UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1382nd MEETING: 22 NOVEMBER 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1382)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 7 November 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8226)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 22 November 1967, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Mamadou Boubacar KANTÉ (Mali).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, India, Japan, Mali, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1382)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 7 November 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8226).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 7 November 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8226)

1. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at its 1373rd meeting on 9 November and at its 1375th meeting on 13 November, I propose with the consent of the Council to invite the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Israel, Jordan and Syria to take places at the Council table and to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mahmoud Riad (United Arab Republic), Mr. A. Eban (Israel), Mr. A. M. Rifa'i (Jordan) and Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* The Council will now resume its discussion of the question before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Syria, and I now call upon him.

3. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): During the 1377th meeting of the Security Council, held on 15 November, my delegation stated in the clearest terms the stand of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic regarding the Israel war of aggression against the Arab States and the conquest of Arab territories, which resulted in what is referred to now, ominously, by Mr. Eshkol as "Greater Israel".

4. Today the Council is considering draft resolution S/8247, submitted on 16 November by the representative of the United Kingdom. As this session of the Security Council constitutes but another phase in the tragic history of Palestine—tragic only because of the unbridled ambitions of Israel, world Zionism, their allies, and the conspiracy of silence and callousness that up till now have surrounded Arab rights—my delegation feels it its duty to state once more, and in the clearest terms, the stand of the Syrian Arab Republic vis-à-vis the United Kingdom draft resolution.

5. That this session may prove to be crucial and a turning point has been expressed by many representatives in the Council, which has had "The Palestine question" on its agenda for the last twenty years; whether it may be so depends basically on the safeguarding of Arab rights, so far ignored and disregarded.

6. In every great historical cause there comes a moment, the moment of truth, when the whole past converges on the present and the future. In such rare and unique moments one is motivated only by concern for the truth.

7. But as one looks around this Council table, when the future of a whole area and the destiny of a whole people are being decided on, one is struck by an anomalous fact, namely, that the party directly concerned, the Arab people of Palestine, who should themselves be the first speakers to be heard—since they have never ceded their inalienable rights to anybody nor forfeited them—are totally absent from the picture. No reference is made to them in the draft resolution, except, belatedly, in sub-paragraph *(b)* of operative paragraph 2, as constituting the refugee problem. Yes, this is the Arab people of Palestine, the uprooted, dispossessed people in exile, crying for justice for over twenty years now, without so far finding justice in the councils of the world.

8. The United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, indeed, all the international documents pertaining to the unhappy history of Palestine, were not meant in any way to deprive peoples of their inalienable rights to self-determination in their own lands and their right to their homeland in which they had lived for over two thousand years; what is of pertinence here is enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter, to which no reference whatsoever is made in the United Kingdom draft resolution.

9. In our last statement, on 15 November, we outlined what we believe should be the basic guidelines for the solution of the present crisis. We stated then that:

> "... one of the cornerstones of the Charter is the non-recognition of the fruits of aggression ... that any solution of the present crisis which does not recognize that principle is a negation of the Charter itself ... that the new international order envisaged in the Charter ... involved the renunciation for ever of the use of force for aggressive purposes ... and non-recognition of any right based on conquest." *[1377th meeting, para. 6.]*

In fact, and once more, the very first Article of the Charter is a confirmation of these principles.

10. It goes without saying that the withdrawal of the Israel aggressive forces from occupied territories is at this stage the central point of the problem and should be the focus of the attention and efforts of the international community. The advocates of the draft resolution must know this axiomatic fact very well. That is why the question is a prerequisite for efficiently tackling the United Kingdom draft resolution.

11. While there is a mention of the withdrawal of Israel forces, this reference is almost nullified by the absence of any time limit or any *modus operandi* for ensuring this withdrawal. No clearer proof could be given to illustrate the ambiguity of this withdrawal than its description by Israel-Zionist sources. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency's *Daily News Bulletin* of 20 November describes it in these words:

> "Israelis are known to have indicated unofficially that Israel 'could live' with the British formula. The draft does not spell out Israel's withdrawal as to timing, nor does it say that the withdrawal is to be to the pre-June 5 armistice lines."

12. Moreover, this mention of withdrawal is made subject to a score of concessions to be imposed on the Arab countries, thus coupling it with conditions amounting to the liquidation of the whole Palestine question, a question which is basically and primarily the product of colonialism in the area. All of this is done purposely with a view to ignoring the will and rights of the Palestine Arab people. Even in the very mandate entrusted to the special representative-to-be, the call for withdrawal of the Israel occupying forces is not provided for. He is merely asked to: "proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution" *[S/8247]*.

13. Twenty years of experience in the United Nations of trying to resolve the conflict between the Arab States and Israel arising out of the Palestine question, involving scores of resolutions emphasizing the rights of the Arabs of Palestine, have been completely disregarded by the Israel authorities. Suffice it to mention that the General Assembly, at its very first session held after the expulsion of the majority of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine from their homeland, endorsed the recommendation of the slain Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte; at that third regular session the Assembly, recognizing the right of the refugees to return to their homes, directed, in its resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, that they be permitted to do so "at the earliest practicable date" if they so chose, and that compensation be paid for "loss of or damage to *[their]* property".

14. The recognition of the right of the refugees to repatriation to their usurped homeland in accordance with their free choice has been recalled by the General Assembly at every regular session it has held since 1948—eighteen in all; but what has happened to those rights, affirmed regularly every year since 1948? Why have they been glossed over in the present draft? Why is no reference whatsoever made to those resolutions, as if they did not exist at all? It is in the light of this experience and of Israel's disregard of those resolutions that we consider the present United Kingdom draft resolution.

15. A mere review of the events which took place after the Israel aggression of 5 June would show the rightness of our position vis-à-vis the grave situation obtaining in the Middle East and the reasons which compel my delegation not to accept the present draft resolution submitted for our consideration. In fact, Israel conducted its occupation, its invasion of Arab territories, while the Council was in session. In the case of Syria, the invasion of our territory started after we had accepted the cease-fire. There could be no better illustration to demonstrate how Israel was acting in fulfilment of a preconceived programme of aggression and expansion. The momentum of premeditation was so strong that the fact that the Security Council was just at that time considering the very problems involved did not deflect it from its course. Everybody remembers what happened in the Council during those dramatic and catastrophic days. My delegation referred more than once to the use of delaying tactics that would have allowed a new Israel *fait accompli* to materialize, more especially in the territory of Syria.

16. The draft resolution under consideration fails to take account of all these factors, contents itself with a mere, vague call on Israel to withdraw its armed forces and is completely silent on the systematic violation of the Council's cease-fire resolutions and the rejection by Israel of the resolutions of the General Assembly concerning the status of Jerusalem *[2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)]* and the return of the new refugees since 5 June 1967 *[2252 (ES-V)]*. It is inconceivable to Syria that this draft resolution be accepted because it ignores the roots of the problem, the various resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the Palestine question and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, and goes further than that; it crowns all those failures by offering to the aggressors solid recognition of the illegitimate truths of their wanton aggression when it speaks of "secure and recognized boundaries".

17. While the Arabs are being asked to surrender, the Israelis, who ought to withdraw their forces, on the contrary are consolidating more and more their grip on the occupied territories. If any confirmation is needed, a

dispatch from Tel-Aviv gives loud testimony as to the scorn with which Israel is treating the Security Council and the international community. For, as the Security Council has been deliberating and is deliberating, the Israelis are building new colonies in occupied Syrian territory, as indeed they have been doing in all other occupied territories. The following dispatch in *Le Monde* of 12/13 November is entitled "The Israelis establish a new paramilitary kibbutz on occupied Syrian territory", and it states:

"*Tel-Aviv,* 11 November (AFP).—A kibbutz of paramilitary type has been established at Kuneitra, on the Syrian heights occupied by Israel forces.

