

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1551st
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 13 July 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

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

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHwak
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia): The inactivity of our Organization in the question of the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli military forces from occupied parts of the territories of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria—inactivity caused by obstruction and outrageous pressure in the Security Council and at the present special emergency session of the General Assembly—has already produced its first ill-famed fruit. It has encouraged the aggressor to continue his illegal activities with what he believes will be impunity.
2. Shortly after the occupation of the Old City of Jerusalem, and of Jordanian territory on the West Bank of the River Jordan, the Israeli Government, contrary to the Charter and the norms of international law, annexed the Old City, integrated it with the New City, and incorporated all of Jerusalem into Israel. And the Israeli Government proceeded still further. It also annexed other parts of occupied Jordan which it merged with its integrated Jerusalem. This action of Israel has provoked indignation and a number of protests throughout the world.
3. In our opinion, the General Assembly reacted correctly and promptly to the illegal actions of the Israeli Government when, at its 1548th meeting on 4 July 1967, it adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V), dealing with the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem. The Czechoslovak delegation gave its full support to this resolution, which rightfully considers these measures invalid and which calls upon the Government of Israel to rescind them and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would violate the status of Jerusalem, based on General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947. Israel, which has never respected that resolution and has never accepted the special régime of Jerusalem worked out by the Trusteeship Council, solved the question of Jerusalem by way of aggression in 1948, and continues to do so at present.

4. In its resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967 the General Assembly, *inter alia*, requested "the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on the situation and on the implementation of the present resolution not later than one week from its adoption". That week has passed and we now have before us the report of the Secretary-General [A/6753]. It is obvious, in the light of this report, or, if you like, of the letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel contained therein, that the Israeli Government has not implemented, and apparently does not intend to implement, the resolution of the General Assembly. Instead of a report on the implementation of the resolution, the Israeli Government, as we see, has launched efforts to justify the annexation.

5. The assertion that the action taken in Jerusalem does not involve measures of a political nature but only measures related to "the integration of Jerusalem in the administrative and municipal spheres" and furnishing "a legal basis for the protection of the Holy Places in Jerusalem" constitutes nothing but an attempt to conceal expansionist aims and avert the just and indignant criticism of public opinion in the whole world. The conduct of the Israeli authorities is only a further continuation along the line taken by Israel as early as the years 1948-1950 when the Israeli Parliament adopted a decision on the promulgation of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. At that time the former Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Ben-Gurion, declared:

"The United Nations...decided that our eternal capital should become a *corpus separatum* under international control... Our rejection of this shameful decision is unequivocal and absolute. The Government and the Parliament have simultaneously moved to Jerusalem and made it crown and capital of Israel, irrevocably and before the eyes of all mankind."

6. No one can be deceived by the attempted Israeli justification in the matter of Jerusalem. In spite of every effort to conceal the real substance, things, as well as actions of Governments, remain what they really are. Aggression is and remains aggression. Accordingly, annexation is and remains annexation. In the case of Jerusalem and its vicinity, the Israeli Government has committed an act of annexation that has changed the status of that city, which constitutes a violation of the Charter and of the norms of international law.

7. It must be stated that the call of the General Assembly upon the Government of Israel, contained in resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967, has remained unheard. Israel does not intend to rescind the measures already taken as far as Jerusalem

is concerned. This is a challenge to our Organization which all of us should seriously consider. We believe that an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly will resolutely condemn the stand of the Israeli Government and will call upon the Israeli Government to cancel without further delay the law on the promulgation of Jerusalem as an integrated city under Israeli administration.

8. Having this in mind, the Czechoslovak delegation, faithful to its previous stand in favour of resolution 2253 (ES-V), also wishes to express its full support of the new draft resolution [A/L.528] submitted yesterday, 12 July, by Pakistan, in which, *inter alia*, the failure of Israel to implement resolution 2253 (ES-V) is deplored, and the call upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken in Jerusalem is reiterated. We must not permit another flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and of international law to take place before the eyes of the whole world, nor must we permit such actions of the Israeli Government to escape condemnation.

9. The case of Jerusalem attests to the true intentions of the Israeli militarist circles which unleashed the conflict in the Middle East and started the aggression against the Arab countries. The insolent act of annexation of Jerusalem and its vicinity, which was speedily enacted by the Israeli Parliament as a law in the course of a mere three hours, points to the wider intentions of the ruling circles of Israel that are striving to extend their territory by the annexation of captured areas to the detriment of neighbouring Arab countries. The refusal of the Israeli Government to comply with General Assembly resolution 2253 (ES-V) in the case of Jerusalem is a serious warning to our Organization and raises the question of why Israel ignores and can ignore the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and where Israel has found support for such actions.

10. In our opinion, the reason lies in the fact that the Israeli aggressor has found among the Member States of our Organization powerful protectors in the ranks of certain Western countries, primarily the United States. This was also the reason why the General Assembly did not succeed in adopting a resolution demanding the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli military forces, as asked for by the draft resolution submitted by a group of non-aligned States [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1].

11. The General Assembly should take resolute steps, not only on the question of Jerusalem, but also on the fundamental question: namely, that of the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli military forces from the occupied territories—the occupied parts of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria.

12. The absence of any resolution of these questions enables the aggressor to continue its illegal activities and helps its efforts, through pseudo-legal acts, to strengthen its position which was acquired by force. The requirement for the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli military forces is all the more urgent at present, since we have witnessed a constant violation of the armistice by the Israeli military units.

13. In the course of the last two weeks, Israel has launched several grave attempts to extend the occupied territory, particularly in the region of Suez. Last week, it was even necessary to convene the Security Council, which decided [1366th meeting] to send a group of United Nations military observers to the region of the Suez Canal. In our opinion, this measure, even though it constitutes a certain positive element, can by no means eliminate the provocation of more armed clashes.

14. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, it is necessary to put a speedy end to this situation, to adopt a decision on the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces from the occupied parts of the territories of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria, to solve the fundamental problem of that region, and to liquidate in this way the dangerous hotbeds of conflict and tension in the Near East. Failure to attain this goal would produce far-reaching consequences for further development in the world, for the Charter, and for the entire United Nations. The peace-loving nations of the world would never understand why our Organization, whose fundamental mission is the maintenance of peace and security, failed to adopt any coercive measures against the aggressor.

15. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait): Like the five representatives who have preceded me since our meetings were resumed yesterday afternoon, I shall address myself in the first instance to the document circulated by the Secretary-General [A/6753], which constitutes his report and the exchange of communications between himself and the Foreign Minister of Israel in implementation of resolution (ES-V) of the General Assembly of 4 July regarding Jerusalem.

16. In the view of my delegation, the recent vicissitudes of Jerusalem have two aspects which are inextricably connected to each other, but which nevertheless may be distinguished logically from each other. The first affects the fate of the Holy Places in Jerusalem, and the status of the Holy Places as influenced by the recent measures adopted by Israel after occupying Jerusalem in the course of an act of aggression.

17. But Jerusalem is not only a Holy City with Holy Places scattered throughout its territory. Jerusalem is also a city; it is a locus of human residence, a place where people live and move and have their being. Both the fate of Jerusalem, the Holy City, and the fate of Jerusalem, the city, have been influenced—and decisively so—by the recent annexation of the city by Israel.

18. The representative of Pakistan dwelt in depth and at length yesterday afternoon [1550th meeting] on the first aspect of the fate of Jerusalem, and I shall not take the time of this Assembly to reiterate what he said and to dwell on that aspect of the question. I shall, therefore, focus my remarks on the fate of the city of Jerusalem as influenced by the annexation by Israel in the aftermath of its occupation as a result of aggression.

19. The document circulated by the Secretary-General, containing Mr. Eban's response, is, to say the least—and I am carefully trying to use the

least sensational words—an unusual document. It is, to say the least, an astounding document, because what we have before us in this exchange is not a dialogue, a question and an answer, a statement and a response; what we have in this document is, in fact, a succession of monologues. The United Nations says something, through its General Assembly resolution and the communication of the Secretary-General, and then Mr. Eban says something, entirely unrelated to the communication of the Secretary-General and the resolution of the General Assembly.

20. There are at least five elements in this exchange which one can discern as distinct from one another. The United Nations contribution raises two of these elements, whereas Mr. Eban's letter, like his statements before the Assembly of 21 June, 29 June, 4 July and of yesterday, 12 July [1529th, 1541st, 1547th and 1550th meetings], ignores the two elements raised by the United Nations, and deals with three entirely different ones.

21. The two elements raised by the United Nations are, respectively, the question of right and the question of future action. The United Nations ruled, in its resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July, that Israel's annexation of Jerusalem was invalid; Israel had no right to take the measures it purported to take in Jerusalem. That is the first element raised by the United Nations in its contribution to this dialogue. The second element is this: inasmuch as this action is invalid, it should be rescinded, and Israel should desist from taking further measures along the same line or in the same direction.

22. Mr. Eban's letter, however, ignores the challenge of the United Nations embodied in a resolution adopted with the affirmative votes of ninety-nine Members of the United Nations and without a single dissenting vote; ignores the challenge of the United Nations to the right of Israel to undertake the measures which it has undertaken; ignores the order of the United Nations that Israel should rescind those measures and desist from taking further measures on those lines. Instead, Mr. Eban advances three new elements.

23. The first element advanced by Mr. Eban is a creative contribution to semantics. He dwells upon the name of the measures undertaken by Israel, or rather, to be more exact, he dwells upon what, in his opinion, is not the name of the measures undertaken by Israel. That is his first contribution. The second contribution is the consequences and the purposes and the ends of Israel's measures—not their legitimacy, not their cessation, but rather their alleged consequences and purposes. And thirdly, he advances what he considers to be the historical context within which those measures were undertaken and, therefore, the historical, so-called justification for those measures.

24. I should like now to comment on these three contributions of Mr. Eban to this exchange before I return to the two contributions of the United Nations.

25. First, Mr. Eban's innovation in morality and law consists in the doctrine that a perpetrator of an act can arbitrarily choose what name to apply to that act, or can arbitrarily decide what generally

accepted name he rejects for that act; and, on the basis of that rejection, escape moral judgement or legal judgement of that action. It is a purely semantic play on words under which the perpetrator of an act decides what name to apply or not to apply in order to escape the appropriate judgement. Mr. Eban tells us that what Israel has carried out in Jerusalem is not annexation. He grudges us an insight into what legal definition he has of annexation. He does not try to tell us what he considers to be an acceptable definition of annexation, which would then be a yardstick in terms of which we could determine whether what Israel has carried out is or is not annexation. We have to accept it on his say—so that what Israel has carried out is not annexation—the presumption is that therefore it is not invalid. That is Mr. Eban's first contribution.

26. Mr. Eban's second contribution is a little more elaborate. It is an attempt to justify what Israel has done in Jerusalem—whatever name one gives it—in terms of what consequences will flow from it, according to his own analysis. And here he tells us in particular that there are three consequences which would result from Israel's annexation of Jerusalem: unification, pacification and compassionate humanitarianism. In fact, there are passages in Mr. Eban's reply which sound like hymns to the spirit of ecumenism, like songs and psalms of praise to the spirit of peace and compassionate humanitarianism which the action of Israel allegedly reflects and creates.

27. Unification, we are told, is the first consequence of the annexation of Jerusalem. But we all know that only that unity which is spontaneous and voluntary and chosen freely by those who are affected by it is authentic union; the rest is unification by tyranny. And human history abounds in instances of tyrants and adventurers who sought to unify continents or who, at times, dreamed of unifying the whole world by conquest. The union which Israeli annexation of Jerusalem creates is this union of tyrannical conquest, and not the authentic union of voluntary choice and spontaneous desire. The latest similar "unification" in human history was made by a mad tyrant who sought to unify a continent and to create a new order of unity for the world under his rule, a tyrant whose name Mr. Eban on several occasions has protested being associated with his own. The action of Israel in the annexation of Jerusalem is not authentic unification based on free will, but rather integration based on tyrannical conquest by force of arms.

28. The second alleged consequence of the Israeli annexation of Jerusalem is peace. May I recall to the Assembly the distinction which St. Augustine made in his City of God between peace based on justice and harmony, on the one hand, and peace based on the ruthless tyranny and suppression of will, on the other. Which peace it is that now reigns in Jerusalem is a question the answer to which I need not elaborate upon.

