsewhere. Also I wish to thank the distinguished Vice-Presidents who have assisted me this morning and this afternoon. I now call on the representative of Yugoslavia.

115. Mr. BOŽOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): The draft resolution sponsored by non-aligned and Afro-Asian States is, as is well known, the result of a broad exchange of views between a large number of delegations, whose considered opinion it is that the most important and urgent task of this Assembly is to secure an immediate withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the territories of sovereign States Members of the United Nations. By demanding immediate withdrawal, the General Assembly would thereby reaffirm the principle that no territorial acquisition or other advantages gained through the threat or use of force should be recognized.

116. Animated by a spirit of co-operation and desirous of evolving conditions that would permit consideration of all aspects of the problem, the delegations of non-aligned and Afro-Asian States, the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1, held a fruitful exchange of views with representatives of some other groups. The revisions of the original draft resolution took into account the various opinions and views expressed in the course of these consultations.

117. The sponsors have also stated on a number of occasions, while elaborating the draft resolution, that either they or their representatives were ready to meet with the Latin American group or with its respective representatives. Unfortunately, these efforts did not materialize until yesterday afternoon. To our satisfaction, meetings between designated representatives of the non-aligned and Afro-Asian countries and of the Latin American group took place yesterday evening and today. To our regret, these

meetings did not yield any results, the differences being differences of principle and not of drafting.

118. The Latin American group continued to adhere to its view that there can be no withdrawal prior to the ending of the state of belligerency. On such a premise, naturally, it was not possible to find a common meeting-ground. Our position has been all along and continues to be—and it is in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations—that there can be no settlement of any of the problems with which the Assembly is now dealing as long as foreign armed forces continue to occupy territories of sovereign Member States of the United Nations.

119. Under such circumstances, and in view of the position that has been expressed in our statement in the general debate, the delegation of Yugoslavia will vote against the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2]. That draft resolution, starting with the situation created by the use of force, is aimed at imposing solutions and is therefore unrealistic.

120. I should now like to refer to amendments which are before this Assembly. We have condemned the aggression committed on 5 June of this year. We continue to maintain that view. However, having in mind the whole structure of the draft resolution submitted by non-aligned and Afro-Asian countries and the need to create the necessary conditions for the accomplishment of this primary aim—that is, the immediate withdrawal of Israeli armed forces—the delegation of Yugoslavia finds it difficult to accept any amendments to the draft resolution, of which it is one of the sponsors, which would affect the present character and aims of that draft resolution. Otherwise, and in another context, the condemnation of aggression would be acceptable to the delegation of Yugoslavia as corresponding with the views we have expressed in the general debate.

121. The PRESIDENT: I call on the last speaker in explanation of vote, the representative of the United Arab Republic.

122. Mr. FAWZI (United Arab Republic): At this stage of our deliberations, and in my capacity no less as a member of the human family at large than as a representative of my country, I ask leave briefly to submit some thoughts and refer to some facts which are of particular relevance to the work we are all trying to do here and to the draft resolutions and suggestions which have been submitted in relation to it.

123. It is only just and right that my delegation and many others should agree with those who say, as we should all say, that the aggressors must not be allowed to retain the spoils of their aggression, that they must be condemned, and that they must compensate the victims of aggression. It is equally just and right that my delegation and many others should disagree with those who say, as none of us should say, that aggression must be condoned, that the aggressor must be rewarded, and that the victims of aggression must be made to pay.

124. Please permit me at this point to say something which is not a statement of defiance but a statement of fact. There is no doubt that any delegation present

would consider it impossible to come to this rostrum and agree to accept for its country the approach which some are recommending that we should adopt, according to which an aggressor would be allowed to occupy the territory of others and would not withdraw until it had exacted a price for that withdrawal. I defy any delegation to come up here and say that. Nor can anyone believe that a delegation would consider coming to this rostrum and accepting for its country and its people what has been meted out to the Arabs. The Arabs have been made responsible for Hitler's misdeeds; they have been made Hitler's whipping boy. They have been penalized for Hitler's misdeeds. People of Jewish extraction, who often came from lands which Hitler's hand had never reached, have been forced upon Arab lands, to the exclusion and expulsion of the lawful Arab inhabitants.