"The members of the kibbutz, which is established at the gateway of the old garrison town, plan to build a tourist hotel. In the meantime, they have started to round up the cattle abandoned by the Syrian farmers who fled during the Israel-Arab conflict.

"The provisional headquarters of the new kibbutz has been set up at Golan, near Kuneitra, and it was visited on Friday by Mr. Yigal Allon, the Minister of Labour.

"On Tuesday the President of the State of Israel, Mr. Zalman Shazar, accompanied by General Moshe Dayan and General Yitzhak Rabin, paying his first visit to the heights overlooking Lake Tiberias, 'confirmed'—and I repeat the word—'confirmed the intention attributed to the Israel Government not to restore those strategic heights to Syria.' "[1]

18. And today, this very day, as the Council contemplates the liquidation of Israel aggression in the area, new proofs are given which indicate Israel's own interpretation of withdrawal. I will quote part of the article appearing in today's *New York Times* under the heading "Israelis, Living in Tents, Work on New Fishing Kibbutz in Sinai". The very title of the news item is indicative. It is datelined "*Nahal Yam,* United Arab Republic"; so already a colony with a Hebrew name has been established on the land of a sovereign State which is a Member of the United Nations. The article states:

"*Nahal Yam,* United Arab Republic, 19 November.—The westernmost settlement in the Israel-occupied Sinai peninsula lies beside a salt-water lagoon on the Mediterranean coast, less than fifty miles from the Suez Canal.

"It is a paramilitary fishing kibbutz, or communal settlement, established by the *Nahal,* a branch of the Israel Army that combines fighting and farming. Its members are boys and girls in their late teens who volunteer for the often dangerous job of settling Israel's border areas.

"*Nahal Yam,* as the new settlement is called, is the most remote of the four Israel settlements that have put down roots in the occupied territories since the June war. The others are scattered through the Syrian heights and the west bank of the Jordan River. More than anything else, their presence has given rise to skepticism about Israel's intention of giving back the land she occupied during the war.

"At the moment, *Nahal Yam* (*Nahal* is an acronym for 'fighting pioneers'; *Yam* means 'sea' in Hebrew) consists of a number of large army tents pitched next to two single-story brick buildings. A clump of eucalyptus trees provides a meager patch of shade, but otherwise the scene is strictly sand."

19. Are not the latest Israel attacks on the Jordanian refugee camp of Karameh, the massacre of children and women and the murder of policemen the actual translation into deeds of the deceiving and clamorous calls for peace with which the Israel Foreign Minister is inundating the Council? Has the history of the tragic past twenty years been anything other than Israel utterances of peace accompanied immediately by killings and massacres on the spot?

20. Yet when we compare those criminal acts of genocide with Nazi practices the representatives of Israel protest with indignation. What, in their opinion, is the fit description of Deir Yassin, Qibya, Qalqiliyah, As Samu (for which Israel was condemned by this very Council only last year, in November 1966) and, recently, the burning of Suez and its installations and the murder of innocent Jordanians? We wonder how these acts differ from those of the Nazis. Of course, the only difference historically is that the Nazis have received punishment for their crimes, but the new Nazis, created to play the role of the henchmen of the colonialists, pouring the fire and napalm supplied to them by their masters on the heads of the rising Arabs, anxious for dignity and justice—these new Nazis continue to carry out their crimes with impunity. The conscience of the Arab people cannot be expected to acquiesce in this persecution, nor should the United Nations continue to evade its responsibility for putting an end to this outlawry.

21. Special attention should be paid to what is referred to as "a state of belligerency", especially in the light of what I have just stated. Who, in fact, is the actual belligerent? For twenty years acts of aggression have been committed by Israel against the Arab countries, resulting time and again in untold suffering and destruction and more claims on the part of Israel. Those acts always constituted infringements of the sovereign rights of the Arab States, annexing more lands and territories and displacing and dispossessing hundreds of thousands of Arabs. All that is done while Israel representatives are preaching law and at the same time practising lawlessness.

22. If there is a doubt about who is the actual belligerent, the records of the Security Council and the General Assembly condemning Israel for aggression should dispel it. The last of those was on As Samu last November, and I shall read three operative paragraphs of Council resolution 228 (1966):

"1. *Deplores* the loss of life and heavy damage to property resulting from the action of the Government of Israel on 13 November 1966;

1 Quoted in French by the speaker.

"2. *Censures* Israel for this large-scale military action in violation of the United Nations Charter and of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan;

"3. *Emphasizes* to Israel that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that, if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts".

23. There are no human beings who, individually or collectively, would on a rational basis resort to war for the sake of war. Peace is a goal which everyone desires and longs for, but measures of self-defence are perfectly legitimate and recognized by the Charter, and there is no measure whatsoever that we have taken which does not fall into the category of self-defence.

24. If the United Kingdom draft resolution is adopted by the Security Council, despite its deficiencies and shortcomings, it is to be feared that another unjust and tragic chapter in the history of the Arab world will be begun, because more gains will be secured for Israel, to the detriment of Arab rights. That is the more so since up to the present time hardly any nation in the world has been subjected to irrational hatred and defamation as have the Arabs at the hands of world Zionism, and indeed of imperialism. Our non-acceptance of the draft resolution should be construed, therefore, as placing things in their real, true and legal context. Regrettably, in a world where values are reversed, where wreaths of glory are offered to the victor of aggression, a restoring of values to a more just perspective becomes a moral imperative.

25. In taking that attitude we most sincerely believe that we owe it not only to the Arab people of Palestine, not only to the Arab nation as a whole, not only in the interests of a just and everlasting peace but also, and primarily, to the Charter, to this high Council and to this Organization, on which the hopes of small nations are pinned. Consequently it is our duty towards the principles and purposes of this Organization to stress the fact that peace and security, while being the cherished goal of every society, would only mean new oppression if they were voided of their basic tenet, which is justice. History has taught us all that the seeds of past wars were sown in every unjust peace imposed by force. A lasting peace cannot be imposed by force. One does not open the way for it by seizing another's property and demanding certain concessions before that property is given back to its legal, lawful owner.

26. Should the principle be approved of putting on an equal footing the aggressor and the victim of aggression, thus offering rewards to the aggressor, no safeguard would remain in the world to prevent one Power from overwhelming another and extracting concessions therefrom.

27. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): In my statement before the Council on 9 November 1967 *[1373rd meeting]* I had occasion to give a clear indication of my Government's attitude and preference with regard to the draft proposals presented then for our consideration. My delegation felt then, and feels now, that our paramount objective at this stage should be to expedite Council accord on a United Nations representative in the Middle East, so that such a representative could establish contact with the parties concerned and prepare the ground for the achievement of a just and lasting settlement of the difficult problems involved.

28. We have now reached the end of the road in our ceaseless search for an agreed formulation and it becomes our inescapable duty to decide on some set of guidelines which will best serve as the basis for the mission that we intend to entrust to a United Nations special representative.

29. In that first step which we want to take in the direction of establishing permanent peace in the Middle East, time is a factor of decisive importance, and I earnestly hope that we shall not fail to reach a final decision at our meeting today. The recent and repeated firing incidents across the truce demarcation lines are obvious reminders of the danger inherent in the present situation and emphasize the compelling need to decide on the first step that we need to take on the road which will lead from a state of fragile truce to one of permanent peace.

30. Since I last spoke on the subject a number of new proposals have been put forward for our consideration. Having studied those proposals very carefully, as we always do, we have found it necessary to reassess our attitude and to indicate the line that we intend to follow in taking a final position on the proposals now before the Council.

