

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Official Records



**1549th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 5 July 1967,  
at 3.00 p.m.

**FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION**

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

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

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

## AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker in explanation of vote after the voting, I should like, with the permission of the Assembly, to make a statement.

2. The General Assembly, having convened in an emergency session to deal with the threat to peace and security of the Middle East crisis, owes it to the peoples of the world to place this session in a realistic framework and perspective. The question before the Assembly has, with all its ramifications, never been a Council case or an Assembly case, but the problem of the United Nations as a whole. The deliberations, therefore, cannot be divorced from the larger United Nations picture in which this problem has been framed for the past nineteen years.

3. The Organization at present is confronted with a state of war in the region, and again there arises in the minds of all peoples everywhere the anxious question of what the United Nations can do to stop the new threat from expanding into a greater danger to peace than heretofore. If you will permit me to say so, what the United Nations is doing, and can and will do, must be measured by the totality of the efforts by all of its organs, which are all interrelated and interlocked in one complex whole.

4. When the war broke out, the Security Council—even on the first intimations of the conflict—at once engaged in a series of meetings. Other United Nations organs, under the direction of the Secretary-General, have risen to the challenge of the emergency. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency's prompt efforts in rapidly mobilizing the forces of relief to the stricken civilian population, and the help provided by other United Nations agencies and specialized agencies, merit admiration for the efficiency and dedication they have manifested, in this human crisis, in alleviating suffering and, in so doing, contributing greatly to the reduction of dangerous emotions and tensions.

5. The difference of views among the Members should not give heart—in any way whatsoever, I might add—to those sceptics and critics who may all too readily find a dubious consolation in the inconclusive battle of the resolutions.

6. Nothing could be more wrong than this cynical and wholly distorted concept of how the United Nations achieves its aims and fulfils its destiny. Let me state that the United Nations long ago, with the maturing of its political evolution, abandoned the resolution as a fetish of international organization. Adopted resolutions, we have learned from experience, do not always imply the inevitability of action. On the other hand, failure to achieve a resolution does not always imply a political vacuum. We have seen this reflected with political realism in the tendency in a number of organs of the United Nations to abandon, when desirable, formal resolutions in favour of tacit, implied and informal consensus. Indeed, we even hailed this tendency recently in the Security Council [1366th meeting] where progress was possible when it might have been hampered by a formal and conventional resolution.

7. Viewed in this truer focus, the current emergency special session has made some important contributions to the cause of peace in the Middle East. Indeed, this session has laid down principles and guidelines which, if properly pursued, may terminate the long period of delay in bringing the unfinished business in the Middle East to a peaceful solution.

8. With virtual unanimity, Heads of State, Heads of Government, Foreign Ministers and Permanent Representatives have agreed that the crisis merits the attention of all Member States in every part of the world, and indeed requires the full participation of all Members in the earnest labours to achieve results. That wide agreement has shown that the Member States have risen to the challenge. They have agreed that the problem is no longer a limited confrontation of two parties, but an issue of regional dimensions which threatens to spread to other areas and other major political alignments. They have accurately taken the measure of this crisis. They have also made important contributions to a proper diagnosis of the illness.

9. They have agreed that the time has come when peace in the Middle East must be made, finally and for all time. This is a very radical departure from the nineteen-year period of hope that time, and time alone, will heal, without the benefit of the doctor; and, concomitantly with this, they have agreed that the long-deferred problem of the refugees likewise must be brought to a final solution, both as a humanitarian and as a political problem.

10. There has been a broad consensus that the effort to achieve final peace and final solutions to this prob-

lem can be hoped for only within the framework of the United Nations.

11. Finally, there is virtual unanimity in upholding the principle that conquest of territory by war is inadmissible in our time and under the Charter. The affirmation of this principle was made in virtually all statements and—I should add with some emphasis—by none more emphatically than all of the big Powers, which bear the primary responsibility in the United Nations for the peace and security of the world. In this sense, virtually all speakers laid down the corollary that withdrawal of forces to their original position is expected.

12. What they have not agreed upon is a procedure and the sequence by which this principle should be implemented. But in this divergency, the high principles which must endure the passage of time as the test of a moral peace have not suffered. On the contrary, they have been affirmed and zealously reaffirmed in a new dedication to this historic fundamental principle of the Charter.

13. There was in addition a broad consensus that the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of States allow them a rightful freedom from threat of belligerency.

14. The speakers have also touched upon the principles of all the legal, political and humanitarian aspects and problems involved in the situation, and have placed on record their points and their positions.

15. The Assembly has adopted a resolution [2253 (ES-V)] rejecting any measure to annex the Old City of Jerusalem. It has also adopted a broad-based resolution [2252 (ES-V)] opening wider the doors to the United Nations humanitarian projects, giving the tragic victims of the war a feeling that they have the concerned world Organization at their side in this hour of their trial to alleviate their sufferings and to bring their ordeal to the quickest possible end.

16. However, the bandages to bind their wounds and the nourishment to stay their hunger will not and cannot be enough. Theirs is a greater hunger than the hunger of the body. They know, better than any other peoples, that man cannot live by bread alone. Indeed, he cannot live at all if he cannot live in peace—or at least in a reasonable hope for peace. Their greater hunger is for peace, and peace is not peace if it is not just, honourable and lasting. And that hope, I believe, this session has given them—if, on the basis of the common denominator here enunciated, new efforts are made to find a programme of action in which the small differences can be resolved and the broad agreements expanded. This is what the refugees expect, and this is what it is our duty to give, if all of us are not to become the wandering refugees of a possibly destroyed world.

17. Thus the deliberations of this emergency special session have not been in vain. Many minds have been brought to bear upon a great catastrophe, elucidating the nature of this problem before the whole world in open debate, in open commitments. It has brought together for the first time in a long while the two leaders of the world's two major Powers in an exchange of views, which, at its minimum, assures us of their resolve to maintain open the channels of

consultation. Furthermore, in accordance with the hope I expressed in my opening statement [1525th meeting] for such meetings on the broadest level of all the major problems of peace, they dealt not only with the Middle East, but with other issues as well. The mere fact of their meeting was considered useful. Their eyes were focused on the United Nations, whose impulse and spirit was the means of their coming together. If indeed the results were useful, then certainly it would not be reasonable to fail to pursue so desirable an initiative.

18. Finally, this session again has demonstrated to the whole world that, as in 1956, the United Nations can rise promptly to safeguard the peace, even in the most precipitous emergency, and that when all other hope is gone the United Nations is there. It has been said that the United Nations is the last hope of peace. It is when men, gambling with other ways, make it the last. When the time comes that men realize—as they realized in 1945—that there is no substitute for a total approach to the problems of peace, they will make it the first hope of mankind.

19. I have not made this statement as a summing up or as an expression of a consensus of the Assembly. I have made it because I felt it my duty to do so. We owe it to the peoples of the world to let them know clearly that this emergency special session has not been in vain. And it is my strong hope that, even at the eleventh hour, we shall be able to grasp the very serious moments that we might have at our disposal and use them to bring about something that we may be able to refer to as a fruitful result, in the interest of peace and in the interest of this Organization.

20. I shall now call on representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote after the voting.

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

21. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan): When I first addressed this Assembly, on 21 June last [1530th meeting] I said that the Assembly was sitting in judgement on one of its Members on a charge of aggression, and that the United Nations should condemn that aggression in no uncertain terms. I then expressed the hope that the usurpation of Arab territories by Israel would be remedied by and through the United Nations. We were convinced that the principles and precedents of this Organization clearly indicated the course of action that ought to be taken and, at the same time, we warned against the danger that some of the great Powers would endeavour to subdue the will of the Assembly and distort its actions in the service of their own designs. We have now witnessed our worst fears coming to pass.

22. What did the Arabs ask of the United Nations? They asked only for justice. They asked that the United Nations should be true to its Charter. They asked that the aggressors should not be allowed to use their aggression to sustain their claims for territory that did not belong to them. They asked that no right should be asserted as a result of military action. That was all that the Arabs asked. And they endeavoured, in co-operation with other Members of this Organization, to achieve those objectives. But, right from the begin-

ning, they were met with obstructions. First, there were the announcements from this rostrum that it was futile to try to apportion the blame, which meant, in other words, that the aggressor was to be equated with the victim of aggression. That was the first abandonment of principle.

23. Then there was the call to be "realistic" and "practical". That was the position of those who claimed that they did not condone the Israeli aggression but were convinced that the Israeli withdrawal would not be achieved unless the Arabs accepted the terms that Israel dictated. That was the second compromise.

24. Then there were the "peace-makers"—those who proclaimed their concern for the future of all States in the Middle East and maintained that unless the Israelis were given assurances about their future, their military gains should not be challenged. That was the final betrayal.

25. Those positions were formulated in the draft resolution submitted to this Assembly in document A/L.523/Rev.1.

26. We voted against that draft resolution because it did not acknowledge the elementary principle that the withdrawal of the aggressor ought to precede any action or negotiation or conciliation. My delegation, and indeed all the Arab delegations, had spared no effort in trying to come to an agreement with other Members of this Organization, before the Assembly came to a decision. We indicated to the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries [A/L.523/Rev.3 and Corr.1] our readiness to accept their position and endorse their draft—although it did not explicitly condemn the Israeli aggression—if by so doing we could convince the other groups that we were genuinely seeking a solution. We were ready to concede that the Security Council might at any time discuss the legal, political and humanitarian problems of the area without stating that such action on the part of the Security Council should be after withdrawal—as surely it should be. We accepted a specific reference to Articles 2 and 33 of the Charter in the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries as an indication of our adherence to the principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

27. What we could not do was to concede that the United Nations should not pronounce itself on the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territory as a necessary prerequisite to any settlement. On this there could not be—and there will never be—any compromise or concession, and on this the United Nations failed.

28. Mr. President, I am extremely sorry to have to disagree with the theme which emerged from your brilliant statement at the beginning of this meeting. I do so with a heavy heart, but I cannot believe that the United Nations will live up to its principles if it does not defend the Charter, indeed defend its very being, by implementing the principle that no aggressor should benefit from the fruits of his aggression and that withdrawal should precede everything else. The failure to do that has made my delegation and all the Arab delegations seriously ponder their position as Members of this Organization.

29. We have witnessed during this emergency special session the symptoms of the malady that led to the demise of the League of Nations. Those symptoms, if unchecked, will surely lead to the extinction of the United Nations. It is instructive to note that, as far back as 1938, the League of Nations had become for all intents and purposes defunct—I repeat, defunct—though it continued to exist in law for quite some time. If this should happen to the United Nations, we should be in no doubt where the responsibility would lie. It would lie with those who have eroded the principles of this Organization. It would lie with the manipulators who exert pressure on its Members to betray its Charter. It would lie with those who cajole and coerce, with those who ought to be the defenders of justice because they are endowed with power so to act.

30. The responsibility for the failure of this lofty edifice to sustain its Charter lies with some of the great Powers. When we reach that stage of final failure, as we must if this trend continues, the danger of a war of annihilation will be so much nearer. The danger of war will be nearer because the United Nations, which is supposed to save mankind from the scourge of war, can only function if it is not used as an arm and a tool of power by some of its powerful Members. When this happens, humanity will have lost all hope because there can be no other organization to replace this one. The great Powers will then be the losers because the shield will have been withdrawn and the loser will have no other recourse.

31. When we mourn the fate of the United Nations, when we predict its extinction; we do so with a heavy heart. For this is the edifice that embodied the hopes and aspirations of all humanity.

32. The Charter of the United Nations, which we are pledged to support, now lies in ruins, ravaged by those mighty nations which ought to have been its main supporters. To this, history will bear witness, as we, the smaller nations, now bear witness.

33. When the catastrophe overwhelms us, the smaller nations will not lose a great deal. We do not have much to lose. We shall be reduced in equal measure to the state of utter ruin that those who trade in ruin will bring upon the world. This fate, the extinction of all culture and civilization, we are not able to contemplate with equanimity. If all we can do is to sound the warning, it is our duty to sound the warning.

34. In this situation, in this hour of disillusionment, we can still state that the principles which the United Nations was supposed to uphold, and which it has now abandoned, will remain alive in our hearts and will sustain our action. If the United Nations has failed, the values of morality, right, freedom and justice will survive. This is our hope and our firm belief.

35. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden): In speaking in explanation of the votes cast by the Swedish delegation, may I first be allowed to recall that in our intervention in the general debate we said that:

"... a fundamental reason why the situation in the Middle East has become so serious and more than once erupted into violence, is that obligations undertaken under the Charter of the United Nations have

not been fulfilled. According to these obligations, Member States shall respect each other's independence, not to speak of each other's right to exist. They shall settle their disputes by peaceful means, they shall refrain from threats of the use of force and the use of force, and they shall live together in peace as good neighbours. To cite these provisions is to illustrate clearly what has gone wrong in the Middle East." [1533rd meeting, para. 90.]

At the same time, we affirmed "our adherence to the principles that no right to occupy and no right to annex territory can be based on military conquest. Troops that are stationed on foreign territory as a result of military action must be withdrawn." [*Ibid.*, para. 92.]

36. We did not feel that the General Assembly had to act as judge and had to weigh the guilt and responsibility of those who were involved in the conflict. Finally, we said that our Organization should in some form declare itself ready to assist in the working out of practical arrangements that could assure peace in the area.

37. Nothing that has happened since then has changed this position. On the contrary, developments have reinforced our conviction that only a short resolution covering the very essentials would, on the one hand, be acceptable to the General Assembly and, on the other hand, form a suitable and workable basis for a serious search for solutions of the grave and urgent problems pertaining to the area. Attempts to formulate more precise requests or injunctions directed to the parties could not succeed, in our view.

38. Furthermore, we have found it questionable whether any resolution which was vehemently opposed by one or other of the parties as detrimental to their vital interests would realistically serve the desired purpose of leading to more peaceful conditions. I do not thereby mean to say that a resolution necessarily has to be acceptable or satisfactory to all the parties. What we should look for is a result which, in our best judgement, serves the basic purposes of the Organization, which are to maintain international peace and security in the interests of all of us.

39. It was in the light of those considerations that the Swedish delegation cast its votes on the draft resolutions so far presented. Let me here register the deep satisfaction of my delegation at the support given to the resolution adopted on humanitarian assistance [2252 (ES-V)].

40. I am instructed to say that the Swedish Government is deeply disturbed about the situation in which the General Assembly now finds itself. We do not think that it is in the interests of the United Nations that this session should be adjourned without some resolution, consensus or action of some other kind on the main matter before it, provided, of course, that such a result has broad and authoritative support. Nor could this be in the true interests of the parties concerned. We feel that the world has a right to expect some contribution by the General Assembly to the establishment of peace with justice in the Middle East.

41. We learned from the voting that took place yesterday that although there is broad agreement on the principles that are to form the basis for attempts to establish peace with justice in the area, it had not been possible to formulate and to combine them in a meaningful and constructive manner. At the same time, the principles themselves are well known. A confirmation of or a reference to the relevant Articles of the Charter might be advisable, combined, perhaps, with a formal decision to forward the records of this session to the Security Council.

42. If a further attempt is made to arrive at a draft resolution, it is our feeling that amongst the main substantive provisions might be an endorsement of the cease-fire with a statement urging the parties to observe it scrupulously and an authorization for the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative who will be in contact with the parties with respect to all problems pertaining to the area. This is, in our view, the least that the United Nations can do to assist in bringing about practical arrangements that can assure peaceful conditions in the area. It would then, of course, be for the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council, on the basis of the observations of his special representative. I need not recall that the Security Council is already seized of the total issue of the situation in the Middle East. May I add that it is our feeling that if the will is there, only a very short time will be required to give it concrete expression in a text. If there is no will, the only result of new, prolonged debates might be further frustration.

43. In conclusion, may I say this. For the Swedish Government the overriding consideration is the necessity of establishing peaceful conditions in the Middle East with respect for the rights of all countries, peace with justice. We still believe that the United Nations has a useful and necessary role to play in this task.

44. Mr. VINCI (Italy): In my explanation of vote, I shall concentrate on some of the draft resolutions on which we cast our vote yesterday.

45. My delegation voted against the draft resolution contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1, sponsored by seventeen non-aligned countries. We supported and we voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.523/Rev.1 which was sponsored by twenty Latin American countries. I should like now to explain the vote of my delegation on these two draft resolutions.

46. I would begin by stressing once more our deep sorrow, our heartfelt regret, at seeing an area of the world, of the Mediterranean world to which we are bound by so many strong and ancient ties, stirred by war not less than three times in twenty years; at seeing peoples towards whom we have old and sincere feelings of friendship becoming again the innocent victims of war; at seeing the land of the Holy Places, which are cherished and venerated by hundreds of millions belonging to three great religions and which should therefore inspire all-round thoughts of peace, become a field of war, death, and destruction.

47. No less regrettable, in our view, is the fact that since both draft resolutions, the non-aligned and the Latin American, failed to obtain the required majority,



we find ourselves after two weeks of debate empty-handed except for the resolution adopted on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V)] and the humanitarian resolution [2252 (ES-V)] with its charitable intent to alleviate the suffering of a great number of civilians and prisoners of war.

48. What we needed most has not come out of our deliberations: a word of peace, as the President of the General Assembly has just suggested to us, which would carry sufficient strength, both political and moral, so as to give to the United Nations and its organs the necessary authority to perform the task entrusted to them by the Charter which all Member States, in signing it, have freely undertaken to observe and implement.

49. To have been right is not always an enviable position, especially when subsequent events prove that it was easy to be a prophet. This is the case with regard to the convening of the present emergency special session. We felt, and said so, that with feelings running high, as they were and still are, with the lack of adequate preparation for an emergency session, with a series of ways and means still to be explored in order to bring about a settlement, there was a risk: a risk of weakening rather than strengthening the prestige and authority of the United Nations. We thought that it would be dangerous to have the United Nations appear impotent to tackle the problem before it, impotent to cope with a situation of crisis, impotent to bring about that settlement which it is bound to seek and indeed to bring about under the Charter.

50. Nevertheless, if we consented to the convening of this emergency special session, we did so in order not to leave any stone unturned in our anxious search for peaceful solutions. My delegation came to this session determined to do its best so that the General Assembly could help achieve a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, or at least to lay the foundation for appropriate action to that end. I would like to quote what the Prime Minister of Italy, Mr. Aldo Moro, said in this forum on 21 June 1967:

"The Italian Government pledges itself today to strive for the solution of the problems which still confront the Middle East and which indeed have become more acute; and it intends, through both multilateral and bilateral channels, to lend its determined and concrete co-operation for the progress of a region which is so burdened with difficult human, economic and political problems and whose peaceful development is so important for the peace of the Mediterranean and of the world." [1530th meeting, para. 128.]

51. The two draft resolutions we voted upon yesterday, the non-aligned and the Latin American, had, I believe, one common purpose: to seek a peaceful solution of the crisis with which we are confronted. I would certainly not deny that the sponsors of the non-aligned draft resolution were prompted both by a spirit of goodwill and by the justified desire to restate some basic principles which as the result of war are too often forgotten. I also gladly acknowledge the increasing efforts the seventeen co-sponsors made up to the last minute in order to meet the views of other delegations, including my own, and to try to attract wider support. I can only regret that some

moves came too late and were not brought to more logical and constructive conclusions.

52. In that connexion, I wish to make it perfectly clear that the vote cast by the Italian delegation on the non-aligned draft resolution was motivated by the support it intended to give to the Latin American draft resolution. That was not only because of our close and friendly relations with the countries of the Western Hemisphere, but also because of our sincere belief that, as the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, Mr. Solomon, stated in introducing the proposal, Latin America is not directly involved and can therefore be truly objective.

53. We felt, and we still feel, that the Latin American draft resolution was not less decisive than the non-aligned proposal on the question of withdrawal of the Israeli forces. As a matter of fact, the first paragraph urgently requests Israel to withdraw all its forces from all the territories occupied as a result of the recent conflict. We considered, furthermore, the Latin American draft resolution more comprehensive and constructive on other important problems of the area, namely, the questions of the refugees, navigation, and Jerusalem.

54. At this point I should like to dispel any interpretation—or rather, misinterpretation—which might be lent to the abstention of my delegation from voting on the Pakistani draft resolution [A/L.527/Rev.1]. I wish to make it quite clear that the Italian Government shares the spirit of that draft resolution and is against any unilateral measures affecting the status of Jerusalem. The reasons for my delegation's abstention, therefore, have nothing to do with the purposes of the Pakistani draft resolution, which are our own. Our reservations concern the text, as we have some doubts about its efficacy and its conformity with the Charter and the powers of the General Assembly.

55. Finally, in voting for the Latin American draft resolution, our understanding of the main provisions, including the fourth and last operative paragraph concerning Jerusalem, was that they implied the invalidation of the Israeli measures following the withdrawal of armed forces, and reserved a final decision about Jerusalem for the General Assembly at its twenty-second session.

56. As the Prime Minister of Italy stated in the general debate, "Jerusalem should not be a cause of division but a centre of high spiritual value" [1530th meeting, para. 134]. That has been the position of Italy since the beginning of the Middle Eastern crisis. It is the position of my Government now.

57. Coming back to the Latin American draft resolution, our preference for it was motivated by other reasons. It laid down other important principles—reflecting some main provisions of the Charter, such as those contained in Articles 1 and 2—establishing the right to existence and the territorial integrity of the State of Israel and the Arab States. Furthermore, the Latin American proposal offered a better basis for the needs of innovation and the development of the Arab countries. Italy has always shown a sincere understanding of the expectations of the Arab populations. My country, which maintains long-standing links of confidence and friendship with the Arab

world, is determined to take an active part, as it has in past years, in the solution of the problems of the area and to co-operate fully in the development of those countries.

58. In this connexion I should like to say that the Italian delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/L.526 and Add.1-3] introduced by the representative of Sweden, Mr. Åström, is particularly glad that it was adopted by a virtually unanimous vote of the General Assembly. My Government has already provided first-aid by means of shipments of medical and food supplies, has submitted a proposal to the European Common Market, and is ready to contribute further to the alleviation of this vast human problem. Following the important statement which the President of the General Assembly has just made, I should like to draw the conclusion, from the result of the vote on this humanitarian resolution, that if our Assembly can find moral unanimity when the sufferings of our fellow men are at stake, there is no reason why we cannot do the same when we deal with the vital problem of war and peace.

59. This is not, of course, the moment to enter here into the substance of the controversy. We know that its implications are far-reaching and deeply felt, and that they touch upon both vital interests and strong ideas and sentiments. We think, nevertheless, that in this context also goodwill is an indispensable element towards any solution; indeed, it is a prerequisite. I fully agree on this point with the representative of Sweden, Mr. Åström, who spoke just before me. It is not our intention at this moment to put blame on one party or another, but we cannot help feeling that if something had been done in the past to alleviate tensions or specific problems, much suffering by innocent people could have been avoided at this time. Even if no final solutions to the over-all problems had followed, at least we should have achieved this first result.

60. The emergency special session has been unable to produce a resolution, a proposal for a solution to the current Middle East crisis. We sincerely hope that before the session ends a further and greater effort may still be made in order to show that the United Nations can still perform a useful task in securing the conditions of peace and security in the Middle East for which we all yearn. I would stress that peace is also the precondition for that orderly economic development of which all countries of the region are so urgently and desperately in need and which cannot be undertaken outside the framework of over-all stability. We wish to assure all these countries that no other purpose has moved us than that of acting realistically on the lines of our deep and ancient friendship and of co-operating in a disinterested manner towards peace and the development of the whole important Middle Eastern area.

61. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): The results of yesterday's voting might well allow the Colombian delegation to state that it was not making any mistake when, on 16 June of this year, it said, in a note addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, that the Colombian Government felt that there was good reason to fear that in the present circumstances the convening of the Assembly,

instead of making it easier to find solutions that will safeguard peace in the Middle East, might increase and spread international tension.

62. We do not think that the Assembly has made any progress towards solutions, for, as was foreseeable in the heated diplomatic battle, no draft resolution of substance was able to gain a two-thirds majority in the votes.

63. Now, either because that is what the Assembly has decided or by the simple force of circumstances, the crisis in the Middle East will once again become one of the concerns of the Security Council. This fact points up the incontrovertible fact that that body has lost fifteen precious days, during which it could have adopted effective measures to supplement the cease-fire between Israel, on the one hand, and Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic on the other.

64. As I had occasion to state when I spoke before this sovereign Assembly on 27 June, Colombia considered that "the paths of understanding do not run along extreme lines, but are to be found in the middle line of law, reason and justice" [1538th meeting].