125. Israel, from the starting point through the moment when Mr. Eban assured us of Israel's disdain for whatever majority vote of the Assembly—even if 121—that would order it to withdraw from recently occupied territory, has gone on compounding and continues diligently to compound its contempt of the Assembly. There has been and continues to be the unfolding of the Zionorama picture—not a mere film but an ugly and most disturbing reality of life. Just look at the motley crowd, the misguided, the frightened, the Zionism-drugged, and their Uncle Sam, cajoling, arm-twisting, their ubiquitous, omnipresent Uncle Sam, with his steamroller, gold bag and all, leading the band. Just look and try in vain not to feel disdain. Just look and try not to see the abyss. What a far cry, what a sad retreat, what a dizzy descent the Johnson posture is from the wise and moral stance of Jefferson when he said, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

126. Playing its principal part, Israel in a few days destroyed more towns and villages and committed more savage acts all over the territories it invaded than the vandals of old committed in many a month. It took action, enacted so-called laws, and made statements relating especially to the West Bank of Jordan and to the Gaza Strip, indicating unequivocally its dreams of lingering forever and belying its pretence of intending to go away.

127. Naturally Israel feigns that it has no ambitions of territorial aggrandizement and that its retention of the territories which it has recently occupied is no more than transient. Yet let us have at least a sampling of the successive Israeli acts and statements in this connexion.

128. The New York Post published on 28 June the statement that "Israel wrested the Old City from Jordan during the Middle East war, and Government leaders have made clear they would not give it up." Mr. Eban stressed at a news conference at the United Nations on 1 July that Israel's policy remained the preservation of what he called the unity of Jerusalem. These are acrobatics of words. We have more and more of that as we go on.

129. The New York Times reported on 29 June that "the absorption of the Jordanian sector was carried out administratively, but in a carefully planned, paramilitary fashion".

130. The Israelis, even according to the journal called the Jewish Advocate of 29 June went further; that journal stated that "the Bank of Israel introduced Israeli currency as the only legal tender in the new areas of the United Jerusalem".

131. The Israelis, moreover, have emphasized that if they do not have their say about the future of the West Bank, they are, as reported in The New York Times of 30 June, "expected to hold at least the western part of this region". Even as late as yesterday and today, we have read and heard that the Israeli broadcast announcing that refugees from the Jordan River's West Bank would be permitted to return stipulated that they should return by 10 August and that no one who left after today would be allowed to return.

132. Are these acts and statements of logic in line with the Israeli pretence of not coveting any territorial aggrandizement? Or are these Israeli professions of good intent in this regard much rather flat lies and a sustained insult to this body, the General Assembly?

133. Yet hearing Mr. Eban speak today for the 150th time or so during this special session and launching a renewed attack against the United Arab Republic and its President, some might be inclined to believe actual history no more and to think that it was Egypt which committed an aggression against Israel in 1956 and not the other way around; and that the aggressor against Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic in 1967 was not Israel but some mysterious fiend for whom the Federal Bureau of Investigation or its equivalent must immediately start a search.

134. Let us look, even if it pains us, as it is bound to, at the double or triple number of Arab refugees in the recently invaded Arab lands. We read the following not from our own Arab reports, but from an Associated Press dispatch:

"Refugees who crossed the improvised foot-bridge on the wreckage of the Allenby Bridge started walking toward Amman. The representatives of their Government on the East Bank urged them to go back to and keep their homes, but Israeli soldiers guarding the bridge barred them."

135. On 26 June last, the Associated Press reported from Tel Aviv that the Israeli Defence Minister, Moshe Dayan, had made a statement to the effect that about 300,000 Palestinian inhabitants of Gaza might be transferred to camps in the occupied region west of the Jordan River. The Associated Press added that Dayan declared that he had already discussed this idea with officials of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. Dayan also declared that he believed that Israel should allow the inhabitants of Gaza to be deported in Israeli buses from Gaza, just as it did, step by step, with the refugees from the occupied regions of Jordan.

136. Let those, then, who believe or pretend to believe the fiction of Israel's insecurity ponder. Let them open their eyes and see not the fiction but the reality of Arab security being continuously threatened and many a time exploded by Israeli aggressions, the most salient examples of which happened in 1956 and last month in 1967.

137. Are all these happenings, all these enactments, all these statements, and all these acts of horror such that the Arabs can be expected to submit to them? Are they such that the United Nations, with its Charter in hand and its principles in mind and in heart, can be expected to put up with them?