31. As I have already indicated on a number of occasions in the past, my delegation's attitude and its final position on any proposal will depend upon three considerations, each of which is in our view of the utmost importance. First, no proposal can be worthy of our consideration, let alone of our support—nor indeed is any proposal likely to produce lasting results—unless it is based on the Charter of the United Nations and its relevant principles. Secondly, no resolution can have a chance of successful implementation unless it is balanced in its affirmation of principles as well as in its clear recognition of the complicated problems involved. Thirdly, the set of guidelines within which the special representative will have to operate must be such as, on the one hand, not to depart from the basic principles of the Charter while, on the other hand, to allow reasonable room and discretion in the representative's delicate task of contacts and preparations and in his search for a negotiated settlement.

32. The preceding are the three tests of balance and equity that we have always intended to apply to any resolution before we would commend it for adoption by the Council.

33. With regard to the principles that need to be affirmed, we deem it most essential that due emphasis be put on the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war and hence on the imperative requirement that all Israel armed forces be withdrawn from the territories occupied as a result of military conflict, and likewise on the need to ensure conditions of permanent peace in which all States in the area can live in security free from threats or acts of force. It follows from this that we seek the termination of all claims or states of belligerency and consider that there should be mutual respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the area.

34. Moreover, in our consideration of the deep-rooted problems that have afflicted the nations in that vital region, the problem of the refugees comes uppermost in our mind. We believe that so long as the refugee problem remains unresolved, it is bound to continue to poison relations of the States in the area. It is therefore the duty of the international community to insist that justice be done with respect to the refugees and that a final and constructive solution be promoted in order to resolve this grave and painful problem.

35. There is likewise the problem of freedom of navigation which has in the past been the cause of so much controversy and conflict. It is, we believe, in the interest as much of the Middle Eastern States themselves as it is of the international community at large that freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area be guaranteed for all nations.

36. These, in short, are some of the vital elements that we have always wished to see included in a resolution of the Security Council at this stage; and if we have shown preference for any proposal in the past, it is only because we have found these elements in them and have been guided by the belief that they were fair, balanced and reasonable in their presentation.

37. It is again with the same fair and open attitude of mind that we have studied the draft proposals that have been submitted since we last spoke in the Council. I do not, of course, intend to make any detailed comments on the proposals at this stage. I can only repeat that in the light of the statement that I have just made, our final position on any proposals will depend on whether or not they go a reasonable way to meet our test of balance and equity and on the extent to which they accommodate the basic elements that we consider to be essential for any Security Council decision at this crucial stage.

38. I need hardly remind the Council that the appointment of a special representative is only the beginning, albeit a good and necessary beginning, in what is likely to be a long and difficult process of building permanent peace in an area which has for so long lived under the dark cloud of mutual animosity and in a state of constant hostility and belligerence.

39. The United Nations has indeed a challenging opportunity to help usher in a new era of Middle Eastern relations based on mutual respect of rights and on constructive co-operation. But this can only happen if all concerned are willing and prepared to co-operate with the United Nations to bring this about.

40. A United Nations presence in the area can only be helpful if it can enjoy the full co-operation and support of all members of the Council and of the permanent members in particular. The permanent members of the Council need to put all their power and influence behind the United Nations effort if our Organization is to succeed in creating an atmosphere conducive to the establishment and maintenance of a just and durable peace.

41. Much will obviously depend on the co-operation of the major Powers and equally on understanding between them. My delegation was particularly encouraged in this connexion by the spirit of co-operation expressed in the statement made before the Council by the distinguished Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union in the course of the 1381st meeting on Monday, 20 November. I recall with equal satisfaction the similar assurances of co-operation expressed at earlier stages of our deliberations by the representative of the United States, our colleague, Mr. Goldberg. This, I submit, is a most welcome element in the common search for a negotiated settlement and one that can greatly facilitate the urgent task of bringing peace and calm to this war-tormented region.

42. Finally, everything will depend on the co-operation and support of the parties directly concerned, and I wish to seize this opportunity of addressing a humble but sincere appeal to them to co-operate with and to assist the special representative in his difficult mission of conciliation and peace.

43. In conclusion, I wish to reiterate the hope that we shall decide today on the first and meaningful step in our common endeavour and that we shall take this first step not divided but united for peace.

44. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Many of us around this table have tried very hard and sincerely to find a balanced approach to the solution of the West Asia crisis. The draft resolution *[S/8247]* introduced by the United Kingdom is one example of the sincere efforts which have been made since the outbreak of the conflict in June 1967. Another such effort is a draft resolution of 20 November *[S/8253]* introduced by the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union.

45. At the 1373rd meeting of the Security Council on 9 November 1967, my delegation, while introducing the three-Power draft resolution of 7 November *[S/8227]*, had explained our basic approach to the course of action which the Security Council should take to break the impasse in the West Asia crisis. I shall not repeat all that I said then, but I should like to emphasize a few points. In working out the three-Power draft resolution my delegation proceeded from certain fundamental considerations. First, any resolution to be adopted by the Security Council should be fair and balanced and should ensure mutuality of rights and obligations. Secondly, it should spell out in clear and unambiguous language the principles and guidelines within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations in order to achieve a just and lasting peace. Thirdly, disputes should be settled by peaceful means in accordance with Article 33 of the Charter.

46. Members of the Council will recall that during the fifth emergency special session an overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations, whether they voted for the Latin American draft resolution[2] or the non-aligned, Afro-Asian draft resolution,[3] had reaffirmed the principle of non-acquisition of territory by military conquest and had supported the call for the withdrawal of

2 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

3 *Ibid.*, document A/L.522/Rev.3.

Israel armed forces to the positions they held prior to the outbreak of the recent conflict on 5 June 1967. On this point there was universal agreement among the membership of the United Nations. Similarly, there was considerable agreement on the principle that every State has the right to live in peace and complete security free from threats or acts of war and consequently all States in the area should terminate the state or claim of belligerency and settle their international disputes by peaceful means. This was considered essential so that withdrawal does not lead to the emergence of the unfortunate situation of part war and part peace which existed in the area prior to the outbreak of hostilities on 5 June 1967.

47. I should like to remind the members of the Council that the three-Power draft resolution provides for the right of all States in the area "to live in peace and complete security free from threats or acts of war". While the first principle of our draft requires the withdrawal of Israel armed forces from all occupied territories, the second requires the termination of belligerency by all States in the area. The equality of obligation of all States is thus maintained in a fair and balanced manner and takes account of the views of the great majority of the Members of the United Nations as well as of the views of the parties concerned. The third principle of our draft affirms the right of every State of the area to be secure within its borders and also stresses the obligation of "all Member States of the area to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of one another". Taken together, these three principles of withdrawal, security and non-belligerency and the right of every State to be secure within its borders, form the core of our approach to the problem and correspond to the second point of our basic approach; namely, that the Council should spell out in clear and unambiguous language the principles within the framework of the Charter to bring about a just and lasting peace in the area.

48. These three principles of our draft provide an over-all context within which the long-standing problem of the Palestine refugees and that of freedom of navigation in international waterways can be solved. As I had occasion to state at the 1375th meeting of the Council on 13 November, the purpose of our draft resolution is to initiate the process of peaceful settlement of the West Asia crisis. Our draft resolution provides for the adoption of all peaceful means under Article 33 of the Charter to settle the dispute and gives the choice to the parties to seek solutions by any means of their own choice under that Article. We do not ask the Council to suggest or recommend any of these methods. It is left to the parties concerned to choose any of the methods of peaceful settlement.

49. The principle of the inadmissibility of territorial acquisition by force is absolutely fundamental to our approach and we cannot accept or acquiesce in any decision that leaves out territories occupied by military conquest from the provision of withdrawal. This is the central issue in any approach to the solution of the West Asia crisis. Once we are agreed on this principle, then the process of bringing a just and lasting peace to the area becomes an integral whole in which all principles that I have enumerated above acquire equal importance and priority. For this reason, the three-Power draft resolution gives equal validity to the principles of withdrawal, non-belligerency and secure borders. It also ensures a balanced and fair approach by calling for equal obligations from all the parties concerned.