65. Simply to call for the withdrawal of Israel's troops, as did the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union, Albania and Yugoslavia [A/L.519, L.521 and L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1], leaving the germ of belligerency alive and active, would of necessity lead to a recurrence of the crisis, just as would the fact of the Israel troops remaining indefinitely in the territories of Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic once the state of belligerency is ended. What is needed is simultaneous action, which will have to be taken sooner or later in order to attain the objective of a lasting peace. Let there be no fear that simultaneous action might favour any given country. In our opinion, both actions should be carried out at once and in full.

66. And, just as the withdrawal of the Israel troops and the ending of the state of belligerency between the States of the Middle East are indivisible, so should the case of Jerusalem be studied in the light of the entire problem as a whole. It is not easy to settle the legal status of the city of Jerusalem without considering all the other determining factors of the crisis.

67. Colombia abstained in the vote on the Pakistan draft resolution on Jerusalem [A/L.527/Rev.1], not because it has any doubts about the legal invalidity of the unilateral acts that may have occurred there, but because it understands that the situation in the Middle East cannot be settled by partial agreements; it requires a general agreement that will create the essential conditions to bring peace and harmony between Israel and its neighbours.

68. My country, the vast majority of whose population are Catholic, feels spiritually linked to the destiny of the Holy Places and would like the city of Jerusalem to be converted into an invulnerable objective, would like the whole world to respect it and the faithful of all the religions that are venerated there to have free access to it.

69. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): I should like to explain briefly the votes cast by my delegation on the draft resolutions that were before the Assembly.

70. First of all, I wish to express our gratitude to the sponsors of the draft resolutions, who spared no effort to help bring about a possible solution to the problems arising from the crisis in the Middle East.

71. My delegation co-sponsored draft resolution A/L.526 and Add.1-3, calling for urgent assistance and relief to the victims of the hostilities in the Near East. We consider this a matter of immediate importance and a humanitarian duty of the Assembly. We hope that the overwhelming endorsement given to this draft resolution by the General Assembly will contribute to bringing speedy and effective assistance to all inhabitants of the area who have suffered so much from the hostilities.

72. My delegation also voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.527/Rev.1, submitted by the delegation of Pakistan and others, on the question of the future status of Jerusalem. In this connexion, I wish to state that my Government attaches great importance to a satisfactory solution of the problem of free access to the Holy Places in Jerusalem. We consider that a solution along the lines suggested by the Holy See might offer the best guarantee for free access to the Holy Places. In our support for this draft resolution, we were guided by the principle that military conquest cannot be the basis for territorial aggrandizement. We believe that this resolution leaves open all possibilities for an equitable and durable settlement which should take into account the desires and preoccupations of three of the world's great religious communities.

73. In voting on the draft resolutions dealing with the main political aspects of the crisis, the Austrian delegation was guided by the desire to see peace and stability established in the Middle East, to see all troops withdrawn from foreign territories, and to see the state of war, which for too long has plagued this area, replaced by a new climate of co-operation among all nations of that region. To arrive at such a settlement, it will be necessary to liquidate the causes and the consequences of the recent outbreak of hostilities.

74. Although we recognize and appreciate a number of suggestions contained in the non-aligned and Afro-Asian draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1], my Government felt that the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1], though not ideal or perfect, came closest to the principles outlined above. It was this consideration which determined our vote.

75. Austria has always maintained most friendly relations with all the nations of the Middle East. We were therefore deeply grieved at the renewed outbreak of hostilities, and it was and still is our sincere hope that the General Assembly of the United Nations will be able to contribute to consolidating the ceasefire achieved by the Security Council into a durable and equitable settlement. We are disappointed that all efforts in this Assembly failed to lead to a resolution which would command the necessary wide support among the Members of this Organization. We feel that further efforts are necessary in order to overcome the present difficulties, and we hope that such efforts will enable the United Nations to make a constructive contribution to the establishment of peace in the Middle East.

76. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): The reasons why the Finnish delegation voted as it did yesterday can be

deduced from the statement I made on behalf of my delegation in the general debate, on 27 June [1537th meeting]. I stated then that the Finnish Government was prepared, within the framework of its policy of neutrality, to support any constructive effort to establish conditions of peace in the Middle East. In our view, neither the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1], nor the draft submitted by the Latin American countries [A/L.523/Rev.1], could have served as a basis for such an effort. Each of the two proposals was strongly opposed by one or the other of the parties primarily concerned in the Middle Eastern conflict; neither draft had the support of all the four permanent members of the Security Council, the Powers whose co-operation is an indispensable prerequisite for any really effective effort to settle the problems of the Middle East; nor did either proposal have the backing of a decisive majority of Member States.

77. As a result of the voting that took place yesterday, the Assembly has reached a deadlock. This is not to say that the emergency special session has been useless or that the debate has been without value; and here I find myself in agreement with the statement made by the President of the General Assembly a little while ago. In spite of the serious and profound differences which are only too obvious to all of us, the debate in the General Assembly has affirmed some of the fundamental principles governing international relations, including, and above all, the principle that no right to occupy or annex territory can be based on military conquest, and that troops occupying territories of other countries as a result of military action must be withdrawn; including also the principle that all Member States are obliged to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State.

78. Indeed, the debate has shown that the national community as a whole desires, in the interest of world peace as well as in the interest of the countries of the area itself, the establishment of conditions of peace and justice in the Middle East on a firmer basis than has so far been possible.

79. The fact remains, however, that the Assembly is divided on the question of the proper balance and relationship between these generally accepted principles and their application to the present situation in the Middle East. In view of the very genuine efforts that have been made in the past couple of weeks to find a compromise, this division seems to be irreconcilable. Yet, in our view, we should not allow this session just to peter out, as it were, without any positive or constructive conclusion—one which might at least ensure the ability of the United Nations to continue to play an effective role in the search for peaceful solutions to the problems of the Middle East.

80. Mr. TUQAN (Jordan): Having witnessed the results of the voting on each of the draft resolutions before the General Assembly, and having noted how various Members have cast their votes, may I be permitted to make the following observations on behalf of the delegation of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

81. This Assembly, which man has established as an instrument and haven for peace, has witnessed how blatant aggression can be unjustly defended; how nineteenth century practices and defunct laws of invasion and conquest can be reinstated.

82. We in the Arab world have gone through successes and failures in our long history; we have learned from both. As a small country, Jordan cannot but be disappointed, and indeed dismayed, by the double standard displayed in the Assembly during the recent deliberations on a vital issue, which resulted in its failure to pronounce a clear judgement condemning aggression and liquidating its consequences.

83. However, there might be some consolation in the fact that the principle of immediate withdrawal, despite heavy political pressure aimed at suppressing it, was able to survive in the hearts of Member States, and indeed in all of the draft resolutions that were put to a vote.

84. It has become clear that my delegation found itself unprepared to support the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1], which made the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab-occupied territories conditional upon the settlement of certain political matters clearly prejudged by the Latin American draft. That draft resolution embodied the obviously wrong position of attempting to impose certain solutions on the Arab countries, while the armed forces of the aggressor occupy their land and dominate hundreds of thousands of their peoples. In other words, prescriptions were made for the settlement at gun-point of outstanding issues pertaining to Arab rights.

*Mr. Waldheim (Austria), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

85. My delegation was one of several other delegations in this forum which could under no condition accept any form of draft resolution that did not, clearly and unequivocally, call for the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from the territories which they have occupied since their last aggression. We shall also oppose the attachment of any such proposal to the settlement of other issues, political or legal. I say this so that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of any delegation.

86. While the armed forces of aggression occupy half of my country, and while more than half of my people are under domination by the invader, and subjected to all forms of humiliation and persecution, how are we expected to view the shocking acquiescence of an international body, whose main task it is to prevent the occurrence of such a situation? How are we to view the pressure exercised by some powerful Members on many small countries to paralyse the effectiveness of the United Nations in its most elementary task of condemning aggression? Neither we, nor any other small nation in the world, shall ever forget that the United Nations has not been able, for the reasons indicated above, to tell the aggressor to withdraw.

87. By its indecision, the General Assembly is setting a dangerous precedent which implies that international conflicts can be decided by the sheer use of force. To us in Jordan, and in the rest of the Arab world, not to speak of others, the present sad ex-

perience is another manifestation of the same imperialist policies which have brought nothing but havoc and misery and as long ago as 1947 rendered a whole Arab people homeless.

88. The Arab nation must have learned much from the outcome of the recent deliberations of the Assembly. We have learned, to our dismay, that aggression, given suitable opportunity, can be condoned and even rewarded.

89. During its participation in the consultations which took place to amend and revise the various texts of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1], which was defeated yesterday, my delegation spared no effort to make it possible for the General Assembly to arrive at a solution which would satisfy our minimal aims. We were anxious to let moderation continue to be our guide. In our disappointment with the recent events, my delegation is seriously contemplating to what extent and to what limit moderation should continue to be pursued, and at what price.

90. To those Members which supported our just cause we are very grateful. We shall for ever remember their honourable stand in defence of the principles of right and peace. To those who disappointed us, we say that the experience we have gone through will provide us with a greater stimulus to enable us to achieve success.

91. Despite the injury inflicted on the Arab nation by the United Nations in 1947 through the partitioning of Palestine and the uprooting of its Arab inhabitants, we kept endeavouring for nineteen long years to seek redress in this hall. Today we find, to our sorrow, that the tragedy has grown bigger and its dimensions much wider. We also find that the doors of this institution continue to be locked in the face of our legitimate rights. In consequence of what we have recently found, we are led to feel the necessity for reappraising our future outlook and policies towards many problems, issues and Governments within the scope of our national interests.

92. Mr. MATSUI (Japan): The Japanese delegation voted for draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1, which called for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces, for the following reasons: first, that territorial expansion by means of force or by the fait accompli of occupation is not acceptable under the Charter of the United Nations, and secondly, that the withdrawal of Israeli forces is the condition of foremost importance for the realization of peace in the Middle East.

93. It is quite clear to us, however, that a simple withdrawal of Israeli forces would not, by itself, bring about a permanent solution to the present conflict in the Middle East. We are confronted with many other urgent problems, such as supervision of the cease-fire and of the withdrawal; the prevention of any recurrence of armed conflict; the termination of belligerency; relief for the new refugees and a lasting solution to the long-standing refugee problem as a whole; the problem of navigation in international waterways; the problem of Jerusalem; limitations on the supply of arms; and, in the longer term, the economic development of the countries in the area.



94. Considering that the final target should be the firm establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East, it was and remains our view that these problems require urgent attention. It was our belief that operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, had it been adopted, would have provided the basis for such urgent attention by the Security Council. The resolution not having been adopted, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.523/Rev.1, believing that it also reflected the basic views of my Government with regard to the peaceful settlement of the problem in the Middle East.

95. Surely, both of the draft resolutions were drawn up with the genuine intent of solving the crisis and establishing peace in the area. One was entitled to expect that all efforts would be made to bridge or combine the two drafts in order that the support of the great majority of the Member States could be obtained. The Japanese delegation cannot but regret that such efforts proved unsuccessful and that the General Assembly finds itself divided in this manner.

96. The Japanese delegation also voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.527/Rev.1 because of our opposition to any unilateral action by Israel which would result in annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem.

97. Finally, the Japanese delegation was privileged to participate, together with other delegations, in co-sponsoring draft resolution A/L.526 and Add.1-3, which was adopted almost unanimously by the General Assembly.

98. The hardships of the Arab refugees, already endured for nearly twenty years, have been greatly intensified by the recent conflict. Their numbers have been swollen by untold thousands. It is obvious that the United Nations, through its competent agencies and with the full co-operation of all Member States, must expand its activities and provide the maximum possible help.

99. In response to the adopted resolution [2252 (ES-V)], and also in response to various appeals already made, my Government will shortly be making a special contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, in addition to our regular annual contribution.

100. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): In explanation of the votes cast by my delegation, I wish to make the following points.

101. Although I made it clear in one of my interventions in the Security Council that the result would be nil if Zionist aggression became the subject matter for a special emergency session of the General Assembly, my delegation nevertheless made its position clear in the Assembly that it could not subscribe to any draft resolution which directly or indirectly condoned Israel's new usurpation of the Arab homeland.

102. The United States draft resolution [A/L.520] had the effect of pouring corrosive acid on Arab wounds inflicted by the aggressor on our Egyptian, Jordanian and Syrian brothers, aside from the havoc this aggression caused in the lives of the Palestinian Arabs. Some parts of the United States draft resolution constituted a severe blow to the dignity of the whole Arab people. The United States draft resolution

espoused the policy of Israel in advocating a bogus peace to be attained under duress. But why should I mention the United States draft resolution, which my good friend, Mr. Goldberg, did not press to a vote? I think he suspended it. I do so simply because its intents and purposes became quite evident in the so-called Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1], which was tailored to satisfy the aggressor at the expense of his victims by endeavouring to impose an artificial peace upon certain Arab Governments.