138. Can the Arab countries and the Arab peoples all over North Africa and East Africa and a great part of West Africa really be expected meekly to accept such destruction of their own rights and their own selves? Can they be expected meekly to allow their communications facilities and the flow of the excellent and less-costly Arabian oil to countries whose Governments are supporting Israeli aggression? Can they again really be expected meekly to allow a large part of their sterling and dollar earnings to lie in the coffers and at the disposal of the banks of those countries, instead of channelling all these earnings out of these coffers, out of the reach of these banks, and into the healthy processes of Arab economic evolution—the projects and progress for all of which there is particularly ample scope within the frontiers of each and all of the Arab oil-producing countries?

139. On one condition, namely, respect for our rights, we the Arabs want our communications facilities to resume their role as the arteries of goodwill and of world as well as Arab prosperity. We want our oil to flow to as many countries as possible. We want it to help in creating more and more of the good things of life for as many people as possible. We want not only to co-operate, as we have done before, in the maintenance of world peace and prosperity, but to foster and redouble this co-operation. On only one condition: respect for our rights.

140. For those reasons and for many other good reasons, my delegation trusts that the vote of this Assembly will uphold the principles of the Charter and will heed the call of justice and of foresight.

141. The PRESIDENT: In view of the fact that the statement which has just been made was not strictly an explanation of vote, if any other representative wishes to speak at this stage I shall be pleased to call upon him. Since no other representative wishes to speak, the representative of the United Arab Republic was the last speaker before the voting.

142. The General Assembly will now consider the request made by the representative of Yugoslavia that priority should be given to the draft resolution in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1. As I understand it, that is a formal request before the Assembly. If no representative wishes to speak on this point, and if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the request of the representative of Yugoslavia.

It was so decided.

143. The PRESIDENT: At this stage, for the reasons that I have explained to the Assembly in connexion with other draft resolutions, I call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/L.527/Rev.1.

144. Mr. PIRZADA (Pakistan): I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Members of the Assembly for acceding to our request to be permitted to intro-

duce at this stage, on behalf of the delegations of Guinea, Iran, Mali, Niger, Turkey and my own delegation, the draft resolution contained in document A/L.527/Rev.1. The draft resolution reads:

"The General Assembly,

"Deeply concerned at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City,

- "1. Considers that these measures are invalid;
- "2. Calls upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem;
- "3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on the situation and the implementation of the present resolution not later than one week from its adoption."

145. The Assembly will appreciate that the draft resolution is self-explanatory. The Holy City of Jerusalem commands the deepest spiritual allegiance of millions of people in all continents. Its fate during and since the recent hostilities has, therefore, caused the deepest anguish in the Islamic and Christian worlds and among the more responsible elements of Judaism. It is a matter of satisfaction that, both in the Assembly and outside, His Holiness the Pope, the Heads of States and Governments, and the Foreign Ministers of many Member States have expressed their deep concern at Israel's unilateral action. The draft resolution seeks nothing more than to make this concern effective.

146. We note the provision regarding the Holy City in the draft resolution sponsored by the Latin American countries. Paragraph 4 of this text, however, provides only for the consideration of the status of Jerusalem at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. This would have the effect meanwhile of permitting Israel's illegal action to continue and be consolidated. Considering the paramount importance attached to the question by the faithful of the great world religions, it is obviously not desirable that the Assembly should rest content with a passive role.

147. I would appeal to the General Assembly not to entertain the comforting illusion that Israel's action to alter the status of Jerusalem does not amount to annexation. Some misleading statements to this effect have been made by Israel's leaders. Mr. Eban was reported as having said that he would choose his own vocabulary to describe Israel's action. The matter is too serious to be only a question of vocabulary or a play of words. Any so-called municipal or administrative action, accompanied by such measures as census-taking, the demolition of habitations, the imposition of Israeli currency, etc., has the same effect as a constitutional action in consolidating physical seizure and possession. No amount of hairsplitting can possibly delude world opinion, which is gravely agitated on this issue.

148. Current developments, of which the Assembly is aware, and in particular the strident defiance and stentorian harangue to which the Assembly was subjected earlier today by Mr. Eban, make the adoption of our draft resolution a matter of the greatest urgency.