50. I have listened with great care and attention to the statements made in this Council by Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom. Before commenting on the United Kingdom draft resolution, I should like to quote from two statements of policy delivered in the General Assembly by Mr. George Brown, the British Foreign Secretary. This has already been done by Lord Caradon at the 1381st meeting, but it will bear repetition. During the fifth emergency special session, Mr. Brown said the following on 21 June 1967:

> "The attitude of the British Government is clear. We want the area to be at peace. We recognize that peace demands the greatest measure of justice in its political arrangements. And on this foundation the progress of its peoples, especially of those whose need is greatest, must be based.
>
> "I should like, if I may, to set out certain principles which I believe should guide us in striving collectively for a lasting settlement. Clearly, such principles must derive from the United Nations Charter. Article 2 of the Charter provides that:
>
> " 'All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State . . .'. Here the words 'territorial integrity' have a direct bearing on the question of withdrawal, on which much has been said in previous speeches. I see no two ways about this; and I can state our position very clearly. In my view, it follows from the words in the Charter that war should not lead to territorial aggrandizement."[4]

51. On 26 September 1967, at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, Mr. Brown had this to say:

> "I should like to repeat what I said when I was here before: Britain does not accept war as a means of settling disputes, nor that a State should be allowed to extend its frontiers as a result of a war. This means that Israel must withdraw. But equally, Israel's neighbours must recognize its right to exist, and it must enjoy security within its frontiers. What we must work for in this area is a durable peace, the renunciation of all aggressive designs, and an end to policies which are inconsistent with peace."[5]

52. My delegation has studied the United Kingdom draft resolution in the light of these two policy statements of the British Foreign Secretary. It is our understanding that the draft resolution, if approved by the Council, will commit it to the application of the principle of total withdrawal of Israel forces from all the territories—I repeat, all the

4 *Ibid., Plenary Meetings,* 1529th meeting, paras. 14 and 15.

5 *Ibid., Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings,* 1567th meeting, para. 91.

territories—occupied by Israel as a result of the conflict which began on 5 June 1967.

53. In other words, the draft commits the Council to the withdrawal of Israel forces from the whole of Sinai, Gaza, the Old City of Jerusalem, Jordanian territory west of the Jordan River and the Syrian territory. This being so, Israel cannot use the words "secure and recognized boundaries", contained in sub-paragraph (ii) of operative paragraph 1 of the United Kingdom draft resolution, to retain any territory occupied in the recent conflict. Of course, mutual territorial adjustments are not ruled out, as indeed they are not in the three-Power draft resolution co-sponsored by India. This is our clear understanding of the United Kingdom draft resolution. Our vote on the draft will be determined accordingly.

54. In view of the position stated above, in which the delegations of Mali, Nigeria and India, the three co-sponsors of the draft resolution *[S/8227]* concur, I have been authorized to state that we will not press our draft to a vote at this stage.

55. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): As sponsor of the draft resolution in the name of the United Kingdom *[S/8247]*, I wish to speak very briefly before the vote to which we now are about to proceed. I shall do so in sincere respect for the part played by every member of the Council and with the utmost care not to raise any new dispute or to embark on any new controversy. On the contrary, we are all, I am sure, determined to conclude agreement.

56. We must now all strain every effort for harmony and unity, and it is in that spirit that I warmly welcome the decision which has just been communicated to us by the distinguished Ambassador of India, speaking on behalf of himself and the other co-sponsors of the draft resolution which they presented to us. It is a decision certainly of the utmost importance. It marks a turning-point; I feel that it opens the way to agreement and to action.

57. Throughout this debate I have tried to put forward five propositions, and it might be well if, immediately before the vote, I repeat them very briefly. As to the policy of my own Government, we stand by our votes and we stand by our declarations. We have throughout made our national position and our national policy quite plain.

58. Secondly, the draft resolution which we have prepared is not a British text. It is the result of close and prolonged consultation with both sides and with all members of this Council. As I have respectfully said, every member of this Council has made a contribution in the search for common ground on which we can go forward.

59. Thirdly, I would say that the draft resolution is a balanced whole. To add to it or to detract from it would destroy the balance and also destroy the wide measure of agreement we have achieved together. It must be considered as a whole and as it stands. I suggest that we have reached the stage when most, if not all, of us want the resolution, the whole resolution and nothing but the resolution.

60. Fourthly, I would say that every delegation has a right, of course, and a duty to state its own views. As I said on Monday: "Every delegation is entitled, indeed is expected, to state the separate and distinct policy of the Government it represents" *[1381st meeting, para. 40]*.

61. But the draft resolution does not belong to one side or the other or to any one delegation; it belongs to us all. I am sure that it will be recognized by us all that it is only the resolution that will bind us, and we regard its wording as clear. All of us, no doubt, have our own views and interpretations and understandings. I explained my own when I spoke on Monday last. On these matters each delegation rightly speaks only for itself.

62. I trust that now we can all go forward to approve the draft resolution. By so doing, we can put the maximum weight of this Council behind a new and determined effort to bring, at long last, peace and justice to all the peoples concerned.

63. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The United States is prepared to grant priority to the draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom, and will vote for it. If the United Kingdom draft resolution is adopted, as we hope and trust, we shall not press our draft resolution of 7 November *[S/8229]* to the vote.

64. As Lord Caradon pointed out both on Monday and today, various members of the Council have views of their own for supporting the United Kingdom text. The voting of course takes place not on the individual or discrete views and policies of various members but on the draft resolution. We will vote for that draft resolution. We do so in the context of, and because we believe it to be consistent with, United States policy as expressed by President Johnson on 19 June and as subsequently reaffirmed in statements made by me to the Security Council, including those made recently. Accordingly, I give our consent to priority for the British text.

65. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French)*: As there are no further speakers on my list, I propose, with your agreement, to put the draft resolutions before the Council to the vote. The order in which the draft resolutions were submitted is as follows:

(a) Draft resolution submitted by India, Mali and Nigeria *[S/8227]*;

(b) Draft resolution submitted by the United States of America *[S/8229]*;

(c) Draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *[S/8236]*;

(d) Draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom *[S/8247]*;

(e) Draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *[S/8253]*.

66. The sponsors of draft resolution S/8227 and the sponsor of draft resolution S/8229 have indicated that at this stage they will not press for a vote on their texts. It is also my understanding that the representative of the Soviet

Union will not press for a vote, at this stage, on the draft resolution he submitted in document S/8236.

67. If there are no objections or observations on the part of the members of the Council, I shall put to the vote the United Kingdom draft resolution *[S/8247]*.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.[6]

68. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) *(translated from Russian):* The Soviet delegation wishes to state that, in view of the situation that has developed, it will not insist, at the present stage of our consideration of the situation in the Near East, on a vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in document S/8253.

69. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria): When on 9 November last I spoke in support of the three-Power draft resolution *[S/8227]*, I said the following:

> "May I appeal to my colleagues around this table, as well as to the general public-and especially to members of the press, who disseminate news of our proceedings to them–to deal fairly with the draft that we have presented." *[1373rd meeting, para. 115.]*

70. Since that time a lot of statements have been made both by the parties to the dispute before us and by members of this Council. Those statements disclosed what we knew beforehand: that our draft did not satisfy everybody. But unfortunately, some of those statements seemed to suggest that the people to whom I addressed my appeal of 9 November had not taken that appeal too seriously. A number of unkind things were said about the draft resolution that we put forward that I think were unfortunate. In that draft resolution we had, as faithfully as possible, followed the Latin American draft resolution *[A/L.523/Rev.1]* that had been put before the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly. A number of representatives here have done what we also have done: they have paid a great tribute to the Latin Americans for their wisdom and their balanced position in regard to this matter. It was therefore very surprising to those of us who had done the Latin Americans the compliment of following their draft that some of those who joined us in paying that compliment for the balanced nature of that draft nevertheless said unkind things about our own.