103. Had my good friend, Mr. Goldberg, been in the place of the late Winston Churchill during the Second World War, when none other than Mr. Hess, Adolph Hitler's deputy, flew to England, would he or any member of his Government have stretched their hands to meet that of Hess in making peace? No, the Western Powers, who fought the Nazis with all their resources, seem to have forgotten their repeated ultimatum of unconditional surrender to their German foes. I was in New York when President Roosevelt spoke of unconditional surrender, and every Western Power, even when it was crushed under the heel of the Nazis, also spoke of unconditional surrender.

104. The Arabs consider, rightly or wrongly, that Western Zionism in Palestine is no better than German Nazism which expanded all over Europe during the last world war. This is how the Arabs feel about this incursion of Western Zionism in their midst. It is indeed pathetic how power and affluence can blind the eyes of some countries represented here to the injustice perpetrated upon the indigenous people of Palestine. If a single national of one of these powerful States gets hurt, let alone killed, his Government would utilize all its forces to redress the wrong, but if one and a third million Palestinians are killed or dispossessed or scattered to the four winds, it does not matter. They are merely Arabs, so what? If they are decimated, they are Arabs. There are many of these Arabs in the Middle East and in North Africa, and they have vast stretches of territory, so what does it matter if a handful of them, a mere one and a third million, are killed or trodden under foot? These Arabs do not use birth control pills, so what is the difference if one or two million of them are eliminated.

105. What is the attitude which no Western Power dares to articulate? Come on, tell the truth. It is that the Western Zionists, once permanently established among the Arabs, will bring Western civilization to them, the good life in material terms, but many other things as well, such as homosexuality which has recently been legalized, incestuous films of which "My sister, my love" is only a mild example, and synthetic narcotics, such as LSD, which some theologians have asserted is a good medium for communication by man with his God. Those are manifestations also of that civilization and that culture which they want to bring to the Middle East, but what is the use of talking and wasting one's breath here in the United Nations where decisions as often as not are based upon expediency and the special interests of some States. I have said enough about the United States draft resolution, although it is still suspended, like the sword of Damocles.

106. My delegation voted against the Latin American draft resolution on the principle of an old Arabic

proverb which says, and I am paraphrasing: "Many things in this world may be achieved. However, love and peace by compulsion or coercion are unattainable." Where is my friend, Mr. Goldberg? He is a friend and I like him personally, but no one can force me to like him. No one can force me to make peace with his friends, the Zionists. I am a person. How could the Governments do it? If I, as a person, cannot be forced to love another person or be compelled to make peace with him, why should we ask this of Governments?

107. The purpose of the Latin American draft resolution is to pave the way for a dialogue or some sort of accommodation with the Western Zionists, who literally have robbed the indigenous people of Palestine of their own native land, their homes, their orchards—nay, of their patrimony. Time and again my delegation stated in this very General Assembly that even if certain Arab Governments were to stop challenging certain Western States for the injustice these States have perpetrated by proxy upon Palestinians, only the Palestinians themselves who were unjustly placed under the British Mandate have the right to be questioned as to whether or not they mind having been robbed, killed, wounded and mutilated by the aggressors. Not the Arab Governments—only the native Palestinians have the right to be questioned to see whether they accept any solution.

108. The Government of Balfour was supposed to prepare those native Palestinians for self-rule. The French came to Lebanon; Lebanon today is free. The British also went to Iraq; Iraq is free. But the Palestinians were another breed of human beings. They were subjected to secret machinations and arrangements behind the scenes. And here in the United Nations we should condone the aggressors.

109. Some Western Powers, including unfortunately a goodly number from the new hemisphere, remotely situated as these States are from our troubled area—6,000, 7,000 miles—have acted on the United States thesis that peace is imperative at any price, that peace is even justifiable at the expense of the indigenous people of Palestine, leaving aside the Arab Governments, the indigenous people of Palestine who had the right, like the Lebanese, like the Iraqis, like the Syrians, to independence when they were unjustly placed under foreign mandate. It is not only a question between Israel and the Arab States; it is a question of Israel against the indigenous people of Palestine who constituted 80 per cent of the population. And here the United Nations builds on sand.

110. I witnessed personally the machinations of the League of Nations. Where is the League of Nations now?

111. In describing the non-aligned draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1], Mr. Goldberg went as far as calling it unbalanced because it did not provide for an imposed peace on certain Arab Governments. From what has taken place before our eyes in this Assembly, it looks as if our friend, Mr. Goldberg, and the States huddled behind the policy of his Government hold the scales of peace and justice in their own hands and hence have appointed themselves the arbiters over Arab destiny. Only the Arab people are the masters of their destiny. Any moment the Arab people feel that their respective Governments do not

reflect their aspirations, they, like any other people, will endeavour sooner or later to topple any régime which does not fulfil their deep yearning to rid their homeland of Western Zionism transplanted as it was amongst them.

112. Is it any wonder that not a single Arab representative in the Assembly allowed himself to negotiate in any way with the sponsors of the Latin American draft resolution. And all of them are our friends, the Latin Americans. The Latin American draft resolution was snugly tailored in accordance with the accurate measurements provided by other Western Powers. Even the lining, the thread, the buttonholes were provided. You know by whom. All you had to do was to put it on snugly and button it like your coat. Never before have we seen our Latin American brothers so deaf to our plea that their draft resolution was unacceptable to the Arab people. But all our pleadings seemed like humming in a thick-walled bathroom, as we say in Arabic.

113. All that I have said is only part of the reasons why my delegation had no choice but to oppose the Latin American draft resolution on which the United States hallmark was stamped.

114. Of the Western Powers, only France and a few other Western States were courageous enough to go against the stream.

115. We voted for the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.519] paragraph by paragraph because it was the most just and satisfying to the Arab people at large. This is from the mouth of a monarchist. More power and glory to anyone who is just.

116. I have been told by several Western representatives—and do not think that I am not on talking terms with them from the tone of my voice; they are all friends of mine and we still drink coffee together—that the Soviet draft resolution was prompted by ulterior motives. How pure and spotless, how immaculate were the proposals spelled out or inspired by our Western friends? Of course they had no ulterior motives whatsoever! Our Western friends, the holders of the scales of peace and love and the arbiters of justice, whom do they think they are fooling, Baroodi or the man in the street in Arab cities or towns or villages? They cannot fool anybody except themselves.

117. My delegation did not participate in the vote on the humanitarian draft resolution presented by Sweden [A/L.526 and Add.1-3] in spite of the fact that we deeply appreciated its noble and charitable purpose. However, I personally could not visualize myself joining some of those—not all—who voted for it, who reminded me of the person who participates in some way or another in causing a tragedy and then afterwards who marches in the funeral procession and wipes away his copious tears for the victims.

118. We voted for the draft resolution on Jerusalem presented by Pakistan [A/L.527/Rev.1], for we believe that it is sacrilege that those who consider Jesus as a false prophet, the Jesus of Christianity and Islam, that the modern Zionists who never believed in Jesus who, according to Christian Scripture, was crucified at the request of Jewish leaders of ancient days—no guilt attached to our secular Zionists in this—I repeat, we believe that it is sacrilege that the Holy Sepulchre

and the other Holy Places in Palestine revered by the three monotheistic religions should be administered by secular Western Zionists, who are already thinking of building a "fun city" in Jerusalem, and possibly a Coney Island on the shores of the Dead Sea, which is not too distant from Jerusalem. Yes, the beaches of the Dead Sea and other beaches of the Holy Land may possibly be adorned with topless bikinis and the trappings of a decadent culture, which may become the order of the day in the Holy Land. Anything is possible in this world, even the commercialization of Jerusalem, plans for which have already been set by the Rothschilds of France, as I read some days ago in the magazine section of The New York Times. The Fourth of July 1967, a memorable day for this great American Republic, which is our host country, will be a day of perfidy for the Arabs since so many States represented in this Assembly have shut their eyes to the plight of the natives of Palestine who have been clamouring for the restoration of their homeland since 1947.

119. The Western Powers, with the exception of France and only a few other States, have reaffirmed their belief in the superiority of the methods and tactics which the colonial Powers have adopted in order to attain their ends. The United Nations, like the League of Nations, has not transcended those antiquated policies which were based on the balance of power and on clandestine political arrangements. If we do not mend our ways by causing right to triumph over might, the United Nations will be doomed.

120. And I am reminded here of a couplet written by Rudyard Kipling, who said: "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." He was—Lord Caradon will bear me out in this—the maternal cousin of the late Winston Churchill, as some of you may not know. The British erred in their colonial days, when at one time they thought that they could mold the Indian people and the other colonial peoples into their own image. When they failed to do so, they began to respect the traditions of the colonial peoples, and Rudyard Kipling epitomized the fossilization of peoples' cultures, mores, and traditions, by proclaiming: "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet."

121. But the United Nations was predicated on making one world, of east and west, of north and south; but I doubt, from what I see, whether this can be made feasible in my own generation.

122. Before it is too late, therefore, I do hope that the peoples of the world will jostle their politicians everywhere into the consciousness of the grave situations which we have been witnessing during the last twenty years, not only in the Middle East, but in many other parts of the world. For if we persist in what we are doing, there is no guarantee that mankind will not commit suicide. And lest anyone think that I harbour anger or rancour or hatred towards anyone, including my foes, I shall finish my statement by saying: Lord, forgive them, for they know not what they do.

123. Mr. PINERA (Chile) (translated from Spanish): The fact that the delegation of Chile has not taken part in the general debate at this emergency special session does not indicate any lack of interest on the

part of my country in the difficult problem that we have been considering for the past two weeks.

124. Chile is a sincere friend of all the peoples in the area in question and we have given evidence, in the past, of our desire to collaborate in the solution of the problems existing in the Middle East. It is this same spirit that has prompted us to lend our support to the many efforts that have been made during this session, especially in the last few days, to find a formula that could be effective in relieving the situation created by this most recent outbreak of war in the Middle East. At the same time we have wanted to consider the points that would make it possible to start, even in a very modest way, along the long and difficult, yet indispensable, path leading to the creation of a stable and lasting peace.

125. In considering the complex aspects of the problem, we have come to the conclusion that the principle of the withdrawal of troops from the territories occupied as a result of the conflict is an essential point. At the same time, however, we have seen that it is impossible to place this problem in a complete vacuum, isolating it from other aspects which are also basic in any analysis of the situation and which are linked in a relationship which in many cases is that of cause and effect. For that reason it has not seemed practicable to us to ask for the withdrawal of the Israel troops from the occupied territories as an absolute element, quite separate from the rest of the situation in the Middle East.

126. This position is well known, but in explaining the votes that my delegation cast yesterday I should like to state the point of view of my Government. My delegation, together with the other sponsors of the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1], thought it better to submit its own point of view in a formula that we consider just and balanced. We state categorically and unequivocally the need for the withdrawal of the troops and we affirm in the clearest possible terms the principle that territorial acquisitions resulting from the use of force must not and cannot be tolerated. This stand, which is reflected in the Latin American draft resolution, represents a sincere effort to collaborate in arriving at the goal which we are all seeking, namely, the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

127. Above all, we have tried to find a formula which respects the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, which takes into account the factors that we believe to be inseparable from the problem, and which therefore offers real possibilities of helping towards a genuine settlement in the area.

128. It is in the light of these considerations that my delegation is sponsoring the Latin American draft resolution. Its sponsorship explains its lack of support for the draft resolution submitted by Yugoslavia and a large number of non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1]. I do not need to remind those countries of the many ties of affection and co-operation that unite us and that my delegation is anxious to preserve and to strengthen. On this occasion, in yesterday's vote, we were unable to join them in submitting the draft resolution because of this different way of looking at the problem that I have tried to explain. I am sure, however, that we share with them a most

deep and sincere wish to see peace ensured in the Middle East and to see the United Nations emerge from this great trial with greater strength.