29. Thirdly, we are asked by Mr. Eban to believe that Israel took the trouble to launch a large-scale war of aggression, sent its men to be killed in that war, its resources to be destroyed, its armour to

be used, only in order to bring water to the parched lips of the Arabs of Jerusalem, to double their water supply, to open new schools for their children who, allegedly, had been denied the right of access to schools, to establish clinics for the sick who had been left to die without medical attention, and to expand social services, of which Arab Jerusalem, allegedly, had not even heard. We are led to believe that this act of aggression, occupation and annexation was prompted not by a greedy desire for expansion and territorial aggrandizement, but rather by a selfless dedication to the welfare of the victims of the act of aggression. And we are in fact almost urged, in the last sentence of Mr. Eban's letter, to express our gratitude to Israel for all the good it had done and is going to do for the people of Arab Jerusalem.

30. But even if this were true, the bringing of water to Arab Jerusalem, the opening of schools and clinics and the establishment of social services would not justify aggression and would not justify annexation. In the heyday of imperialism in the latter part of the nineteenth century, when it was customary to speak of "the white man's burden", this argument was used to justify the occupation and annexation of one territory after another in Africa and Asia during the scramble for those continents. But half of the Members of this Organization would not be here today as representatives of sovereign States had they not rebelled against this "white man's burden", this logic of imperialism, and had not the United Nations itself erected its structure on the foundation of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples large and small, developed and underdeveloped, white and black, and of whatever faith.

31. Mr. Eban's logic is seventy years too late, and it is a logic which the United Nations by its sheer existence has repudiated and by its present membership has destroyed. First, Mr. Eban speaks about what name not to apply. Secondly, he tries to justify the action which the General Assembly called invalid, by invoking the alleged consequences of that action. Thirdly, he turns into a historian and gives us his version of the historical context within which the recent hostilities in the Middle East took place and which, in his version, justifies the occupation and the annexation of Jerusalem.

32. According to Mr. Eban's version, the Arabs were the aggressors in 1967 and they were the aggressors in 1948. For one reason or another, he forgets 1956; he omits accusing the Arabs of having been the aggressors in 1956. But he does assert that the aggression which we all know is the reason why we are meeting in this emergency special session was an aggression by the Arab States against Israel and not vice versa. He builds that upon his claim that in 1948 the Arabs also were the aggressors.

33. Now, 1967 is still too fresh in our memories for any of us to need to be reminded of what really happened on 5 June. But 1948 is a bit remote, and Mr. Eban apparently believes that an untruth, repeated frequently, becomes the truth by the sheer weight of repetition. Just because for nineteen years he has been saying that the Arabs were the aggressors in 1948, he believes that that makes them the aggressors in 1948. May I just refresh the Assem-

bly's memory, and that of Mr. Eban, as to who was the aggressor in 1948?

34. We are told that Israel, which came into being late on 14 May 1948, suddenly found itself exposed to aggression by Arab armies on the morning of 15 May. But the record of April and early May of 1948 shows, without a shadow of a doubt, that on 9 April Arab villages in Palestine were already being raided and destroyed and razed to the ground by Zionist paramilitary and terrorist organizations, and their populations massacred; that on 26 April, the city of Jaffa, which was earmarked by the General Assembly for the Arab State of Palestine and not for the Jewish State, fell into the hands of Zionist military organizations; that early in May, the city of Acre, also earmarked for the Arab State, fell into Zionist hands; and that therefore by 14 May, prenatal Israel—embryonic Israel—had already raided and occupied portions of the Arab State of Palestine envisaged by the General Assembly.

35. Israel was an aggressor before it was born. Prenatal Israel had already committed an act of aggression. The Arab armies entered Palestine on 15 May 1948 at the request of the Arab community of Palestine, through the recognized representatives of that community, in order to prevent the rest of Palestine from being occupied by prenatal Israel, an occupation which now has been accomplished in consequence of the invasion of 5 June 1967.

36. Instead of answering the challenge of the United Nations to the validity of Israel's action—instead of addressing itself to the question: will or will not Israel comply with the order of the General Assembly to desist from further action and rescind earlier actions?—Israel chooses to talk on different levels and to raise different issues.

37. May I say, in all candour, that Israel has been emboldened to be evasive, it has been emboldened to fail to comply with the will of the United Nations, it has been emboldened to annex Jerusalem—and will be further emboldened to annex the remaining territories it occupies as a result of the recent aggression—by virtue of the failure of the United Nations to perform its tasks and to discharge its duties.

38. Had the Security Council and the General Assembly, in its present session, been permitted to order immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied as a result of the recent invasion, there would have been no opportunity for Israel to annex Jerusalem. But neither the Security Council nor the General Assembly was permitted to act, largely because one great Power chose to abuse its power and exert its influence in order to sway and twist the will of sovereign States and change the votes of delegations, thereby preventing the adoption of the resolution, the only resolution consistent with, and mandatory under, the Charter.

39. Thus, the General Assembly and the great Powers which abuse their influence and power in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, must bear a share of the responsibility for what Israel is doing today.

40. Therefore, in our view the draft resolution submitted yesterday by the representative of Pakistan

[A/L.528] is worthy of as widespread support as was given to resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July, if not greater support, now that the real intentions of Israel have become known. The draft resolution not only reiterates the proclamation of the invalidity of the actions of Israel, not only reiterates the request that Israel desist from such action and rescind its past actions, but also takes into account Israel's past record, a record of non-compliance with United Nations resolutions, and therefore includes in its operative paragraph 4 the machinery and procedure for implementation. My delegation views this paragraph as a crucial part of the draft resolution, as important as the other paragraphs, and exhorts all delegations with any concern for peace and the rule of law to support that draft resolution.

41. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland): Once again we have gathered here in plenary meeting to discuss the ways and means of liquidating the consequences of aggression committed by Israel against the Arab States.

42. It is a well-established fact by now that the overwhelming majority of delegations here have considered, and continue to consider, the immediate and complete withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all the occupied territories as the most important condition, without which there cannot be even the slightest possibility of liquidating the consequences of aggression and bringing peace to the troubled area of the Middle East. That is a logical conclusion, and a conclusion which is dictated to all of us by the very principles of the Charter.

43. The fact that today we are going to deal with only one aspect of this urgent and difficult problem—that of measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem—is but the outcome of the situation which was created here by the tactical manoeuvres of some of the Powers to block the possibility of adopting a resolution which in its essence corresponded to the sentiments generally voiced and which would have enabled the United Nations to meet the situation, fulfil its duty and take the appropriate steps. There is probably no necessity today to analyse all the methods and tactics used to block the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1]. But the same kind of pressure continued to be exerted today by the use of all available media to intimidate those who are thinking in terms of using the Charter and the United Nations to make it impossible for anyone who dreams of benefiting by aggression so to benefit.