71. I refer to this phenomenon because I do wish once more to appeal to my colleagues by pointing out that in this forum, the greatest of the United Nations, it would help our work very greatly if we refrained, all of us, from unnecessary misunderstandings caused by apparent misinterpretation. The truth of the matter, of course, is that our draft was as balanced as the Latin American original draft was. What was deficient in it for the purpose of the consensus here was the fact that the parties to the dispute were not agreed upon accepting that draft to the extent, at least, of being ready to co-operate with the special representative to be appointed under the terms of our draft. This we ourselves had recognized. My colleagues will recall that at the conclusion of my statement on 9 November I did say that if there should emerge from our proceedings a different formulation to which the parties to the dispute were prepared to lend their support by co-operating with the special representative to be appointed under that formulation, nothing would more delight the co-authors of our draft resolution.

72. Thanks principally to the labours of Lord Caradon of the United Kingdom, we now have adopted such a resolution. We all know how hard Lord Caradon laboured for this compromise draft. He worked like a Trojan. His performance and the results of that performance demonstrate what, given the right instructions from his Government, an able, experienced and fair-minded person like Lord Caradon can achieve in the councils of the United Nations. The Nigerian delegation heartily extends to him and to his country a well-deserved tribute for this contribution to our proceedings.

73. Two months ago, at the opening of the twenty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly, one of the most experienced correspondents at the United Nations accosted me and asked me whether I thought, in the current state of the world, the United Nations could reach a decision on the Middle East situation in the course of this session. I replied, in American parlance, "I sure do". He said, "You seem to me to be an optimist". I replied, "Yes, I am; not only am I an optimist, I am an incurable optimist". He said, "Are you sure that your optimism will not prove to be unfounded? " I replied, "I prefer to be an optimist proved by events to have been wrong than to be a pessimist proved by events to have been correct". Being an optimist and holding strongly to the conviction that anything can happen, I work very hard to see that what I believe in does happen and, with the co-operation of colleagues, sometimes what seemed to have been impossible at the start does get achieved in the end, as has been the case on this occasion.

74. But the resolution that we have just adopted is, of course, only the beginning, although a promising beginning, to our labours. The immediate duty of the Council is for all of us to avoid, in the course of our present interventions and outside at the conclusion of this meeting, any action or statement calculated to weaken the effect of what we have just accomplished.

75. Lord Caradon said a moment ago that it was for each of us to hold his own opinion about the effects of this or that clause of the resolution that we have adopted. I could not agree more.

76. We, for our part, feel that the resolution that we have adopted does provide for what we believe are the essential factors to the peaceful and just settlement of the Middle East situation. One of those factors, as we have reiterated more than once, is the recognition of the inadmissibility of territorial aggrandizement by military conquest and, as a consequence, the withdrawal of Israel forces from all the territories that they occupied as a result of the recent conflict. But one of the essential factors also is that this

6 See resolution 242 (1967).

withdrawal should take place in a context in which all the countries in the area, including Israel and all the Arab States, can feel and enjoy a sense of security. We therefore subscribe very heartily to what Lord Caradon said when he stated that the resolution must be taken as a whole.

77. We have supported this resolution because, taken as a whole, we think it can promote peace in that disturbed area known as the Middle East. And yet, as we all know, if we succeed in our objectives, that success will not be due simply to the fact that we have adopted a resolution today and have adopted it unanimously. That success will turn very largely on what follows upon this achievement.

78. It is the duty of all of us, as one or two of my colleagues have already indicated, to follow up our action of today by consistently courageous action in the future. None of us must encourage any of the parties to this controversy to cheat under this resolution. We must encourage them to help us open a new page in the Middle East. I think the parties—all of them—are now in a mood to respond favourably to that encouragement. And in this connexion, I should like to pay a tribute to the representatives of the parties for the relative restraint with which they have expressed themselves before this Council, because, let us face it, we are dealing with a very difficult and delicate situation. But may I, after this performance of today, appeal to the parties to follow up the restraint they have shown here with even more restraint if they intervene in these proceedings and when they arrive home in their respective capitals. We all know that there are a good number of people in those capitals who may not quite approve of what we have done today. Therefore, a lot of courage will be required on the part of the leadership to explain and support what we have done not because it represents exactly the point of view of this or that country, but because we think that we have achieved a compromise solution which could help them to settle their differences, a settlement which, we all know, will require a real change of heart on the part of all the peoples of the Middle East.

79. Another factor that is going to contribute to the success of this scheme that we have built up in the resolution is, of course, the personality, competence, ability and experience of the person who is going to be chosen by the Secretary-General to be the special representative charged with this mission. We are very glad that fortunately we have a Secretary-General to whom it is not necessary to give advice in this connexion. We know how carefully he goes about complying with the resolutions that we adopt. All we can say is that we wish him luck, we wish him success in choosing the right man. And to whomever may be chosen for this task, we also wish to say that we wish him luck and success. He will require all the luck in the world to be able to succeed.

80. But the Nigerian delegation feels that if the parties are prepared to live with the scheme we have here built up, if they are prepared to co-operate with the special representative and if the Council is prepared to follow his action with as much support as he needs from time to time, we shall be able to achieve the success that we hope for from our performance of today.

81. What is our objective in the Middle East? It is not the achievement of any special interests that Nigeria, India, the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom or any other Member State wishes to secure. Our objective is the well-being of all the peoples of the Middle East. We hope that what we have done today will contribute to that. We hope that it will help to begin to create in the Middle East a region free from insecurity, free from fear and free from hatred, a Middle East where stable peace and tranquillity will begin to reign.

82. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* I call upon the representative of Israel.

83. Mr. EBAN (Israel): I regret that this meeting should have begun with the statement that we heard from the representative of Syria. On his interpretation of the resolution I have nothing to say, but on his comments on my country's policy I must say a few words.

84. The Syrian utterance speaks for itself; it was a hymn of hate and aggression trumpeted by the Government which, more than any other, was responsible for disrupting the tranquillity of the Middle East in 1966 and 1967. The Syrian representative has repeated the revolting attempt to hang the odious Nazi label on the only people that sustained the full brunt and fury of Nazism without interruption or compromise for all the twelve Nazi years. What a sorry spectacle it is to see a tribunal of peace thus transformed into an arena of hate.

85. The policy of the Israel Government and nation remains as it was when I formulated it in the Security Council on 13 and 16 November *[1375th and 1379th meetings]*, namely that we shall respect and fully maintain the situation embodied in the cease-fire agreements until it is succeeded by peace treaties between Israel and the Arab States ending the state of war, establishing agreed, recognized and secure territorial boundaries, guaranteeing free navigation for all shipping, including that of Israel, in all the waterways leading to and from the Red Sea, committing all signatories to the permanent and mutual recognition and respect of the sovereignty, security and national identity of all Middle Eastern States, and ensuring a stable and mutually guaranteed security. Such a peace settlement, directly negotiated and contractually confirmed, would create conditions in which refugee problems could be justly and effectively solved through international and regional co-operation.

86. Those are our aims and positions. They emerge from five months of international discussion, unchanged, unprejudiced and intact. It is now understood as axiomatic that movement from the cease-fire lines can be envisaged only in the framework of a lasting peace establishing recognized and secure boundaries.