129. As Mr. Pazhwak, our President, rightly pointed out at the beginning of this meeting, it would be rash and erroneous to conclude from the rejection of the draft resolutions of the non-aligned countries and the Latin American countries that this emergency special session of the General Assembly has been a failure. For one thing, we have adopted, by a vast majority, an important resolution on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V)], which has made it quite clear that the United Nations is determined to reject any unilateral measure which might endanger the special status of the Holy City. Secondly, the General Assembly was almost unanimous—116 votes, I think—in its support of the humanitarian resolution [2252 (ES-V)], which means a great deal in terms of relieving the suffering caused by the war among the populations affected and which is of the utmost importance in that it deals with a problem that affects a large group of men.

130. It is true, however, that as far as the essential problem of how to bring peace to the Middle East is concerned, we have not been able to reach agreement. Despite this lack of agreement in a specific resolution, it seems clear to us that the various speeches and statements made, as also the draft resolutions submitted, show that there is a vast area of agreement among the Members of the United Nations on the basic principles that should guide the parties and the Security Council, when it resumes consideration of the problem which it started to deal with more than a month ago.

131. Outstanding among these principles is the principle, upon which all have laid stress, that the threat or use of force can never be accepted as a means of obtaining territorial advantages. There has been reaffirmation of the principle that the sovereignty and territorial integrity and political independence of all States are protected by the Charter and must be respected by all members of the international community, as also the principle that disputes between States must be settled by the peaceful means provided in the Charter and never by violence.

132. I think that yesterday—and I say once again that Mr. Pazhwak, our President, drew attention to this—there was a great deal of disagreement, but there was one important agreement, which was that the resolutions affirmed the basic principles of the United Nations Charter which, for a small country like Chile, dictate its line of conduct because they interpret the will and determination of this international community to which we belong.

133. We think that these principles accepted by the Assembly could provide a valuable guideline for the Security Council in its work. Lastly, we also think that even at this late hour the Assembly can make an effort to transmit to the Security Council its thoughts on the matter and its wish that this principal organ of the United Nations may devote all its ability and its energy to continuing its consideration of the problem and leading it towards positive and peaceful solutions. We know that this is a great task but my delegation thinks that a start, however modest, should be made on it.

134. This afternoon there have been comments in the corridors of this Assembly on yesterday's meeting. Some representatives have called it a sad afternoon; others have called it an afternoon of great importance. To conclude my modest words, I would say that yesterday afternoon and this afternoon are afternoons of great consequence for the United Nations and that the resolutions or decisions which we may adopt should be inspired by the gravity of the steps which we took yesterday and which we may take today.

135. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): In explaining the votes cast by the South African delegation yesterday [1548th meeting] on the six draft resolutions which were put to the vote, I wish to emphasize that our attitude was based on the following considerations. The South African delegation is of the view that, while the General Assembly may discuss any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, any such issue on which action is necessary is the responsibility of the Security Council, in terms of Article 24 of the Charter. Furthermore, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation regarding a dispute or situation in respect of which the Security Council is already exercising its functions, as is the case with the present crisis in the Middle East.

136. Apart from these reservations, the South African Government had considerable doubts as to the wisdom of seeking a solution of the Middle East situation through debate or the adoption of resolutions in the General Assembly.

137. For those reasons, the South African delegation abstained, with one exception, on all of the draft resolutions, as well as on the amendments thereto, which were put to the vote yesterday.

138. My delegation, however, was happy to vote in favour of the joint draft resolution contained in document A/L.526 and Add.1-3 on humanitarian assistance to those persons who are suffering as a result of the recent hostilities in the Middle East.

139. While sincerely regretting the recent armed conflict in the Middle East, it is the hope of the South African Government that a just solution will soon be found so that peace, security, stability and prosperity can be restored to all the peoples of the Middle East.

140. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): The problem of Palestine is contemporary with the United Nations. That it is still with us is due to the fact that so far we have found no lasting solution. A heavy burden lies upon the United Nations; no less heavy is the burden borne by the States which are friends of one or other of the parties and which are trying to rise above passions and to lead the problems towards a plane where equanimity and justice prevail.

141. We have witnessed a long debate which for the most part has been bitter. Now the Assembly has considered the various draft resolutions submitted to it and only two of them, on problems peripheral to the great political problem of the Middle East, have gained its approval. It therefore seems useless to point out what remains to be done for the future of the Middle East, as also for the Organization itself, since the essence of the problem we are considering is part of



its integral being. Questions of war and peace in the region, and perhaps in the world, are subordinated to antagonisms which threaten to put an end to our world. For the General Assembly the problem is of consummate organic importance: a system of complementarity between the General Assembly and the Security Council is being initiated and if it is developed it might perhaps strengthen the Organization by drawing attention to this mutual complement between the functions of its principal organs which was provided for in the Charter.

142. The Government of Mexico, which has links of close and long-standing friendship with all the countries of the region now in conflict, had to base itself on the broad principles that govern its policy in order to guide the problem of Palestine towards a solution. Through the General Assembly, it had to try to mediate in the bitter opposition that was jeopardizing the future of the region, and to do so with the prudence that is the fruit of our age-long rejection of the use of force in international affairs and the absolute denial of its effects.

143. The problem of the Middle East poses a challenge that must be taken up. An organization set up for the purpose of preserving peace is under an obligation to respond to the use of violence, violence which masquerades as the complement of reason—a poor complement, to be sure—or as a means of settling international disputes, when the very fact of violence complicates and multiplies such disputes. As Members of the United Nations we refuse to recognize the fruits of so-called victories in the battlefield; nor do we respect the so-called diplomatic victories, which detract from the ideals upon which this Organization is based, for it is only with the help of its rules and by attachment to its ideals that we can, if not solve, at least lighten the problem. I should like to place particular emphasis on this point: the more complex the problem and the more deep-rooted the passions, the more the need for clear vision and for the application of the great principles that govern international life. In the levelling process of history, only those great ideals, developed in the evolution of the nations, can help in the construction of permanent solutions.

144. It is precisely the application of those principles that has prompted the submission of the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1]. I should like, in passing, to refer to the fact that some speakers have questioned whether it is a Latin American draft resolution. We have witnessed a great deal of confusion and many errors of judgement in this debate. It does not surprise us that this is yet another and that the delegations involved in it have been incapable of understanding the feeling of the Assembly. With the passage of time and the hoped-for calming of passions that today are at their height, the balance and sound basis of the Latin American draft resolution will become evident and it will be seen that it rests upon justice. My delegation has been inspired by one thing only: the desire to propose impartial solutions, which for that very reason—and only for the moment—do not meet with the full approval of the parties. We are content to wait, in the confidence that the present vituperations will be transformed into a chorus of praise, for Mexico understands international friendship as the obligation to double and redouble one's ef-

forts to make justice and law the predominant standards in the international community.

145. The Latin American draft resolution, which in our opinion is well-balanced and comprehensive, offered the General Assembly the most correct conclusion for its emergency special session. Although the essential brevity of a resolution makes it somewhat sketchy in parts, it offers constructive suggestions for all the different aspects of the problem. In the conviction that we were offering the best possible solution, my delegation, together with the other Latin American delegations, voted against the other draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly. On the other hand, the Mexican delegation was glad to support the humanitarian resolution submitted by the delegation of Sweden with eighteen other sponsors, in the confidence that it could indeed help to alleviate the human sufferings caused by the conflict. Similarly, we supported the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan in order to prevent any change in the status of Jerusalem [A/L.527/Rev.1].

146. As the greatest writer of the Castilian language has said, men are no more than others unless they do more than others. The statesmen of the Middle East are faced with this immense responsibility of doing more than other men. If they can rise above the immediate reactions of the conflict and lead their peoples to the lasting emotions of greatness, which can only be reflected in the desire to be useful to the great mankind of the future, a new era will have opened, for the Middle East, of course, but also for this Organization, which today is abused but which has within it the epitome of everything constructive that is to be found in international life in the second half of the twentieth century.

147. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I should like to explain briefly some of the factors which guided my delegation in voting on the draft resolutions which were put before the General Assembly yesterday.

148. First, my delegation considered it important that the Assembly should adopt a resolution which would terminate the present dangerous confrontation of forces in the Middle East. The fighting which broke out along the Suez Canal on Sunday and Monday was a demonstration of the uneasiness of the cease-fire. A call for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab territory would eliminate what we all know is a most provocative and intolerable situation. Continued tension and renewed outbreaks of fighting will be present so long as the Israeli invaders are allowed to remain on the territory of three sovereign States.

149. Most speakers in the course of the general debate expressed agreement on two points: first, that no rights can flow from an act of aggression; secondly, that there can be no reduction of tension, no elimination of danger and no hope for peace while a Member State continues to occupy the territory of other States by force and in defiance of the United Nations Charter.

150. Secondly, my delegation took into consideration the justice and practicability of the draft resolutions from the standpoint of the generally accepted code of international conduct and in relation to past actions of the United Nations under similar circumstances. We

looked for the next logical step after the cease-fire: the withdrawal of the forces of the occupying Power. Such withdrawal, in the opinion of my delegation, is absolutely necessary if it is desired to create an atmosphere conducive to a settlement of the issues involved in the dispute.

151. My delegation could not accept a resolution which attempted to judge intricate issues which have defied solution by this international Organization over the past twenty years. On the contrary, my delegation looked for a draft resolution which, while acknowledging the existence of those issues, provided the appropriate channels through which they could best be dealt with. We believe in first things first. Only when the Israeli forces withdraw would it be appropriate to enter into the legal, political and humanitarian aspects of the problem with all the thoroughness, urgency and justice which the situation demands.

152. Thirdly, in considering the draft resolutions before us yesterday, my delegation, representing a country which is a staunch supporter of the pacific settlement of disputes, assessed the draft resolutions from that aspect, too. The Charter outlaws the exercise of force. In this particular situation there has been a clear-cut case of aggression. If armed attack can achieve the purpose of the aggressor and if we allow such aggression to take place without condemnation and without penalty, we shall, I submit, be giving the green light to international chaos and international lawlessness. It is an established principle of international law that a nation which attacks another and occupies foreign territory cannot, as a condition for withdrawing its forces, demand rights and privileges in return for withdrawing its forces of invasion. This body has already pronounced itself clearly on that point in a previous case of aggression by the same aggressor State.

153. The General Assembly has confirmed that a change of the status juris resulting from military action is contrary to the provisions of the Charter. In the opinion of my delegation there must be an unconditional return by Israel to the status quo ante bellum. Furthermore, Israel, or for that matter, any State guilty of aggression, not only must be condemned, but must also be made to understand that its unlawful acts cannot escape penalty. If aggressors were allowed to escape liability for their aggressive actions, not only would their example destroy the authority and prestige of this Organization, but it would embolden others to follow in their path.

154. The United Nations has now devoted a month to the Middle East situation. We all recall the Israeli pronouncements at the beginning of the conflict; first, that they had no territorial designs and, second, that their actions were purely defensive ones under Article 51 of the Charter. In my statement to this Assembly on 27 June [1538th meeting] I described the expansionist policies of Israel, giving in support quotations from statements made by Israeli leaders over the years, and citing actions which they had taken against their neighbours in the past twenty years. As the Israeli war machine' conquered more territory, so the true aims of the Israeli aggression became apparent. They began talking about annexing Jerusalem, the West Bank of Jordan and parts of

Syria. Yesterday, this Assembly firmly rejected any change in the status of Jerusalem and adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V) opposing Israeli designs over the Old City. During the course of yesterday's proceedings concern was expressed over Israeli designs in the Gaza Strip. When that matter was raised—and it was raised in connexion with the Latin American draft resolution—my friend, the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, had this to say, referring to the representative of Kuwait: "May I tell him that we did not do it in haste"—that is, exclude the Gaza Strip from the framework of his draft resolution—"The Gaza Strip, after all, is under the administrative control of the United Arab Republic." [1548th meeting, para. 58.]

155. A short while ago, my attention was drawn to a news despatch from Tel Aviv, Israel, and I should like to read it. It states:

"Israel's Defence Minister, Major-General Moshe Dayan, said Wednesday that steps would be taken soon to incorporate the Gaza Strip into Israel. 'The Gaza Strip is Israel, and I think it should become an integral part of the country', Dayan told a news conference in Gaza.

"The Defence Minister was replying to a question as to whether various economic, transport and social measures now being prepared by the Israeli Government for the Gaza Strip meant that the area was about to be included in the country.

"'Exactly', said Dayan. 'I do not see any difference between Gaza and Nazareth any more.' Gaza, administered under the armistice by Egypt for nineteen years following the 1948-1949 Palestine war, was taken by Israeli forces in the war of last June 5-10.

"Asked whether his statement about Gaza also applied to the West Bank of the River Jordan, Dayan hesitated for a moment, then replied, 'The West Bank and Gaza are of the same status. I do not see any difference.'"