44. To mention but one of the media, I am tempted to read a few lines here from an article by Drew Pearson, printed by the New York Post on 11 July:

"The list of nations voting for Russia and against the United States in the crucial United Nations debate last week was printed in fine type and most people did not read the roll-call. But State Department diplomats did, and they got the lesson as to who are the real friends of the United States."

45. In other words, it is stated plainly enough that the delegations here which voted for draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1 are considered by the diplomats of the State Department as the enemies of the United States. And yet, in spite of all the pres-

ures, no one here can or does accept tacitly the continuing process, for the time being, of Israel's absorption of the territories which it occupies as the result of military aggression. Those sentiments found their expression here in the unanimous approval of the Pakistani resolution [A/L.527/Rev.1] on the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem. For, to our minds, that resolution is nothing but a means by which the General Assembly has expressed its condemnation of Israel's efforts to annex occupied Jerusalem. It is in this light that we are summoned today to evaluate the extent to which resolution 2253 (ES-V) has been complied with by Israel.

46. We have before us the document circulated by the Secretariat under the symbol A/6753, which despite its title, contains solely the text of the letter written by Mr. Abba Eban, representing the party now occupying Jerusalem. Under the circumstances, we would prove to be extremely naïve indeed should we try to find in that letter any objective analysis of the situation dictated by a desire to comply fully with the premises of the aforementioned resolution; all the more since we cannot help remembering that it was the same delegation of Israel which objected to the resolution by its non-participation in the vote, and later by a whole series of statements made by Israeli politicians.

47. All those statements, as well as all the phraseology contained in the letter that was circulated, have one aim in common, and that is to camouflage the true picture and to gain time, which is being used by the Israeli occupying authorities with the intention of confronting our Organization with a whole series of faits accomplis, contrary to the premises of the resolution. Those intentions are so obvious that in spite of all the careful wording used in this instance they clearly emerge from the text. For in what other way can we understand the formulation, included therein, to some sort of negotiations concerning the places of worship upon which the Government of Israel has embarked and which, in the final analysis, can lead only to changing the status of occupied Jerusalem?

48. We should like very much to hear what right the occupying authorities had to enter into those negotiations, and whether this is not but another outright violation of the premises of the resolution in question.

49. The Polish delegation would also like to hear a report concerning what has been done so far in the implementation of the resolution, to allow the Arab population, which had been driven out, to return to Jerusalem.

50. We are also waiting to hear what has happened to the Arab population which was driven out of their homes, and whose houses in the very heart of Jerusalem were razed to the ground by bulldozers. We have already heard from Israeli sources that the Arab population, of their own free will, left their homes in the occupied territories. I presume that there is no necessity to elaborate on the conditions which must have prevailed to make those people part

with their own homes, leaving their entire wealth behind.

51. The absence of answers to these and other questions reaffirms once again that the action in Jerusalem was carefully prepared and constitutes but a fragment of a large-scale Israeli scheme to enlarge its occupation of Arab territories. This has never been a secret. One can also see it in the American Press.

52. What other interpretation could possibly be given to an editorial in The New York Times of 9 July, which, dealing with the failure to adopt the draft resolution submitted by the group of non-aligned countries, states:

"Premier Levi Eshkol called the vote 'a triumph of justice and logic'.

"The fact is, of course, that Israel would not have withdrawn from any of its territories even if the United Nations had overwhelmingly voted for her to do so. This applied equally to the resolution that was approved, without dissent, on the invalidation of the unification of Jerusalem.

"Israeli officials had gone to some length during the week, especially at the United Nations and in Washington, to deny that the unification was a political act, thus suggesting that a door might have been left open for discussion. There is no open door, however. The absorption of Jerusalem into Israel is so firmly a fact that any talk of an arrangement other than permanent annexation is hypocritical, and local and Government officials have been saying so privately in Jerusalem."

53. In the present situation there arises a question of paramount importance, and we have to have a clear and unequivocal answer to it. The question is: Where do we go from here?

54. Is it not enough that, as a result of the pressures exerted and the tactical manoeuvres applied, the United Nations has so far been unable to adopt a well-balanced resolution which could constitute an important instrument in introducing peace into the troubled area of the Middle East? Should we now passively accept the contempt with which the Israeli authorities simply ignore the provisions of resolution 2253 (ES-V), even though it received the unanimous approval of the General Assembly?

55. It is the firm contention of my delegation that only the immediate and complete withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories can create the premises for any future peaceful solution. This point of view we share with the overwhelming majority of delegations here.

56. But today, at this very moment, we have to utilize every means at our disposal and do our utmost to see to it that resolution 2253 (ES-V) is strictly observed, and that no violation on the part of Israel of any of the premises of that resolution is tolerated.

57. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): The draft resolution in document A/L.528, dated 12 July 1967, was presented yesterday by the representative of Pakistan [1550th meeting]. In introducing the draft resolution, he rendered honour, by his words and his scholarly presentation, to a subject deemed worthy

of great honour. Each of his words, each of his sentences, spoken in objective and scholarly fashion, stands as a landmark in the discussion of one of the most dramatic aspects of the problem that the General Assembly is faced with.

58. Allow me, at the beginning, to emphasize our perspective in approaching this subject. It is with a solemnity worthy of the matter under discussion—Jerusalem—that we approach it. We approach it as Arabs, Moslems and Christians alike. We approach it with all the holiness that it deserves, because to us Jerusalem is a Holy City, because we also sing the song of Jerusalem:

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.

"If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

59. To us Arabs, Jerusalem is a sacred city. It is not a mere place, it is also a time. In terms of its geographical boundaries it can never be understood; it is only within history, within four thousand years of history all assembled in one moment, the moment in which one should look at Jerusalem. In that city history is alive, speaking out from each of its stones. It is a history full of contradictions, full of tragedy, but it is a history that is revered and adored by all mankind. Jerusalem was never a city of stone, mud, business, politics and international intrigue, and napalm bombs used by the Israelis. It has always been a city of dreams wherein the human soul looked towards God. It stands proudly on a mountain, looking from one side towards the sea and from the other towards the desert. Within its walls are gathered the meanings of both the sea and the desert: two civilizing forces in eternal interaction, two primordial forces which, in alternating rhythms, have borne men to conquest and achievement. In this lies the mystery of its tragedy and also the mystery of its greatness.