87. The time has come to adapt the Middle Eastern situation to the general principles and concepts which regulate the international order. Let us be done, after nineteen years, with truces, armistices and "demarcation lines based on military considerations" which leave territorial problems unsolved. The relations between States in the Middle East for nineteen years have been fragile,

anomalous, indeterminate and unresolved. The hour is ripe for building a stable and durable edifice within which the peoples of the eastern Mediterranean can pursue their separate national vocations and their common regional destiny. The tensions and rancours of the past cannot be ended overnight, but if the relations of States in the Middle East are contained in a permanent and contractually binding framework the patient task of reconciliation can go forward.

88. The Security Council, like the General Assembly, has consistently refused to endorse proposals which would have sought a return to the ambiguity, vulnerability and insecurity in which we have lived for nineteen years. It has now adopted a resolution of which the central and primary affirmation is the need for "the establishment of a just and lasting peace" based on secure and recognized boundaries. There is a clear understanding that it is only within the establishment of permanent peace with secure and recognized boundaries that other principles can be given effect. As my delegation and others have stated, the establishment for the first time of agreed and secure boundaries as part of a peace settlement is the only key which can unlock the present situation and set on foot a momentum of constructive and peaceful progress. As the representative of the United Kingdom indicated in his address on 16 November, the action to be taken must be within the framework of a permanent peace and of secure and recognized boundaries. It has been pointed out in the Security Council, and it is stated in the 1949 Agreements, that the armistice demarcation lines have never been regarded as boundaries so that, as the representative of the United States has said, the boundaries between Israel and her neighbours: "must be mutually worked out and recognized by the parties themselves as part of the peace-making process" *[1377th meeting, para. 65]*.

89. We continue to believe that the States of the region, in direct negotiation with each other, have the sovereign responsibility for shaping their common future. It is the duty of international agencies at the behest of the parties to act in the measure that agreement can be promoted and a mutually accepted settlement can be advanced. We do not believe that Member States have the right to refuse direct negotiation with those to whom they address their claims. It is only when they come together that the Arab States and Israel will reveal the full potentialities of a peaceful settlement.

90. There were proposals, including those submitted by three Powers and then by the Soviet Union, which failed to win the necessary support because they rested in our view on the wrong premise that a solution could be formed on the basis of a return to the situation of 4 June. We hold that that premise has no logical or moral international basis. Similarly, the failure to understand that Israel's action last June was a response to aggression has prevented certain Governments from keeping pace with the development of international thinking. Israel notes, however, that recent Soviet statements and drafts reflect an understanding that the establishment of peace requires, amongst other things, an explicit respect of Israel's national identity and international rights.

91. I also note that the Soviet text *[S/8253]*, like that of the United States *[S/8229]*, included a reference to the need for curbing the destructive and wasteful arms race. I hope that the absence of this provision in the text on which the Council has voted does not mean that that objective will be lost from sight.

92. The termination of this debate takes us into a new phase, of which the centre lies not here in New York, but in the Middle East. What will henceforward be decisive is not the particular words of an enabling resolution, but the spirit and attitude and policies of the Middle Eastern States. One of the points most strongly emphasized around this table and in all the exchanges which I and my associates have been privileged to have with representatives of Member States is that the only peace that can be established in the Middle East is one that the Governments of the Middle East build together. Peace can grow by agreement. It cannot be imposed. Our Governments in the area must look more and more towards each other. For it is only from each other that they can obtain the satisfaction of their most vital need, the need of peace.

93. I reiterate that in negotiations with our neighbours we shall present a concrete vision of peace. Before saying what that vision is, I should like to make one comment on the course of this debate with special reference to the remarks of the Indian representative. The establishment of a peace settlement, including secure and recognized boundaries, is quite different from what he had been proposing, namely, withdrawal, without final peace, to demarcation lines. The representative of India has now sought to interpret the resolution in the image of his own wishes. For us, the resolution says what it says. It does not say that which it has specifically and consciously avoided saying.

94. Thus, if the representative of India is in any predicament, he should not escape it by reading into a text adjectives and place-names which do not occur in the text. He must know that the crucial specifications to which he referred were discussed at length in consultations and deliberately and not accidentally excluded in order to be non-prejudicial to the negotiating position of all parties. The important words in most languages are short words, and every word, long or short, which is not in the text, is not there because it was deliberately concluded that it should not be there.

95. I have said that we would, in peace negotiations, present a vision and a programme of peace. I draw attention to the ideas which I proposed to the General Assembly at its 1577th meeting on 3 October 1967 under the heading of an "agenda for peace". In direct negotiation, we would seek the discussion of juridical problems, including the establishment of peace treaties instead of cease-fire or armistice lines; security and territorial problems, including the establishment of permanent and agreed frontiers of peace and security; population problems, involving regional effort and international co-operation to resolve the problems of displaced populations created by wars and perpetuated by belligerency; economic questions, including the replacement of blockades and boycotts by intense economic co-operation; communications problems, including the opening of the Middle East to a free and normal flow of

commerce; cultural and scientific problems, involving an attempt to substitute the best traditions of Arab-Jewish co-operation for the recent tensions and disputes, thus ending the epoch of alienation and hostility.

96. These are the horizons to which we shall address ourselves. For all the States and peoples of the Middle East, they hold the promise of a new and better age.

97. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The United States is gratified that the United Kingdom draft resolution has received the unanimous support of the Council. As I made clear in my brief intervention before the vote, we have voted for the resolution because we found it entirely consistent with the policy of the United States Government on the Middle East, the five principles enunciated by President Johnson in his statement of 19 June, and my several statements in the Council since then.

98. My delegation has worked unceasingly since last May for the constructive result we have reached today, but I should like to acknowledge that, whatever the differences of view, all other members of the Council, many other Members of the United Nations, you, Mr. President, and your predecessor, Ambassador Tsuruoka, the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly have also contributed their unstinting efforts towards bringing about today's result. We cannot and should not ignore the contributions made under very difficult and trying circumstances by certain of the key parties immediately concerned. We owe particular gratitude, I am sure, to the United Kingdom delegation and its head, my esteemed friend Lord Caradon, and to the Latin American group as a whole and their representatives on the Council, Ambassador Ruda of Argentina and Ambassador de Carvalho Silos of Brazil.

99. We trust and we believe that the Council has the right to expect that the parties concerned, without prejudice to their respective positions, will receive the United Nations special representative and co-operate with him in the peace-making process which this resolution sets in motion. Success will depend, in the final analysis, upon the spirit in which the parties receive him and work with him to find solutions that will permit the Middle East to benefit from a permanent state of peace, security, justice and tranquillity. For this reason, we strongly urge all parties not only to participate in the peace-making process, but to do so with the maximum spirit of accommodation, of respect for each other's vital interests and legitimate grievances and of mutual accommodation and magnanimity.

100. Were it not for the fact that the United Kingdom resolution was so delicately balanced, and our realization that the offering of any amendments from any source could have upset that balance and jeopardized the chance of successful action by the Council, my delegation would have offered an amendment so that the Council could have endorsed the need to achieve a limitation of the wasteful and destructive arms race in the Middle East. This was one of President Johnson's five points. We have taken particular note of and have been encouraged by the fact that a provision to this effect was included in the draft resolution placed before the Security Council by the Soviet Union, as it was in our draft resolution. However, we do not conceive that the mandate of the special representative to be designated by the Secretary-General excludes his exploring this important and urgent requirement of peace, as he establishes and maintains contacts with the States concerned. His mandate encompasses the search for a just and lasting peace and in pursuing that search he should be encouraged by the fact that two great Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, have indicated their willingness to have the problem of a limitation on the arms race discussed and explored.

101. As for my own Government, we have stated before and I renew that statement now that the United States will use every recourse of diplomacy, including co-operating with the special representative, to find a course which will put an end to the waste and futility of the arms race in the Middle East. A beginning, but only a beginning, could be made if the United Nations, as we have proposed, would call upon all its Members to report all shipments of all military arms into the area and keep those reports on file for all the peoples of the world to observe.