156. It is very important that we should take note of this statement, because at the very beginning of this aggression the Israeli representatives tried to make out a case to the Assembly that they acted in self-defence. At the very beginning of the aggression, they kept assuring the world that they had no territorial designs. We have already seen their pronouncements on Jerusalem, and I trust that the Assembly has taken note of this latest statement by the Israeli Minister of Defence. I submit that this is a very serious situation, a situation which, if allowed to deteriorate, could increase the already growing tensions in the area and set the spark for another conflagration.

157. The people and Government of the Somali Republic are deeply grieved by the suffering which have been inflicted on the Arab people in this latest outrage by Israel. International charity is not the answer to the Palestine problem, even though this might temporarily relieve some of the anguish and pain which befall people whose homes have been destroyed and who have been forcibly uprooted from their homeland. There is one thing for which international charity can never compensate, and that is the sorrow caused by the death and injury of the dear ones of these poor

Arab people as a result of the acts of the aggressor. To them we say, "May Allah bless and comfort you, and may justice triumph".

158. The situation in the Middle East is not beyond solution, it is not beyond the capacity of the United Nations to handle. We have heard in the course of this debate abundant expressions of concern and of the need for achieving peace and the need for goodwill towards the parties involved in the dispute. To have concern for the welfare of others is laudable, as it shows our humanity. To seek peace is the prime objective of this Organization. To entertain goodwill for others is the basis of good relationships. But these in themselves are not sufficient, we must eliminate the causes for concern. We must establish the conditions for peace, and, finally, we must ensure that the goodwill we show for others is supported also by good deeds. The situation in the Middle East requires all these qualities, and it also requires a scrupulous regard for the rights of all parties in the dispute, not only Israel. The prescription for peace lies in the strict and faithful adherence to the United Nations Charter. It is the hope of my delegation that the United Nations will be guided by these principles and purposes and that it will not be found wanting in this grave hour of need.

159. Mr. LIATIS (Greece): I should like to say just a few words by way of explanation of vote in reference to draft resolution A/L.526 and Add.1-3 on humanitarian assistance, which was adopted quasi-unanimously yesterday by this Assembly.

160. The sufferings left by the war and its aftermath could not be a matter of indifference to the Greek Government and the people of Greece. The victims of the Middle Eastern tragedy, the wounded soldiers and civilians and the unfortunate men, women and children displaced from their homes had to be helped as promptly and as fully as possible. Greece decided to contribute its utmost in sending assistance to the stricken areas. It was in this humanitarian spirit that the Greek Ministry of Social Welfare, in close collaboration with the Greek Red Cross, made available every possible form of medical and other relief to Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Syria, in that order of importance.

161. Greek aid to those countries included two mobile hospitals, one having a capacity of 100 beds and the other of 75 beds, all kinds of medical equipment, drugs, food, tents, and so on. Greece also expressed its solidarity with the war victims by dispatching a team of seven doctors and thirty-six nurses to Jordan to help in the dispensing of medical care to injured soldiers and civilians. The total cost of this Greek humanitarian assistance sent directly to the Arab countries amounts to approximately \$700,000.

162. Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Bolivia wishes to give the following explanation of vote in connexion with the voting that took place yesterday.

163. The delegation of Bolivia took part in the preparation of the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1] and is glad to have sponsored it and voted in favour of it. The draft resolution proclaims, among other things, the principle that military victory

does not confer any rights and that consequently any change in territorial status brought about by force of arms is null and void. The Latin American draft resolution—which always has been and still is exclusively Latin American—also serves as a living witness to the spirit of justice of our peoples, our respectful attachment to the principles of the United Nations Charter and our sincere desire to contribute as far as we are able to the preservation of peace.

164. With regard to the specific problem of the Middle East, Bolivia would have been better pleased if the Latin American draft resolution, in addition to calling for the withdrawal of troops simultaneously with the ending of the state of belligerency, had included specific provisions for the direct and immediate negotiation between the parties concerned of a system of just and lasting peace. In a spirit of realism, respecting the majority view and adhering to the concept of unity, Bolivia discussed, accepted and sponsored the draft resolution to which I am now referring and which, although it did not gain the two thirds necessary for its adoption, received more favourable votes, according to the record, than any of the other draft resolutions dealing with the substance of the question.

165. Bolivia is proud to have been able once again, in absolute understanding with its brothers of Latin America, to serve the cause of world peace and the increased prestige of our Organization, which, in emergencies such as that with which we are now faced, is in duty bound to draw strength from its own frustration, so that the peoples of the world may never lose hope of achieving justice and peace one day.

166. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): I explained yesterday [1548th meeting] my delegation's vote on the draft amendments to the non-aligned and Afro-Asian draft resolution, and also on the Latin American draft resolution. Therefore, I need only a few moments to explain our vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.519].

167. There is no need for me to go into my delegation's attitude in the Security Council where the situation, before and after the recent outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, was considered in the months of May and June 1967. India's views on the subject are on the records of the Security Council. The point I wish to make is that after the rejection of the non-aligned and Afro-Asian draft resolution, the only draft which in some measure satisfied the principles enunciated by my delegation was the Soviet draft resolution. As I explained before the voting took place yesterday, the Latin American draft did not meet the requirements of the situation.

168. The Soviet draft resolution, in its crucial operative paragraphs, was the same as the one submitted by the delegation of that country in the Security Council and on which we had taken a position in the Council. My delegation voted in favour of the Soviet draft resolution in the Council<sup>1/</sup> and it has taken the same position in the General Assembly, especially because the non-aligned and Afro-Asian draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1] had already been rejected by the Assembly.

<sup>1/</sup> Document S/7951/Rev.2, incorporated in the record of the 1358th meeting of the Security Council. (See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, 1358th meeting.)

169. In this context I should like to place on record that both the Albanian and Cuban amendments [A/L.524 and A/L.525] to the non-aligned and Afro-Asian draft resolution were not supported by my delegation because we considered that they did not contain constructive elements contributing to the success of that draft resolution.

170. We also voted against the draft resolution introduced by Albania [A/L.521], because of its unconstructive approach.

171. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker in explanation of vote is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

172. Mr. MAKHOS (Syria):<sup>2/</sup> Permit me, before explaining the vote cast yesterday by the Syrian Arab Republic, to express our sincere appreciation for the objectivity, the patience and the constant efforts which the President of the General Assembly impartially deployed in his endeavour to reach a just solution, to safeguard the dignity of the United Nations, and to ensure the triumph of law over force. But alas, the formidable pressures to which this international Organization has been subjected by the United States of America were instrumental in its failure to adopt the necessary resolutions that would safeguard right and justice.

173. To be honest, I am of the opinion that the Assembly spent two long weeks in order to reach the present deadlock, whereas any fair-minded man would expect that the General Assembly within two or three days, in the wake of the Israeli aggression, would pronounce itself by condemning this aggression and adopting any of the draft resolutions which condemn the Israeli aggression and calls upon Israel to withdraw its forces. Although we were aware of the tremendous pressure exerted by the United States Government on various delegations in 1947 forcing the Assembly to vote for the partition of Palestine under direct personal orders from President Truman, we never thought that the United States Government would resort to the same immoral tactics and exertions twenty years afterwards—and especially when we realize that our Assembly's present membership has been increased by the addition of representatives of countries which have experienced the humiliation of foreign occupation in the past and which have fought bitterly to attain their independence. Thus the United Nations is supposed to be a haven for the protection of its Members' independence and a sanctuary for peace, justice and freedom in the world.

174. But our disappointment was great as certain States displayed all their energies to transform this Organization, the hope of mankind, into a market for international bargaining, thus dashing the hopes of humanity in the United Nations.

175. The Arabs, in their just cause, have come to realize that they are facing the insistence of the United States on the defeat of any positive and constructive resolution condemning aggression, as did the Soviet and Albanian draft resolutions and the Cuban amendment. Even a draft resolution that only calls for immediate withdrawal of occupying forces—as proposed

in the non-aligned countries' draft resolution, which we voted for because of this indispensable and constructive paragraph—was actively obstructed by the United States.

176. Within the context of the vote that took place, allow me to say that the Syrian Arab Republic was among the founding Members of the United Nations and made an active contribution towards the drafting of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

*Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan) took the Chair.*

Since then it has never ceased the struggle, within and outside the United Nations, to promote the aims of the Charter and to back every liberation movement throughout the world. Subsequently, many struggling peoples, since achieving their independence, have come to enrich our ranks in the United Nations.

177. We are certain that the failure of the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1], modest as it was, and the negative votes cast thereon by some delegations do not truly reflect the genuine feelings of nations the representatives of which in this Assembly were prevented, under direct American pressure and duress, from condemning aggression and upholding the principles of the Charter. There is no doubt in our minds that the peoples, in their conscience, stand with us against aggression. If this trend is allowed to go on, and if these peoples do not close ranks with us and with every struggling nation, they will inevitably meet the same fate and find themselves at the mercy of ruthless, immoral United States imperialist policy.

178. We voted in favour of the Soviet and Albanian draft resolutions [A/L.519 and A/L.521] and the Cuban amendments [A/L.525] because they did provide for the condemnation of aggression and the punishment of the aggressor, and for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its occupying forces. In some of those draft resolutions, condemnation of the United States and the United Kingdom was requested. In fact, the Arab people rightly consider these two States as the direct cause of most of their sufferings and disasters and the underdevelopment, division and exploitation of their land. It is our duty here to draw the attention of Members, as proof of what we say, to the conduct of the United Kingdom in Aden, where reoccupation is under way in violation of the previous resolutions of the United Nations. This is the worst exploitation of the circumstances of the Israeli occupation and the preoccupation of the Arab people and of international public opinion with this aggression.

179. Our generation had known the United States of America only through George Washington, who fought British colonialism, and through Abraham Lincoln, who emancipated the oppressed and fought secession. But then we came to know the United States better after the creation of Israel: the United States as successor to the old colonialism, which began to retreat before the consecutive blows of subjected peoples; the United States as the leader of neo-colonialism in all parts of the world and as the foremost imperialist force standing against the liberation of peoples and

<sup>2/</sup> Mr. Makhos spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.



promoting human exploitation and underdevelopment everywhere.

180. The United States representative came to this rostrum claiming to explain his vote that was instrumental in the failure of the non-aligned draft resolution, which unfortunately took place on the anniversary of the achievement of independence from British colonialism of the American nation, on the Fourth of July. The attitude he took was but a confirmation of the official United States policy, which is to defeat every condemnation of Israeli aggression and to exert the most extreme pressure to confirm that aggression; to create rights resulting therefrom; to link withdrawal of forces with solutions imposed by way of blackmail, force and the fait accompli of occupation. Is this not a violation of every human law, aside from being a burial of United Nations principles?

181. In our view, this attitude of the Government of the United States towards the draft resolutions voted upon yesterday is not a strange one. On the contrary, it is proof of the participation of the United States in the planning of the aggression and in its linking to specific results and definite purposes, and, furthermore, in the use of occupation as a means—in its view, a very efficient one—to impose solutions and to consolidate the same imperialist plans that the world is faced with in Viet-Nam. In short, what is sought is to impose solutions through force, to compel peoples to negotiate to surrender under napalm bombs and by conquest. Had it been otherwise, the Government of the United States would have responded to the call of the international conscience represented in this Organization and voted in favour of the draft resolutions which called for immediate, unconditional withdrawal, thus safeguarding the dignity of the United Nations and the sanctity of international law. The United States could thus have proved, by such a positive vote, that it had not participated in the planning of the aggression and that that aggression did not meet with its blessing. The picture would then have been one of mere difference of views between the United States and the Arab countries over the question of Palestine. Only then would the United States have been faithful to the stand taken by President Eisenhower when, on 20 February 1957, he issued the following warning:

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

182. The withdrawal of the United States draft resolution [A/L.520] could not have surprised anyone. It was the United States itself which inspired the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1] in order to gain time. This was intended to afford the friends of the United States more time to engage in contacts in order to persuade the non-aligned countries of the possibility of working out a compromise solution.

183. We do not question the good faith of some of the States that were sincerely working to find a just formula which would preserve the Arab rights as well as the dignity of the United Nations. However, this was not the objective of those who were trying to gain more time in order to make it easier to exert pressure upon those delegations that were supporting the non-aligned draft resolution. There is no greater human tragedy than that of these people who, under the terrible pressure of the United States, are compelled to take stands against their own convictions and utter words they do not believe. This is indeed humiliating to the dignity of all men.