60. It is in this spirit that we Arabs approach the problem of Jerusalem. And when I say "Arabs", I mean Moslem Arabs and Christian Arabs. Jerusalem was a Holy City to Moslems before it was to Christians. To Moslems it came before Mecca—the first Qibla; and then later it became the third, and remains the third, Qibla of Islam. In it is Al Aqsa Mosque, from which the Prophet Mohammed is said to have ascended to Heaven. It is one of the fundamentals of the beliefs of Islam.

61. But Jerusalem has a specific meaning for Islam. Let me quote some of the verses of the Koran that show the tolerance and respect with which this last of the revealed religions regards both Judaism and Christianity. To Islam, Abraham is the first Moslem. This is proved by the following holy verse of the Koran: "Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Nazarene, but a truly original believer who gave his heart unto God"—the very essence of Islam. Moslems are enjoined to believe in all revelations that came before Islam, as proved by the following verse of the Koran as: "Those who believe in that which has been revealed to you, and in what was revealed before you". Islam has always emphasized the fact that re-

sponsibility is individual, private; that: "No responsibility attaches to one because of the fault of another".

62. I personally—and please forgive me for using the word "personally", but this is relevant to the subject we are discussing—I personally approach this issue as a Christian Arab. I am an Arab and I am a Christian. I come from Syria, where the majority of the population, 90 per cent, are Moslems. The blood of my ancestors has nourished the sacred earth of my country. I am proud to belong to this great Arab nation, and I am also proud of being a Christian.

63. If I say this, it is because I want to remind primarily the Western world of its religious indebtedness to the Arabs as a whole and to my country, Syria, in particular. Must I mention that Christ spoke Aramaic, which was the language of Syria? Must I mention that the Sea of Galilee, which is now called by the Israelis Lake Kinneret, was part of Syria? Must I remind the Western world that the man to whom Christianity owes its theology and foundation, Saint Paul, came from Tarsus in Syria? It was in Tarsus that he was converted to Christianity on his road to Damascus. That road to Damascus has become symbolic throughout human history as the road to suffering and the road to conversion and to faith. Will that road become again, now that the Israeli hordes are at the doors of my sacred and oldest city, Damascus, the road to human suffering?

64. This old Damascus, that has seen so many conquerors in history, is witnessing another conquest now. But I, who am a Christian, want to remind the West that Saint John the Damascene, whose hymns are sung in Protestant churches all over the world, came from my city, Damascus. Must I remind the Western world of Saint John Chrysostom, who in his own times was the greatest orator of the Byzantine Empire? But even more than that, when Rome was taken, the Christian martyrs who were offered to the Roman mobs to laugh at while they were being devoured by the lions were Arab, and they were Syrians. Will Rome forget its legacy from Syria and from the Arab world? If it has forgotten it once, will it forget it again?

65. Thus to the Christians, Christianity as preached by Christ, a Jewish prophet, was a continuation of the Laws of Moses. No apostle has made this clearer than Saint Paul himself, a great pillar of Christianity, who in his letter to the Romans states: "For I also am an Israelite of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin."^{1/} To him, the prophecies of the Bible for the return of the Messiah were fulfilled by the coming of Christ, and this was made even clearer in his letter to the Galatians, wherein he says:

"For all ye are sons of God through faith in Jesus Christ.

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor freedman, neither male nor female; for all ye are one in Christ.

"If ye are of Christ, indeed ye are Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise."^{2/}

^{1/} Paul to the Romans, chap. XI: 1.

^{2/} Paul to the Galatians, chap. III: 26, 28, 29.

The meaning of this quotation will become clearer later.

66. For those Zionists who use religion as a weapon, it is only political demagoguery. It is only cynical hypocrisy when they speak of religion. Here I shall not use my own words, but the words of a great Jewish Rabbi, Rabbi Wise, who wrote the following concerning the false Messiahs such as the General Assembly has been subjected to, as it was even yesterday when Mr. Eban spoke:

"The false Messiahs who appeared from time to time amongst the dispersed and suffering remnants of Judah had no religious purpose in view; all of them were political demagogues or patriotic fantasists with as much religious zeal as was deemed requisite to agitate the Jewish mind and to win the goodwill of the masses and its leaders for the proposed political end, which was the restoration of the Jewish nationality and the conquest of Palestine. All of them failed miserably and left behind them plenty of misery for their thoughtless followers. And yet with that warning of history before them, the party of men called Zionists and the admirers of Dr. Herzl's Judenstaat propose to do the same thing in our days... We cannot afford to let it go out in the world that we are in sympathy with a cause which we know will ultimately result in harm to the Jews even in this country."

67. I listened carefully and intently yesterday [1550th meeting] as Mr. Eban was subjecting the Assembly to his traditional falsehoods. I have already had occasion in one of my interventions in the Security Council to describe adequately the eloquence and ability of Mr. Eban, who is one of the great sophists of our time, sophistry being the art and ability to picture good as evil and evil as good. But if I were to summarize the speech he made yesterday, I would put it in one category of sophistry known to elementary students in the field of logic as ignoratio elenchi. What is ignoratio elenchi? It is, briefly, the classical type of fallacy wherein the opponent simply ignores and evades the issue in question. I repeat, the opponent simply ignores and evades the issue in question.

68. What is the issue that the General Assembly is discussing now, as it was raised yesterday by the representative of Pakistan when he presented his draft resolution? It is this: First, resolution 2253 (ES-V) was adopted almost unanimously by the General Assembly, and this was referred to by the representative of Pakistan. No reference whatsoever to this resolution was made in the long intervention of Mr. Eban. Secondly, in his letter of reply of 10 July [see A/6753], Mr. Eban refused the unanimous request of the General Assembly, thereby holding in utter contempt the solemn resolution that was adopted by the Assembly on 4 July.

69. One typical aspect of the hypocrisy, fallacy and sophistry of Mr. Eban is demonstrated in his reply to the representative of Pakistan. I do not think that anyone who listened carefully to what the representative of Pakistan said would maintain that he questioned or denied in any way the relationship, even the close relationship, between Judaism,

Christianity and Islam. In words better than my own, he indicated in his presentation the dialectics, the holiness with which Islam regards both Judaism and Christianity—indeed this is one of the basic tenets of Islam. The representative of Pakistan simply pointed out a very clear and doctrinal fact, namely that there is nothing, to say the least, in Judaism corresponding to the extremely high esteem and reverence in which Islam holds Moses, the Judaic prophets and Jesus Christ, who was rightly described as the Spirit of God. Hence the argument.