149. The question of Jerusalem goes far beyond any clash of State interests or conflict of ideologies. It unites people of four continents and many faiths. It is our earnest belief, therefore, that the Assembly will adopt our draft resolution.

150. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has decided to give priority to draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1. However, before the voting begins, I should like to inform Members that I intend to put the proposals to the vote in the following order: First, the amendments contained in document A/L.525; second, the amendment contained in document A/L.524; third, draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1; fourth, draft resolution A/L.519; fifth, draft resolution A/L.520; sixth, draft resolution A/L.521; seventh, draft resolution A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2; eighth, draft resolution A/L.526 and Add.1-3; and ninth, draft resolution A/L.527/Rev.1.

151. It is understood that representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote will be heard after voting has been completed on all the draft resolutions and amendments.

152. Is there any objection to the procedure of voting that I have put before the Assembly? If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly wishes to proceed in the way I have suggested.

It was so decided.

153. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to vote on all the draft resolutions and amendments before the General Assembly. I understand that a roll-call vote has been requested on all the proposals except draft resolution A/L.526 and Add.1-3.

154. Before we proceed to the voting, I would ask the Under-Secretary, Mr. Narasimhan, to explain the voting procedure.

155. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs): In respect of the roll-call votes that are to be taken now in the General Assembly, may I request representatives to be kind enough, at the same time as they call out their votes when their names are called, and not before, to press the corresponding button in the small panels on their desks: the green button at the extreme left for "Yes", the red button at the extreme right for "No", and the amber button in the centre for "Abstention".

156. The PRESIDENT: Amendments to draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1 have been submitted by Albania [A/L.524] and by Cuba [A/L.525]. We shall first vote on the amendments. According to rule 92 of the rules of procedure:

"When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal, the General Assembly shall first vote on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal and then on the amendment next furthest removed therefrom, and so on".

157. I therefore put to the vote the amendments proposed by the delegation of Cuba in document A/L.525. Although that document contains two amendments, I understand that the delegations of Cuba does not insist that a vote be taken on the second amendment. I therefore now put to the vote the first amendment proposed by Cuba in document A/L.525.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana.

Abstaining: Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), France, Gabon, Guinea.

The amendment was rejected by 78 votes to 20, with 22 abstentions.

158. The PRESIDENT: Next I put to the vote the amendment contained in document A/L.524, submitted by Albania.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Morocco, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first:

In favour: Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico.

Abstaining: Nepal, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Burma, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran.

The amendment was rejected by 66 votes to 32, with 22 abstentions.

159. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to a vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1, I call on the representative of Albania to speak on a point of order.

160. Mr. BUDO (Albania) (translated from French): When we expressed our views yesterday [1545th meeting] on draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1, we laid some stress on our reservations regarding paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. In view of our delegation's position, we should like to ask for separate votes on the operative paragraphs, that is to say, that we should vote first on paragraph 1, and then on paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

161. The PRESIDENT: Members have heard the request of the representative of Albania for separate votes. Two delegations may speak in favour of that request, and two against.

162. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): If it was ever wrong to vote separately on a proposal, this is the time. Every one of the proposals before the Assembly has been carefully worked out and every word and sentence weighed.

163. If, for instance, the Latin American proposal [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2] were taken separately, the balance which our delegation sought to maintain in presenting it to the General Assembly would be lost. Were we to vote separately on the various parts of the resolution now before us, we might also be making the serious mistake of altering and distorting the intentions of those who submitted it.

164. With all due respect, my delegation opposes the motion put forward by the representative of Albania.

165. The PRESIDENT: One delegation has spoken in opposition to the motion which has been made by the representative of Albania. Does any representative wish to speak in favour of the motion? It appears that that is not the case. Does any representative wish to second the statement of the representative of Costa Rica in opposition?

166. As that is not the case, I shall put to the vote the motion of the representative of Albania.

The motion was rejected by 83 votes to 12, with 22 abstentions.

167. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Saudi Arabia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of

Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania.

Against: Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines.

Abstaining: Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Upper Volta, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Finland, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Laos, Malta, Nepal,^{2/} Niger, Portugal, Rwanda.

The result of the vote was 53 in favour and 46 against, with 20 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

168. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution which has been submitted by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.519]. Separate votes have been requested on each of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution.