102. The special representative will need all the help and support he can get both from the parties and from the international community. I have already given my Government's pledge on this score and I wish to reiterate it today—a pledge to this Council and to the parties concerned that the diplomatic and political influence of the United States Government will be exerted in support of the efforts of the United Nations special representative to achieve a fair, equitable and dignified settlement so that all in the area can live in peace, security and tranquillity. Similar pledges from other members of the Council and the United Nations membership, particularly those with great diplomatic and political influence, would be invaluable because they would not only lend weight to the efforts of the special representative but would help to reassure all the peoples of the Middle East that they are not alone as they turn their attention to the search for the foundations of a just and durable peace.

103. In creating the framework of peace in the Middle East, the Security Council took the first step in June 1967 by helping to bring about a cease-fire. It is vitally important that the cease-fire be maintained. Violations by any party cannot and must not be condoned. Today we have taken a second step—the appointment of a special representative to go to the area in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement. For those who sometimes wonder about the value and effectiveness of the United Nations, perhaps by those two steps we have provided an answer to their worries and concerns. All who have contributed to those two steps can draw satisfaction from the fact that they have been taken. But we know realistically from the nature of this complex problem that those two steps are very far from the goal we have set, a just and durable peace, and we must recognize that although we have begun we shall not achieve that goal easily or without many difficulties. We must persevere with patience and fortitude, just as we have been persevering since May 1967, in the search for peace.

104. I would conclude by quoting a portion of President Johnson's speech of 19 June, for it is an accurate

description of the mood of the world community as we wish godspeed to the special representative:

"The world . . . will look for patience and justice, it will look for humility and moral courage. It will look for signs of movement from prejudice and the emotional chaos of conflict to the gradual slow shaping steps that lead to learning to live together and learning to help and mould and shape peace in the area and in the world."

105. Mr. BERARD (France) *(translated from French):* For the past six months, in all their statements in the Security Council and the General Assembly, the representatives of France have stressed the need and expressed the sincere hope that in this troubled region of the Middle East, Arabs and Israelis, Jews and Moslems, may be able to live together in peace, tolerance and mutual respect.

106. They have also stated that in present circumstances, if any settlement is to be possible and difficulties are to be overcome whose importance we do not underestimate, it would seem essential that there should be a measure of co-operation among the great Powers to help the parties to arrive at a solution, and that the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, seemed to be an appropriate framework. For this is the place to formulate the principles which must be the basis of any peaceful settlement, to define the problems, and to help to bring about the developments necessary for the achievement of a just and lasting settlement of the crisis.

107. These are the points that my delegation has borne in mind in studying the various draft resolutions submitted to us. It seemed to us that to be really useful they should leave no room for ambiguity and that the principles on which the special representative to be appointed by the Secretary-General would base his actions should be clearly set out.

108. I must confess that in this respect the three-Power draft, or a draft based on certain ideas of the Latin American text proposed in the General Assembly in July, would in our opinion have had considerable advantages. It appeared, however, that the desired agreement could not be achieved on those texts, whatever their merits.

109. We are, incidentally, grateful for the persistent and praiseworthy efforts made by the United Kingdom delegation to produce a text which would be rejected by no one, and we wish to pay our tribute to that delegation.

110. We are fully aware that inevitably such a text could not entirely satisfy either side. No one will be surprised, therefore, if I say that we would have preferred the text to be more explicit on certain points, including the terms of reference of the special representative.

111. We must admit, however, that on the point which the French delegation has always stressed as being essential—the question of withdrawal of the occupation forces—the resolution which has been adopted, if we refer to the French text which is equally authentic with the English, leaves no room for any ambiguity, since it speaks of withdrawal *"des territoires occupés"*, which indisputably corresponds to the expression "occupied territories".

112. We were likewise gratified to hear the United Kingdom representative stress the link between this paragraph of his resolution and the principle of inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force, and quote the words used last September by his Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the General Assembly. In his statement, Mr. George Brown, expressing a concern shared by his French colleague, also said:

"I believe that Jerusalem too requires a special mention here. The British position was made quite clear when, with the vast majority of the Members of this Assembly, we voted this summer for the resolutions calling on Israel to do nothing to prejudice the status of Jeruslem."[7]

113. We are also glad to see that the resolution stresses the second principle, namely, the termination of all belligerency, respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and its right to live in peace within its own boundaries.

114. We take note of the fact that the text affirms the necessity to achieve a just settlement of the refugee problem, to which, as we have said, the military operations have given a new and tragic dimension; and that it calls for guarantees for the freedom of navigation through the international waterways in the area.

115. Since the United Kingdom draft enabled us to take a positive decision, and since we felt that it contained the general principles necessary for solving the problem, my delegation voted in favour of it.

116. A favourable vote for the United Kingdom resolution is, of course, only a starting point. Long and arduous efforts will still be needed to implement those principles and to arrive at a solution. We hope that the spirit of conciliation and understanding of which the great Powers, including my country, have given an example today will, in the months to come, help to promote this settlement so fervently desired.

117. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) *(translated from Russian):* The Security Council has just reached a decision on the question of the situation in the Near East. The Soviet Government would have preferred the Security Council to adopt the Soviet draft resolution which is more in keeping with the need to eliminate the consequences of Israel aggression and to restore lasting peace to the Near East.

118. However, we voted for the United Kingdom draft resolution, as interpreted by the representative of India, whose views we share.

119. Thus, in the resolution adopted by the Security Council, the "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict" becomes the first necessary principle for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Near East. We understand the decision

[7] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings,* 1567th meeting, para. 96.

taken to mean the withdrawal of Israel forces from all, and we repeat, all territories belonging to Arab States and seized by Israel following its attack on those States on 5 June 1967. This is borne out by the preamble to the United Kingdom draft resolution *[S/8247]* which stresses the "inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war". It follows that the provision contained in that draft relating to the right of all States in the Near East "to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries" cannot serve as a pretext for the maintenance of Israel forces on any part of the Arab territories seized by them as a result of war.

120. It has been made clear, both from representatives' statements in the Security Council today and from the many statements made during the preceding days, that this is the basic content of the resolution and that it has thus been interpreted by all the members of the Security Council. The same view was expressed in the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, in resolutions which were put to the vote, although they were not supported by an overwhelming majority. But, in the resolution presented by Latin American countries *[A/L.523/Rev.1]* and in that submitted by non-aligned States *[A/L.522/Rev.3]*, the provision relating to the withdrawal of forces was stated so clearly that it could not possibly have been misinterpreted.

121. In this connexion, I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Security Council to the statement which has just been made by the Israel Foreign Minister. His remarks regarding the resolution which has just been adopted cannot but alert the Security Council. It cannot be concluded from that statement that Israel is disposed to co-operate with the United Nations Organization, or is prepared to co-operate with the Security Council in seeking a swift political settlement in the Near East in accordance with the resolution just adopted. And if Israel is going to maintain this attitude when the special representative visits that region, it can be expected that the representative will meet with no little difficulty before the resolution now adopted can be put into effect.

122. The most important task now is to implement without delay the decision which has been taken and, above all, to secure the withdrawal of Israel forces from all territory occupied by them as a result of aggression. We feel that, given the co-operation of all States and of all members of the Security Council, this task can be completed in a very short time in the interests of peace in the Near East and of all countries in that region.

123. Mr. DE CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil): Since the very beginning of the recent conflict in the Middle East the main concern of the Brazilian Government has been to contribute to supporting, either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council, a formula which while having the viability of implementation could also embody the set of principles that have already guided my country's policy in relation to the situation in that area. The members of the Security Council are, of course, aware that we have taken an active part in all the discussions conducted either in public or in private since this matter first came under the consideration of the Council. The non-permanent members spared no efforts to arrive at a consensus or at a resolution acceptable to all of them which could be presented on their behalf to the Council.