70. But Mr. Eban, taking these irrefutable and irreducible facts, made a shambles of them in his own manner of cynical sophistry. As they say in French, "Il a enfoncé une porte ouverte"—"He broke down an open door."

71. There was no need for the long diatribe that he made. Therefore, a correction is needed. In this connexion, Mr. Eban drew a touching image of the mother and the child in describing Judaism with regard to Christianity and Islam. This is certainly a nice image, but, pushed beyond the level of slogans, such images are bound to lead us, I am afraid, to the threshold of radical confrontations, if not radical opposition, which might prove particularly unfavourable and perhaps even disastrous to the basic tenets of Zionism and of the Israeli thesis. For here, as far as Mr. Eban and Zionism goes, they are really on very shallow ground. I certainly believe it is better to avoid this thorny doctrinal issue. I am afraid it is a blind alley at the end of which, I am obliged to remind Mr. Eban, the new Israel, the true Israel is not your State of Israel but the Christian Church described in the Gospel and the New Testament as "the new people of God". If anyone has any doubt about this, I refer him to the Ecumenical Council Vatican II Declaration of 28 October 1965 concerning the attitude of Catholicism vis-à-vis non-Christian religions, for there the words "the new people of God" were used. Originally, however, it goes back to Christ himself and to St. Paul.

72. Concerning the return of scattered Jewry to the country that was their promised land—in regard to which Mr. Eban spoke of an eternal connexion between Israel and Jerusalem—I have to say that for any student of history, even elementary history, it is very well known and we affirm that such a connexion has undergone a most radical disconnexion, and that unless and until God Almighty, through a new supernatural initiative, which as far as I know is not at all expected, demands and re-establishes such a connexion, the temporal return of the Jews to the actual land of Palestine will ever be an empty dream, based on a flagrant injustice of the greatest magnitude, at best a fragile, precarious, temporary, non-viable human initiative and, in the present circumstances, an arbitrary one, in spite of all the conquests, in spite of the fact that they might occupy Damascus tomorrow and Amman and Cairo the day after tomorrow.

73. So far, in replying to Mr. Eban's statement, I have dealt with the theoretical aspect. But there was another aspect of his intervention and reply to the representative of Pakistan; that is, the actual situation of Jerusalem. There is no word in the Christian ter-

minology which Mr. Eban did not use. He said that what the Israelis did in Jerusalem when they annexed Old Jerusalem to the New and promulgated laws in answer to the General Assembly resolution was a landmark in the history of mankind, constructed in detail by them in the higher interest of all mankind. Mr. Eban even went on to speak of rejoicing in the ecumenical harmony. If that translated into practical terms means the use of the napalm bomb to burn alive the Arabs, Christians and Moslems, it is for the United Nations to give the real answer to the atrocities stated by Mr. Eban. I am sure that when it comes to these high spiritual levels, to ecumenical harmony, he knows nothing about the deeper meanings of these words.

74. The General Assembly has been given a rosy picture of Jerusalem, of bread being given to the Arabs, of freedom of worship, of freedom of movement and other similar fabrications of Mr. Eban's imagination. In reply, I am not going to use my words. Here is a letter written by an American woman called Mrs. Nancy Nolan, who is married to a professor at the American University of Beirut:

"My husband and I, along with our three children, lived in Jerusalem from September 1966 until June 29, 1967. During this time my husband, a physician, was spending his sabbatical year of leave from the faculty of the Medical School of the American University of Beirut at the Augusta Victoria Hospital in Jerusalem. There he was engaged in research work concerning malnutrition in Arab refugee children. Up to three weeks ago we knew Jerusalem as it lived in peace and security, its people happy and contented as they began to experience a taste of prosperity which they have worked so hard to attain in the 20 years since disaster struck them during the Arab-Israeli war of 1948.

"Today Jerusalem is an occupied city, ruled over by an enemy determined to irrevocably change its physical appearance and break the spirit of its people. These objectives are being pursued in many ways with the utmost speed and precision as we saw very clearly. After a three-hours' notice to evacuate their homes, the dwellings of approximately 250 families were bulldozed down in the Moroccan Quarter of the Old City to make way for a paved square in front of the Wailing Wall. In like manner the Jewish Quarter, so called after the Jews who rented land there prior to 1948 from the Arab land trusts, was destroyed so that a road leading directly to the Wailing Wall might be built. This area contained a refugee camp, many small workshops and numerous homes. The 2,000 to 3,000 people made homeless by these combined operations, all of which was accomplished within 24 hours, wandered the streets with the few possessions they were able to snatch up and carry until finally, in desperation, most of them had no alternative but to board buses which took them to the banks of the Jordan River where they crossed over into what remains of free Jordan. The Israeli authorities made absolutely no attempt to find or provide any kind of alternate housing for any of these people. Similar upheavals will follow in rapid succession

until the pressure of world opinion forces Israel to act in accordance with basic humanitarian principles."

75. I pause here to affirm that in spite of the humanitarian resolution [2252 (ES-V)] adopted by a majority of the General Assembly, these acts of barbarism are being carried on. The refugees, contrary to what the Israelis have declared, have not at all been permitted to go back to the West Bank of Jordan. They are still refugees, and whenever they try to go back, all kinds of difficulties are placed in their way to prevent them from doing so. Mrs. Nolan continues:

"Still more terrible than such forced dispersals is the immediate danger of starvation which faces the 30,000 people who live within the old walled city. We have, with the help of friends, canvassed much of the Old City population and have neither talked to nor heard of anyone who has received food from the Israeli authorities, in spite of the announcement in the 12 June issue of The Jerusalem Post saying that 'thousands of loaves of bread and bottles of milk' had been distributed free of charge to the residents of the Old City. Unless these people do receive help from the outside world within a very short period of time, they will have to choose between starvation and emigration to free Jordan, thereby abandoning their homes and businesses."

76. Here again I pause to say that they have been migrating and they are still migrating. Then Mrs. Nolan continues:

"Since up to the day of our departure there was no international relief agency working in Jerusalem or in any other section of occupied Jordan which could report to the world about these violations of all humanitarian principles, the Israeli authorities can pursue their aims unwatched and unhindered. All attempts of the Red Cross and its Moslem counterpart, the Red Crescent, to give material aid to the population of occupied Jordan have been ignored by the Israeli authorities."