169. I now put to the vote in their entirety the preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/L.519.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Italy, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq.

Against: Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada,

Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel.

Abstaining: Kenya, Laos, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, France, Gabon, Iran.

The preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution were rejected by 57 votes to 36, with 24 abstentions.

170. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/L.519.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Saudi Arabia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland.

Against: Sierra Leone, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda.

Abstaining: Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, France, Gabon, Iran, Kenya, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Romania.

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was rejected by 57 votes to 36, with 23 abstentions.

171. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/L.519.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Syria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mon-

^{2/} The delegation of Nepal subsequently informed the Secretary-General that it wished to be recorded as having been in favour in the vote on the draft resolution.

golia, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,^{3/} Somalia, Sudan.

Against: Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sweden.

Abstaining: Thailand, Turkey, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Finland, France, Gabon, Iran, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was rejected by 48 votes to 45, with 22 abstentions.

172. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/L.519.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados.

Abstaining: Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, France, Gabon, Greece, Iran, Kenya, Laos, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Zambia.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was rejected by 54 votes to 34, with 28 abstentions.

173. The PRESIDENT: We will now proceed to a roll-call vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/L.519.

^{3/} In a letter dated 5 July 1967 addressed to the Secretary-General the representative of Senegal asked that his vote should be recorded as abstaining.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

El Salvador, having been drawn by lot by the President was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Against: El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Abstaining: France, Gabon, Greece, Iran, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus.

Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was rejected by 54 votes to 36, with 26 abstentions.

174. The PRESIDENT: Since no part of the draft resolution [A/L.519] has been adopted, there is no need to take a vote on it as a whole.

175. We turn now to the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America [A/L.520]. I have been informed that the United States is not pressing for a vote on its draft resolution.

176. I therefore now put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Albania [A/L.521].

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Uganda, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria.

Against: Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran,

Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey.

Abstaining: United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), France, Gabon, Guinea, Kenya, Laos, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Tunisia.

The draft resolution was rejected by 71 votes to 22, with 27 abstentions.

177. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the draft resolution submitted by several Members in document A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2, as revised by the sponsors. As the representative of Trinidad and Tobago announced earlier [para. 58], operative paragraph 1 (a) reads as follows in the revised text:

"(a) Israel to withdraw all its forces from all the territories occupied by it as a result of the recent conflict;"

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay.

Against: Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan.

Abstaining: Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Burma, Cambodia, France, Gabon, Greece, Iran, Israel, Kenya, Laos, Malta, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria.

The result of the vote was 57 in favour and 43 against, with 20 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

178. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by several members and contained in document A/L.526 and Add.1-3.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Luxembourg, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Syria, Cuba.

The draft resolution was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

179. The PRESIDENT: The resolution which has just been adopted by the General Assembly expresses in the clearest and most explicit fashion the concern of the Assembly for the humanitarian aspects of the situation in the Middle East. Therefore, I hope that Members will consider it appropriate if, at this point in our proceedings, I again make a very brief reference to the situation of the refugees and the civilian population, a situation to which I referred in my statement here on the afternoon of 26 June [1536th meeting].

180. I believe that we are all aware that in the last few days a very considerable number of Governments, private organizations and agencies, as well as individual citizens in many countries, have come forward to offer financial or material contributions to help to alleviate the condition of the homeless and the wounded. The situation remains and will remain critical, for the need far exceeds the means available. A vastly greater effort and a much wider response are required. Nevertheless, I feel that it is only appropriate to record here a profound expression of gratitude to all those Governments and private individuals alike who, seeing the need and understanding the urgency, have contributed generously and promptly.

181. Finally, I put to the vote draft resolution A/L.527/Rev.1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Finland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Gabon, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Malta, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Barbados, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey.

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

182. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has now voted on all the proposals that were before it. Some delegations wish to explain their votes after the voting. There are, up to now, sixteen such delegations on the list. After listening to those explanations of vote, we shall have to deal with the report of the Credentials Committee, and I expect that there will be delegations that will wish to speak on that item too. Therefore, if it is agreeable to Members of the Assembly, I suggest that we adjourn this meeting and schedule a meeting for tomorrow afternoon, when we shall proceed to complete our work.

183. Since I hear no objection, this meeting is adjourned until 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The meeting rose at 8.05 p.m.