184. We wonder, as do many others, who was leading the opposition in order to defeat the constructive drafts, such as the non-aligned one. Was it Israel or was it the United States of America? Which one of those two was using the other at the United Nations, as well as on the battlefields of aggression? We wonder why all this unjustified American rancour against the Arab nation. We wonder how long the American people will condone the perpetration of the ugliest Zionist exploitation ever known to history. We wonder for how long the American people will accept the sacrifice of its own interests for the benefit of interests that have no connexion with it, and how long the American people will tolerate losing the friendship of other peoples and isolating themselves from the rest of the world while the colonialist trusts get richer and richer at the expense of the hungry millions.

185. What is the aim of all this humiliation inflicted upon people? Why all this destruction, this devastation of huts and modest homes sheltering millions of happy families? Until when, we wonder, will the fate of draft resolutions unacceptable to Israel depend on the bargaining of American electioneering?

186. The failure of the resolution of the non-aligned countries, far from satisfying the conscience of peoples and far from applying only to the question of aggression which the Arab people are subjected to at present, constitutes in essence a grave warning to all peoples on the fate of this Organization—a fate that seems similar to that of the League of Nations in the aftermath of the fascist conquest of Ethiopia. This state of affairs puts the world at the gate of a new and unpredictable order where the machinery of war has the upper hand.

187. Most of you—perhaps all of you—have once witnessed foreign conquest and occupation. You have all struggled and triumphed. That is why you represent sovereign States here today. The Arab people are not unlike yourselves. They are no less devoted to freedom; they are not weaker in the will to fight. Their struggle is backed by the sense of justice of their cause and by their faith in their existence and destiny, apart from the implications of injustices committed against them, and the wounds inflicted on their dignity. Thus when we insisted on a positive vote in support of resolutions condemning aggression and calling for the liquidation of its effects, we were not only prompted by Arab interests, because we have always stood against aggression on any nation. And we shall assume the same attitude of principle in any similar case.

188. The pressure which led to the failure of the non-aligned draft and the attempt to consecrate the logic of force demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that the colonial and imperialist Powers are leading the world into war.

189. We are not in a position to determine the fate of the world as to war or peace, but we are in a position to affirm that small developing nations are determined to preserve their human values and to safeguard human civilization and its outstanding achievements. It becomes clear that those who stood against the non-aligned draft resolution, while supporting the Latin American draft, have in fact voted in support of a new war.

190. The United States, which subjected the delegations to its pressure in 1947 in order to create Israel, is exerting today a stronger pressure to confirm Israeli aggression and continuous expansion, thus giving the green light to those who, intoxicated with Hitlerite arrogance, have undertaken a new round against the Arab homeland to fulfil the Israeli dream of the constitution of a State from the Euphrates to the Nile. We shall not bow to this, nor shall the Arab people accept occupation. This should be clearly realized, lest miscalculation lead to the gravest dangers.

191. The Latin American resolution, which links withdrawal to other solutions of the Palestinian question, ignores the realities of life and the feelings of the Arab people.

192. Indeed, no Arab statesman on the face of this earth can sit with the invading enemy to negotiate peace. As a matter of fact, no one who has any respect for human dignity can ask the victim to stretch its hand to the criminal. Our children have been burnt with napalm; our girls have been raped; the blood has been drawn from the veins of our youths; our aged have been rendered homeless; our values have been profaned. And upon all this the Latin American draft resolution comes just to deepen our wounds and humiliation. Do the sponsors of that resolution await the actual occupation of their land in order to become aware of the feelings of the Arab people, and to realize once and for all that people cannot accept solutions imposed by force?

193. The countries of Latin America, with which we share many objective ties and brotherly mutual feelings, and where Arab communities live, loyal to their new homeland, owing no dual allegiance, have confirmed through their resolution, which is inspired by the United States, that while their hearts are on our side, their swords are brandished against us.

194. As to the draft resolution on Jerusalem submitted by Pakistan [A/L.527/Rev.1], we voted for it. Our vote was not based only upon the historical and religious importance of the Holy City, but also on the fact that we consider each grain of our soil sacred and dear to us. Crusaders have in the past occupied our homeland under the guise of protecting the Holy Places. But soon it appeared that what the Crusaders were seeking was neither the Holy Places nor the spiritual values they embody. What they sought was a mere colonial conquest, not different from what world Zionism is seeking today. The draft resolution on Jerusalem should remind all conquerors that the

Arab homeland, which is the cradle of their religions, does not need their colonialism to protect the sources of revelation.

195. They have sold the Messiah for thirty pieces of silver and have surrendered him to his persecutors. Today they are crucifying his values afresh. In spite of the statements of President Johnson, in spite of the sanctity of Jerusalem, the delegation of the United States abstained from voting on that resolution. Likewise, Italy, where the Holy See is located, abstained. What a paradox!

196. We affirm that those countries which voted for the Pakistan draft resolution—which denies to Israel the annexation of Jerusalem—but who at the same time opposed the non-aligned countries' draft, were contradicting themselves. It would have been logical if they had supported the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries in the event they could not condone the radical provisions of the Soviet draft, or that of Albania, or the Cuban amendment.

197. Now, we abstained on the draft resolution sponsored by Sweden and other countries [A/L.526 and Add.1-3], because, in spite of our deep conviction as to the good intentions of many States which contributed to this draft resolution, we were suspicious of other intentions. For, after all, it is pertinent to wonder why there is the contradictory dual stand whereby States that vote in favour of the aggression and the occupation, that were at the origin of the expulsion of nationals and of the suffering of the refugees, come afterwards to vote for this humanitarian resolution and ask the criminal to be merciful with the victim. These are hypocritical tears over the wounds of the martyr; this is contempt for world opinion and the dignity of the Arabs. Shamelessly do they vote for the uprooting of Arabs, thereafter reducing them to international beggars who live on \$1.25 a month, while the United States spends a quarter of a million dollars in order to kill another Vietnamese.

198. We appreciate and are grateful for those well-intentioned delegations which contributed to the adoption of this humanitarian resolution [2252 (ES-V)], but we shall never accept the transformation of our Arab people into new refugees, whose number increases every day. Yet experience in the past has shown that Israel did not implement any resolution on refugees and did not respond to the latest Security Council resolution [237 (1967)] on the treatment of prisoners of war and civilians. We have sent many letters to the Secretary-General about the violations committed by the invaders, but in spite of his esteemed efforts, Israel has not complied with any resolution. One example may be enough. Our Consul General in Jerusalem, seized while inside the Belgian Consulate there, is still imprisoned by the Israelis and subjected to torture and persecution.

199. As to those who speak of economic assistance, instead of condemning aggression and calling for withdrawal, as embodied in the Soviet, Albanian and non-aligned resolutions, those who deliberately mislead the world, to them we say: "Leave us with our skin. We are in no need of your coats. We shall never sell our dignity and our freedom for money. What your monopolies are usurping out of the resources of our Arab homeland is enough to transform our countries

into Paradise. Had it not been for your imperialism and your Israel, we would even have contributed to the assistance and welfare of other peoples struggling in our Third World."

200. The obstruction preventing this international Organization from fulfilling its responsibilities in the protection of the independence of peoples prompts the small nations soberly to ponder over their relationship with this supreme international Organization struck, as it is, so fatally by colonialism. As a matter of fact, successfully blocking the passage of a draft resolution which condemns aggression and immediately ends foreign conquest is tantamount to a disaster visited upon the whole world. This is the final funeral of the United Nations which is meant to symbolize the expectations of peoples to a life of dignity, peace, law and justice.

201. It is high time to pause and ask ourselves this grave question: Shall we let colonialism devour our peoples one after another, or shall we face our responsibilities as a united front that includes all freedom-loving countries and peoples, faithful to the preservation of human dignity, inside and outside the United Nations. The latter solution must, in our opinion, be the only way to save international peace and to impose retreat on the ferocious colonial thrust.

202. Allow me, at last, on this historic occasion, to present our thanks to all those friendly States which stood by justice and equity, and which expressed by their stand the conscience of the majority of the nations of the world. We feel that their elementary positions have opened our eyes towards the future, strengthened our faith in the victory of freedom, and disclosed the honest voices inside the West itself, all of which were illustrated in the noble stand of General de Gaulle and Spain. Those positions, moreover, have reaffirmed the close bonds that link us with our free brothers in Asia and Africa, and reassured the honest support given to the struggling peoples by the Soviet Union, our sincere and loyal friend, and the socialist countries. It is, indeed, a big gain when peoples are able to distinguish between friends of freedom and its murderers.

203. The Arab people, being resolute in their determination to go ahead with their struggle, extend their hands to all those noble countries which stood by the side of right and justice. Your noble stand shall be engraved in the hearts and mind of the Arab people which learnt, throughout their ordeals, how to be truthful towards their friends, and which also know how to hate their hangmen and how to revenge their dignity no matter how long it takes. The future will witness the victory for the cause of freedom and just peace.

204. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Costa Rica has asked for the floor in exercise of his right of reply.

205. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): I can understand how it is that in these difficult times which the nations of the Middle East are experiencing their representatives reach a degree of passion and emotion that perhaps prevents their weighing the exact force of their words. Nevertheless, I cannot pass over in silence the last words of

the Syrian representative, who tried to say that the countries sponsoring the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1] are not proceeding on the basis of our own conviction and the dignity of our countries, but are being used by other interests and are under pressure from other countries.

206. The countries of Latin America—and among them Costa Rica—take pride in their tradition of free and independent peoples, which today may support one country and tomorrow another, according to whether justice lies with one side or with the other.

207. We who represent those countries behave in the Assembly according to the convictions of our conscience and the instructions of our Ministries. We do not take orders or ask for instructions from Washington, any more than we ask for them from Moscow, Cairo or Damascus. We ask for instructions from our capitals, our Governments and our Presidents.

208. The reason why we submitted the proposal that was discussed here and did not co-sponsor that of the non-aligned countries is that we wanted—and want—there to be peace in the Middle East; not an armistice, not a cease-fire, but lasting peace. We did not want, and we do not want, a recurrence of the situation of 5 June of this year, in which mines were obstructing the Gulf of Aqaba and closing the passage through the Tiranian Straits, in which the ships of a State Member of the United Nations were unable to go through the Suez Canal, in which the right of existence of a State recognized by the United Nations and by our Governments is not recognized by other States which also are Members of the United Nations and have promised to respect the principles enshrined in the Charter.

209. We want permanent peace, we want the Arab and Jewish peoples to forget their bitterness and their past and to look to the future with confidence, starting afresh along the road that can lead them to a far better future.

210. This may seem like impossible optimism, but we remember the history of mankind; we know that France and England fought for a thousand years and at the end of a thousand years, after the defeat of Bonaparte, they became brother nations and have never again shed their blood because of one firing upon the other. And if we look at Germany and the United States, we can see that today they are following more or less the same road, seeking the democracy in which they both believe—and all this despite the fact that they fought against one another not long ago.

211. It is the hope of the Latin American States—it is Costa Rica's hope—that those who lost their lives in the Middle East crisis will not have died in vain and that the blood that was shed there, and that we all lament, will serve to bring a new era of peace to this historic region and to all mankind.

212. I felt compelled to say these words because the things that the Syrian representative said grieved me very much.

213. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, in exercise of his right of reply.

214. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): My good friend from Costa Rica has made an impassioned statement in reply to one of us, to none other than my brother from Syria. But let it be known that any reply made to one of us Arabs constitutes a reply to the whole Arab nation, regardless of our multifarious ideologies and regardless of whether we are monarchists or socialists, believers in God or atheists. When it comes to a colonial Power which occupies our homeland, and not Costa Rica, we all become one. Let there be no mistake, no wedge can be driven between us. Let Costa Rica and all its friends, who are our brothers in tradition, know that the parallel that our Costa Rican colleague has given does not apply, because the United States never had any intention of occupying Germany and, conversely, Germany did not want to occupy the United States.

215. Your hair, my good friend from Costa Rica, is as white as mine, but you cannot raise your voice and try by raising your voice to convince people and cover up what the State with whom you are aligned in the Organization of American States calls "the community of interests" amongst you. We will excuse you and say that the community of interests in your hemisphere dictate to you that you should work out a solidarity. As for the Arabs—I do not know how many millions there are—we collectively say to you that you need not come and tell us how we should settle our affairs. I think, with all respect to you, that it is a little presumptuous for you to do so.