77. As to the most crucial aspect of the problem, the sanctity of the religious places, the freedom of worship about which we heard Mr. Eban speak yesterday, here is what this American lady living in Jerusalem at the time says:

"While the Israeli authorities proclaim to the world that all religions will be respected and protected and post notices identifying the Holy Places, Israeli soldiers and youths are throwing 'stink bombs' in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and sectarianism is being fostered. The Moslem call to prayer, formerly heard from every minaret five times daily, is no longer heard in Jerusalem, third most sacred city to the hundreds of millions of Moslems all over the world. The Church of St. Anne, whose crypt marks the birthplace of the Virgin Mary, has been virtually destroyed, and the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem was damaged. The wanton killing of the warden of the Garden Tomb, followed by the shooting into the Tomb itself in an attempt to kill the warden's wife, was another instance that we knew first-hand which illustrates the utter disregard shown by the occupation forces

toward the Holy Places and the religious sensibilities of the people in Jordan and in the rest of the world. The desecration of the Christian churches, especially the Church of the Nativity and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, of which we know personally, includes smoking in the churches, littering the churches, taking dogs inside, and entering them in inappropriate manner of dress. Behaviour such as this cannot be construed other than as a direct insult to the whole Christian world.

"The deliberate bombing of hospitals in Bethlehem and Jerusalem, destruction of ambulances clearly marked as such, the strafing of doctors retreating on foot from an army hospital, napalm bombs used on retreating soldiers and civilians, terror tactics such as threatening the use of gas in Bethlehem and the kidnapping of children from the Old City of Jerusalem, are all calculated to drive people out of their homes and country. And the wide-scale, organized looting of stores and homes are some of the other terrible things which we have seen ourselves. It should be stressed that all of these things are being done by Israeli army personnel, many of them officers."

78. Mr. Eban, in his usual way, the traditional way of Zionism, of picturing Israel as a small, tiny State that is bent on peace and suing for peace, repeated this theme again when he said: "The whole drama of this session lies in the efforts of a great Power to intimidate a small nation." [1550th meeting, para. 111.]

79. Is this reality? Is Israel, which has occupied territory four times larger than its own territory, really that small State? If it is, and if it was able to achieve all these victories, there must certainly be something behind it. That "something"—the answer to this burning question—was given to us by no less a man than the Prime Minister of Israel himself, Mr. Levi Eshkol, whose statement was reported in The New York Times of Saturday, 8 July 1967:

"Mr. Eshkol acknowledged that he had put off military action at the request of President Johnson. He said that he had realized war was inevitable from the time that President Gamal Abdel Nasser had concentrated the Egyptian forces in the Sinai Peninsula.

"'But after the President of the United States requested...'"

What was this he requested? Now I pause to ask, What is it that President Johnson requested of Mr. Eshkol? I repeat:

"'But after the President of the United States requested whatever he requested,' Mr. Eshkol said, 'it was decided by an inner Cabinet group after consultation with leaders of Gahal and Rafi, who were then in opposition, to give him the requested respite.

"'After I explained the President's request, all agreed that if President Johnson asked us to wait a few days, we should wait.'"

80. Mr. President, I ask you and this solemn Assembly, could there be any clearer words to prove the

premeditated, disastrous, cynical, barbaric attack of Israel against the Arab countries? Could there be any clearer, more categorical, more unequivocal proof of the co-operation and collusion between the United States Government and the Government of Israel? What is it that the President requested except to delay the aggression of Israel unless and until the green light was given by the United States Government? These are not my words; these are the words of the Prime Minister of Israel, and they are enough to ponder over and to think about as to their inner meanings. Is Israel really a small State that is being harassed by a big State?

81. The same newspaper reports from Frankfurt, Germany: "Major-General Moshe Dayan said in an interview published here today that he would not hesitate to advise his Government to fight the Soviet Union if Soviet troops were ever used against Israel." We know that Soviet troops will never be used against Israel. We know that a great State like the Soviet Union would not even think of such an act; whereas the United States Government, knowing the cause of Israel to be an evil one, nevertheless supported Israel, giving it ten, if not a hundred times more support than that ever received by the Arabs. And so this small State—Israel—wants to wage war, according to its hero, Moshe Dayan, against the Soviet Union.

82. I come back again to resolution 2253 (ES-V), adopted by ninety-nine votes of the General Assembly, concerning Jerusalem. What can be concluded from the answer of Mr. Eban yesterday? Besides holding world public opinion and the General Assembly in complete contempt and scorn, and in spite of the fact that Jerusalem is only a part of the Arab territory occupied by Israeli troops, Israel has affirmed that it will not relinquish Jerusalem, that it holds this world Organization and world public opinion in contempt, and has practically confirmed what Mr. Eban said previously: that "if 121 nations vote against us and only one in favour, we will ignore the 121 votes". What the General Assembly is looking into now is the utter disregard by Israel of ninety-nine votes of the United Nations General Assembly.

83. I ask: is this the behaviour and the conduct of a party that claims that it is civilized and that it is taking civilization to a barbaric world where civilization and culture do not exist? I submit that if one individual is caught in flagrante delicto of the law he is taken to gaol; if a group of individuals is caught doing that, they are referred to as outlaws or a gang. So, given this utter disregard for the law of nations, given this belligerency on the part of Israel, in spite of the fact that the United Nations adopted at least a partial decision that this continued aggression should stop, by requesting Israel to rescind its laws annexing Old Jerusalem, we find that this band of outlaws challenges every law when it is caught in flagrante delicto.

84. If this is the behaviour of small, tiny, peace-loving Israel, I ask the Members of the United Nations what their fate or ours would be if not a small nation like Israel but a medium-sized or large-sized nation were to behave in the manner of Israel, replacing the rule of law with the rule of the jungle.

This is the clear choice before the Assembly: are we going to uphold the law of civilized society, as voted for by the General Assembly of the United Nations, or are we going to uphold the law of the jungle, as represented by Israel in its utter disregard of Assembly resolution 2253 (ES-V) concerning Holy Jerusalem? The answer is not mine to give, I leave it, hopefully, to be given by the General Assembly.

85. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Pakistan to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

86. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): At the plenary meeting yesterday afternoon [1550th meeting], I made a statement about Israel's refusal to comply with General Assembly resolution 2253 (ES-V). Mr. Eban's reply was an astonishing outburst. Vituperative and angry epithets like "disgraceful" are not the kind of words that the Pakistani delegation permits itself to use. It seems that Mr. Eban's reaction was predetermined and had no relation to my remarks. Were it not so, he would not have twisted what I said into its very opposite.

87. He said that I had made the assertion that Judaism is foreign to Christianity and Islam. I had said just the contrary, and my remarks are on record. I said that Islam incorporates the vital elements of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Does that mean that Judaism is foreign to Islam? I said: "We cannot be the followers of the Prophet Mohammed without an ingrained reverence for the Prophet Moses and the Holy Figure of Jesus, whom we refer to as ruh Allah, the Spirit of God." [1550th meeting, para. 23.]

88. Mr. Eban charged my delegation with religious bigotry. Where did he get that notion? I bewailed the raising of a wall of suspicion and discord. Is that bigotry? I expressed regret over the misrepresentation of the humane values and beneficent traditions of Judaism. Is that bigotry? I deplored the collapse of a heritage of tolerance. Is that a bigot's speech? I spoke of the symbiosis between Islam and Judaism. Is this how a bigot talks?

89. Then Mr. Eban charged that I had made a contemptuous reference to the prophetic doctrine of the "chosen people". I emphatically reject that charge. The concept of special burden, of which he spoke, strikes a chord of reverence in us. What I was referring to when I used the phrase figuratively was not a theological tenet, but a political doctrine—the doctrine that a racial or religious group or faction has a right to a territory superior to the right of the lawful inhabitants of that territory. We cannot but oppose any claim based on such a doctrine, especially when its enforcement means the dispossession of a whole population from its homeland. I have too much respect for the religion of Judaism to believe that such a doctrine could ever be an integral part of it.

90. Mr. Eban asserted that Pakistan supports the Arabs blindly. Apparently, he does not credit us with any intelligence. We support justice and the right of peoples to self-determination. We cannot be blind to the violation by Israel of the human rights of the Palestine Arab refugees for twenty years. We are concerned with the security of all States which are militarily weak; we are determined to uphold the Charter, which

outlaws war and conquest. We consider that no nation or people should be excluded from the rights and obligations under the Charter—no, not even the Arabs. It is not we who are blind. Scholars and intellectuals of the highest stature are deeply concerned with the injustice done to the Arabs. I do not have to quote again from the Jewish writer Arthur Koestler to establish this fact.

91. I shall now cite the historian, Arnold J. Toynbee, who said in a recent article: "We Westerners have a major responsibility for opening the way for a reconciliation between the Israelis and the Arabs by finding ways and means of doing justice to the Palestine Arabs."

92. It is our duty here to give expression to the sense of anguish universally felt over the present situation in Jerusalem and concerning its future status by hundreds of millions of the common people and the faithful all over the world. It is our duty to let their voices be heard despite the clash of arms and the anger that has been injected into this debate. This anguish is felt by 700 million people of the Moslem faith and by hundreds of millions of others. Mr. Eban would do well to show some decent respect for their feelings and sentiments and for the universal interest in the Holy City of Jerusalem.

93. Mr. Eban also charged my country, Pakistan, with always having supported a policy of non-recognition of Israel. In order to dispel any misunderstanding that may have been created by this statement, let me say to the Assembly that the first and foremost criterion which my Government follows in extending recognition of States is this: whether the State seeking recognition is able and willing to fulfil its international obligations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It is no secret that my Government and my people consider Israel to be wanting in this respect. I do not have to refer to the disregard by Israel of United Nations resolutions pertaining to frontiers, refugees, and other basic issues. There are a number of Member States in this very hall whose Governments do not recognize every other Member State also represented here. It has never occurred to my Government to question the sovereign right of States to determine for themselves whether they should or should not recognize other States. In any case, this complaint about non-recognition by Pakistan comes ill from the lips of Mr. Eban who, before the General Assembly even started to discuss the crisis in the Middle East, declared from Jerusalem that even if the General Assembly adopted by 121 affirmative votes, of 122 Member States voting, a resolution calling upon Israel to withdraw to positions held prior to hostilities, Israel would refuse to comply.

94. Mr. Eban put the question to my delegation: why did we not express dismay at the happenings in

Jerusalem in 1948? I am surprised at this question. The records of the United Nations bear testimony to the fact that from 1947 to 1949 Pakistan repeatedly expressed its anguish over the fact that the element of war and conflict was being injected into the Holy Land, the land of peace.

95. Then Mr. Eban travelled to another realm and preached a remarkable doctrine which has a bearing on the force and importance of all United Nations resolutions. This doctrine is implicit in his remark which I must quote:

"I confess to the General Assembly in all candour that, in view of the policy of Pakistan towards Israel and towards its neighbours, the fact that a recommendation affecting Israel's interest is drafted and initiated by Pakistan has an enormous effect on the moral weight that my Government and people give to such a recommendation." [1550th meeting, para. 92.]

96. What do these remarks connote except that, first, a Member State can sit in judgement on a resolution of the General Assembly and, second, in doing so it will determine the validity of the resolution, not by its adoption and the number of votes in its favour, but by its sponsorship? I leave it to the Members of the Assembly to ponder this doctrine and to judge how far it promotes respect for the United Nations. Mr. Eban was referring to resolution 2253 (ES-V) and trying to justify disregard for the resolution because it was sponsored by Pakistan. I am afraid that this is not complimentary to the other Member States which also sponsored that resolution, nor to the ninety-nine Members which voted for it out of their own independent judgement.

97. Those were some of the charges that I felt it my duty to answer. But these exchanges are of little consequence. We are not here to score points in debate. The General Assembly is concerned with an issue crucial to world peace. It is not only a religious issue. There are countries represented here whose peoples do not profess any of the three monotheistic faiths. The issue of Jerusalem, which is quite understandable in secular terms as well, concerns them as much as it concerns us because of its importance to peace in the Middle East and the world.

98. The position is that the Assembly has issued a categorical injunction to Israel not to alter the status of the City of Jerusalem and that Israel has disregarded this injunction. The issue is, what should the Assembly do to overcome Israel's defiance? It is to confuse this issue that Mr. Eban has chosen to subject Pakistan to criticism. I am confident that the General Assembly will not allow the issue to be confused.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.