216. Have the Arabs hurt any Latin American Republic? Have we interfered in your domestic affairs? Have we cursed you or maligned you, my dear friend from Costa Rica? Have we ever done anything but extol the Arab-Hispanic tradition of your countries, a humanizing tradition?

217. Would you, my friend from Costa Rica, if you were sitting in your home with your family, give way to somebody who would eject you and your family from your house and perhaps kill some of them? What would happen if someone came to you and said: "Never mind, forget the past; these tragedies occur"? You may be a Christian, and a good Christian at that, and you may forgive, but how many times have I told you in person and from this rostrum or in United Nations committee for the last twenty years—I do not know how long you have been here—that it is not what you and I want, but what the galvanized Arab world desires?

218. Perhaps I am at odds with the Arab world on many issues, but on this issue I have assured you, and I can assure you again from this rostrum, that the Arabs will die to the last man, unfortunately so in defence of their homeland of which Palestine is part and parcel. You may call it a psychosis, you may call it an obsession, but we call it injustice. Call it by whatever name you will, the Arabs will never give up their struggle. Not I; I am a man committed to peace. I have been here for twenty years dedicating myself to peace. The trouble is that the Arab world will not heed your warnings or my warnings, or the warnings of the President or the Secretary-General. What do you want to do, kill the Arabs? Try to kill them. If here they shot the Red Indians, you cannot shoot 100 million Arabs; they will bring the whole world down with them. Not I, not you, not His Holiness the Pope,

not U Thant, not Mr. Pazhwak and not our brothers here; it is the Arab world, galvanized and electrified. Call it a collective psychosis, call it by whatever name you wish, but we have warned you time and again of what will happen from now on.

219. I assure you, my friend from Costa Rica, and I still do not think there is enmity between us, do not believe in short periods of false tranquillity that may ensue. I am a product of the Arab world and should know the situation there. Do not believe those who say that I have been here too long and that I have lost touch with the Arab world. Every year I go back to my Arab homeland and I sit under a tree and watch the birds fly and watch the children grow. The peaceful life in some places exists now exactly as it existed when Jesus was there, together with the patriarchal life of the family, our traditions, our customs and our language. Even if we wanted to hurt somebody from outside, my good friend from Costa Rica, we are not capable of doing it. We are for peace, but even if we were for war, we could not hurt Costa Rica, we could not hurt Argentina, we could not hurt Brazil, we could not hurt all of you.

220. You say that nobody put pressure on you, but what about pressure being exerted on the capitals of the world? What about the aid which is given not only to Latin America, but to many States by the big Powers? Look at me with one eye, and I will look at you with two. There is a moral chain with which aid is tied, even though it is said that is unconditional and that there are no strings attached to aid. Most of the under-developed countries are in need of aid, and there is nothing wrong with aid, but how many Governments will heed justice when aid is the deciding factor for a big Power in order to see how a policy will be aligned? This is human. There is nothing evil about aid. As I have said before from this rostrum, it is a question of special arrangements and power politics, and not justice, which decide many an issue at the United Nations.

221. Therefore, I depart from you now at this session, not as a foe, not as someone who, because of what you have said, would like to see any harm come to you. As an Arab, my heart goes to you, my Latin American brother. Open your eyes to truth, unblock your ears to justice, and then Jew and Gentile, Moslem and Buddhist, Hindu and Shintoist will live in peace; but do not let anyone put something over you, to use religion, in this case Judaism, a noble religion, as a motive for political ends. Let us reason with each other.

222. Time and again I will repeat my suggestion: let our Western Zionist neighbours open the gates of emigration for those European Jews who, unfortunately, suffered at the hands of Western Europeans, and I bet you anything, my friend from Costa Rica, it will not be long before a stream of emigrants will flow out of Israel. Open the gates of Costa Rica for them; open the gates of Brazil; open the gates of Argentina; open the gates of Australia—England is too small now; it is the author of the trouble; it was but it is not now—open the plains of Texas; open the plains of Kansas; open Canada and its prairies for them. And I am sure that they, with their ingenuity—they are diligent people, those Western Zionists—will sow a number of sky-



scrapers; they will bring you more computers. And leave us in peace in our Arab homeland, to live in peace. How many times have I told you that we are not against the Jews; the Jews are our brothers, the Oriental Jews. The German was a Christian, and so was the Frenchman a Christian. But they cut each other's throats. But the Oriental Jews have never cut our throats and we have never cut theirs. I am talking in collective terms of our Jewish brethren.

223. Zionism is an incursion in our midst, a colonialism. Do you want it in Costa Rica, my friend? I am sure you do not. Please be reasonable. Please do not let oratory get away with you or with me. Let love prevail between us, peace based on love and justice and on the will of the people who think that they are hurt. And may God forgive me if I have said anything to hurt you or any one of these brothers, or even my foes. We are not here to hurt each other; we are dedicated here to real peace, to harmony, to one world, without a new form of colonialism among us.

224. But if we say, forgive us if we have hurt you, please know that you are hurting us, perhaps inadvertently. If, time and again, we tell you and tell our friends from the United States and other Western Powers, you are hurting us, and they block their ears, my good friend from Costa Rica and others, take the cotton wool from their ears, remove the veil from their eyes, let them see and feel with us. And may God bless even the Western Israelis with bounty if they go and build up any home or disperse themselves among you like many of my Jewish friends and become loyal citizens of the countries where they happen to be or to which they may elect to go. And we will live in peace with our Oriental Jewish brothers, even in Palestine, because for centuries they lived as brothers with us.

225. One last word; I must tell you, from my humble knowledge of the history of the area, many of those Moslems and Christians who live in Palestine were at one time Jews. They were converted to Christianity or Islam. Whether they were converted or not, they are still our brothers because we worship the same God. And may God have mercy on you all.

226. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers on the list.

227. Some representatives have expressed a desire for further consultations in the interest of the work of the Assembly. After a series of contacts with various Members, I wish to inform the Assembly that a vast majority of them were in favour of the principle of allowing time for such consultations. Different points of view, however, were expressed on the amount of time to be given for the consultations. At the end of the discussions, all delegations agreed that, with the consent of the Assembly—which I told them I would have to consult—the next meeting should be convened a week from today. I also wish to inform the Assembly that one delegation stated that it did not agree that any time should be given for these consultations.

228. I suggest, on the basis of the above-mentioned considerations, that this meeting should be adjourned and that the next meeting of the Assembly should be held a week from today, that is, on Wednesday 12 July.

229. I call on the representative of Israel.

230. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): Mr. President, you were kind enough to consult my delegation on your procedural proposal and you told us that all the delegations which you had had the opportunity to consult—and apparently it was the great majority of the Members of the Assembly—had agreed to a recess of one week. You also informed me that during that time you would try to lend your personal good offices to parties negotiating. I am not sure whether you wished to extend these good offices in your capacity as President of the Assembly—I am not aware of any decision of the Assembly to request the President to intervene in discussions between parties—or whether it was a personal proposal.

231. I informed you of the stand of my Government: that we believe that this session of the Assembly has fully debated the matter on its agenda, that it has reached a stage of conclusion, that it has taken votes, and that these votes clearly express the viewpoints of the Member States of the United Nations on the various proposals submitted to them for their judgment and decision.

232. The decisions were made, the issues were clear; therefore my delegation did not believe it was necessary to continue the emergency session beyond the present stage.

233. Moreover, in deference to those delegations that still believed they needed a short span of time—twenty-four hours and forty-eight hours were mentioned—I wanted to keep our position reserved. Therefore, when I had an opportunity to speak to you, Mr. President, at a later stage this afternoon, I said that my delegation, having consulted a great number of other delegations, had found that they were not aware of this proposal to adjourn the Assembly for a week and to reconvene next Wednesday. I understand that a number of representatives were contacted by the President and I assume they gave their opinions on the request which was put to them by the President; but I am not aware that the various groups in the Assembly have taken the position, on this specific proposal, that the Assembly should adjourn for one week.

234. I therefore would suggest, in a spirit of compromise, to afford the opportunity to those groups which feel that they still can make a constructive contribution to our proceedings, that we have a recess of not more than forty-eight hours, and that we reconvene then and reconsider the situation after the lapse of forty-eight hours.

235. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has heard the statement just made by the representative of Israel. I should like to make the following observations.

236. I said that I had consulted a large number of delegations—as many as I could possibly consult during the time I had at my disposal. As Members know, because of those consultations I was unable to be in this hall during all of the important statements that were made here this afternoon.

237. During my consultations, I spoke twice with the representative of Israel. I explained the situation to him.

238. At this point I should like to make a clarification, since there has probably been some misunderstanding.

I did not say that I was offering my good offices in this matter. I merely informed him of the situation, in accordance with my usual practice, so that he might be aware of all the information I had. I said that certain delegations had requested me to help in this matter, but I did not say that I had offered my good offices or had agreed to any request for my good offices. There is a difference.

239. Furthermore, in my statement to the Assembly I said that there had been different points of view on the length of the adjournment. I did not say that there had been only one point of view. I added that at the end of the discussions no delegation had expressed any objection to the next meeting being convened a week from today. I confirmed this point with delegations which had expressed different points of view, and they said that they would not raise any objection.

240. Some representatives may have observed that after I took the Chair this afternoon, notes were being handed to me. They were from representatives whom I had not been able to contact and to whom I had sent messages outlining the situation. The replies that I received were in the affirmative.

241. I think I have done my duty to the extent humanly possible.

242. At my second meeting with him, the representative of Israel--whom I had informed about the agreement that existed--told me that he had consulted with his delegation and they could not agree to the proposal. I assured him that in the statement I would make to the Assembly I would inform the Assembly that there was one delegation which did not agree. I did so inform the Assembly, and the position is therefore quite clear.

243. If there is anything else that I could have done and did not do, I shall be pleased to give the floor to the representative of Israel so he may tell me what it might be. He has made a suggestion of his own, which, as I understand it, is that the period for consultations should be not longer than forty-eight hours. I consider this an objection to the suggestion I had made.

244. Therefore, I shall go back to the suggestion I put before the Assembly: that we adjourn this meeting and convene our next meeting a week from today. If I hear further objections to that suggestion, then I shall consider the matter in the light of those objections; and if I do not hear any such objections, that will mean that it is the vast and overwhelming consensus of the Assembly that the suggestion should be accepted.

245. Finally, I should like to say that it was because I had not been able to consult every individual Member that I announced this arrangement and thereby brought it to the attention of all Members in this hall. I hope the situation is now quite clear.

246. I call on the representative of Malta, who has asked for the floor.

247. Mr. PARDO (Malta): Mr. President, I very respectfully beg your pardon, but I just wish to point out that my delegation has not been consulted by you.

248. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will take note of the statement made by the representative of Malta. I have been in the process of consulting the Assembly and the representative of Malta has been present during that consultation.

249. Is there any objection to the procedure I have indicated?

250. I see that the representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to speak. If it is not for the purpose of making an objection, I would ask him to be kind enough to allow the Assembly to deal with this matter as quickly as possible.

251. Are there any representatives who object to the suggestion I have made? Since there appear to be no objections, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to the arrangements I have outlined.

*It was so decided.*

252. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to refer to one or two further matters in relation to our work.

253. In the light of the discussion which has taken place, and the decision of the Assembly, the next meeting will be convened on Wednesday, 12 July, at 3 o'clock.

254. I should like now to refer to a matter which concerns the item now before the fifth emergency special session. At the 1546th meeting of the General Assembly, on 3 July, while delegations were in the process of explaining their votes and while I was in my office consulting with certain representatives on the matter before the Assembly, one representative made a statement in which he referred to a high official of the Secretariat and declared that he had been able to get a communication circulated in document form only on the direct advice of the Secretary-General and on the personal instructions of the President.

255. Had I been in the Chair when that statement was made, I would have considered it irrelevant to an explanation of vote, and would have called the speaker to order. Because I was not present, however, I should now like to offer some necessary clarification. In the first place, it has never been my practice, nor was it so in the present case, to issue personal instructions. There is nothing personal about my instructions. Secondly, the circulation of communications of the nature here involved, as General Assembly documents, was not exactly in the normal form on which I consulted the competent Secretariat official in order to arrive at my decision. As on all other occasions, I valued the advice and co-operation of the high official involved.

256. Judging this particular case on its own merits, I arrived at what I considered to be the right decision: namely, that in this instance the communication, on its own merits, should be circulated in document form. Consequently, I also decided that the reply to that communication should be treated in the manner in which it was treated.

257. Since there are no further speakers on any point, the meeting is adjourned.

*The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.*