124. Unfortunately, we did not succeed in drawing up a text that could secure the undivided support of all those who participated in our discussions. But we reached unanimous agreement on three essential points that I should like, with the Council's permission, to restate: first, the resolution of the Security Council should fall within the scope of Chapter VI of the Charter; second, a special representative of the Secretary-General should be promptly dispatched to the area; third, a set of principles should guide the action of the special representative. The first two points did not raise serious difficulties, but on the third complete agreement failed to materialize.

125. It is our hope that the principles included as guidelines offered to the special representative, even if they do not give full satisfaction to any of the different currents of opinion, may well become the common denominator acceptable to all.

126. The main immediate purpose of the action of the Council is to secure the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General with a view to paving the way for achieving a peaceful solution in the area.

127. I should like to restate, on behalf of my delegation, the general principle that no stable international order can be based on the threat or use of force, and that the occupation or acquisition of territories brought about by such means should not be recognized. The validity of this rule cannot be contested and is not being challenged by anyone around this table. Its acceptance does not imply that borderlines cannot be rectified as a result of an agreement freely concluded among the interested States. We keep constantly in mind that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East has necessarily to be based on secure permanent boundaries freely agreed upon and negotiated by the neighbouring States; on a full and just settlement of the refugee problem; and on the guarantee of free transit for Israel ships through both the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

128. Bearing these facts in mind, and after extensive consultations with the parties concerned, my delegation came to the conclusion that its support of the United Kingdom draft resolution *[S/8247]* would represent a positive contribution to a peaceful solution of the Middle East crisis. This text does not give full satisfaction to my delegation. But, on the one hand, the United Kingdom draft includes a set of principles that reflect most of those suggested by my Government and embodied in the Latin American proposal submitted to the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly. My Government, of course, remains faithful to those principles. On the other hand, the implementation of the resolution presented by the United Kingdom seems to be viable.

129. On behalf of my delegation I should like to thank the representatives of France, Nigeria, the United Kingdom and the United States for their words here today and last Monday on the role played by the Latin American countries since the fifth emergency special session of the

General Assembly. My Government has acted inspired only by the desire to see peace, stability and economic progress re-established in the area and by its commitments and duties as a member of the Council.

130. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I shall be very brief in explaining the position of the Canadian delegation on the draft resolution which has just been adopted unanimously. The Canadian approach towards all proposals has been determined by the extent to which any particular proposal could have the effect of getting under way those diplomatic processes which we believe would lead to a peaceful settlement of the crisis in the Middle East.

131. It is with this consideration in mind that Canada willingly supported the United Kingdom draft resolution which is now the resolution of the whole Council. We think that this resolution, which is clear and speaks for itself, has the best prospects of opening the way to the result which I believe we all desire, namely, a state of just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

132. The resolution just adopted does, in our view, meet the essential positions of both sides, taking into account the various ideas which emerged from consultations among non-permanent members and among permanent members of the Council, as well as with the States in the area. The resolution represents a fair, balanced and non-prejudicial basis for the dispatch to the Middle East of a special representative of the Secretary-General. Furthermore, the unanimous adoption of the resolution is in itself a positive contribution which should provide the best framework for the successful launching of the task of the special representative.

133. This is the main step now being taken by the Security Council, namely, to put the presence of a representative of the Secretary-General into the area to help bring about negotiations and peaceful conditions. As for the mandate of the special representative, it entails, in the words of the criterion which I set out when I spoke in the Council on 9 November, "an equitable balance of obligations" on both sides *[1373rd meeting, para. 214]*. It is most important that the Council has finally acted to have a special representative appointed and that his influence should be brought to bear as soon as possible in the area in the interests of establishing a just and lasting peace. We hope very much that the special representative will have the necessary co-operation of all the States directly concerned in the area.

134. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) *(translated from French)*: The resolution which the Council has just adopted has proved to be the only possible compromise at the present time which does not jeopardize the interests of the victims of the aggression and could point the way to a peaceful settlement of the crisis in the Middle East, provided of course that it was strictly and judiciously implemented.

135. This compromise, the outcome of prolonged and often difficult and hard-fought consultations, represents the minimum positive alternative that the United Nations has been able to present in the face of the steadily mounting tension in that area which constitutes a real danger to peace and security. We would have liked to see the Security Council take much more energetic and effective measures. Several proposals have been made to that effect, including condemnation of the aggression and the aggressor, and a number of such proposals are included in the various draft resolutions submitted to the Security Council. They could not be adopted because of the prevailing conditions in the Security Council because of the violent opposition of certain countries which would not be at their ease if the Council were to begin to give practical application to the condemnation of the aggression and the aggressor.

136. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers, however, that any endeavour, any attempt to bring about a peaceful settlement of the crisis in accordance with the principles of the Charter, must be supported. An end must be put to the present explosive situation which inflicts intolerable sufferings on the Arab population of the occupied territories and also represents a threat to peace.

137. Generally speaking, the resolution just adopted gives a satisfactory answer to the question of the withdrawal of Israel troops; it stresses, first of all, "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war". That is a fundamental principle of contemporary international law which flows from the inadmissibility of aggression and the prohibition of the use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of States.

138. Confirming the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Mr. Zhivkov, made the following statement at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly:

> "The People's Republic of Bulgaria, just as the other socialist and peace-loving countries, does not recognize the forcible seizure of Arab territories by Israel."[8]

139. We note with satisfaction that in the resolution adopted, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, proclaimed in the preamble as a general principle, is clearly and explicitly confirmed in the first operative paragraph, which calls for the "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict". Thus it is a definite call for the withdrawal of Israel's troops from all the territories occupied since 4 June 1967. That is a practical application of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war stated in the preamble to the resolution.

140. The same applies also to the question of the acknowledgement of the "territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries". The peace and security of all States is precisely what makes it necessary, above all, to prohibit any acquisition by one State of the territory of another through war.

141. The provision concerning the withdrawal of Israel troops from all the occupied territories is an important

8 *Ibid., Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1528th meeting, para. 31.

condition for the implementation of the other principles set out in operative paragraphs 1 (ii) and 2 of the resolution.

142. The Security Council resolution defines the terms of reference of the special representative of the Secretary-General satisfactorily. He is to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions of the resolution; in other words, he is to participate in the negotiations and help to solve the problem.

143. It is now essential that the resolution should be strictly respected and applied in good faith by the countries concerned, as well as by all other States; it must be implemented immediately, without any attempt to evade its provisions. Today's vote is only the first step; it will undoubtedly be followed by others on the part of the United Nations and its Members with a view to ensuring peace in the Middle East, for this is essential to world peace.

144. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* I call upon the representative of the United Arab Republic.

145. Mr. Mahmoud RIAD (United Arab Republic): On 7 November, the United Arab Republic requested the Security Council to meet in urgent session to resume its consideration of the grave situation in the Middle East *[S/8226]*. This situation resulted from Israel's war of aggression on 5 June and its subsequent occupation of Arab territories in Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic, as well as territories under United Arab Republic administration.

146. The Council responded to the request of the United Arab Republic and convened on 9 November, at which time I stated the position of my Government *[1373rd meeting]*. I emphasized that it was the duty of the Security Council to apply the Charter of this Organization and thus eliminate the consequences of the present aggression, by forcing Israel to withdraw from all the territories it occupied after 4 June 1967.

147. On 16 November, I again addressed the Council *[1379th meeting]* and I reaffirmed that the United Arab Republic would never accept aggression, and that the Security Council should not be allowed to compromise on a question of such primary importance to the Charter and to international peace and security.

148. Today, I wish to affirm once again our position that the first step towards peace lies in the full withdrawal of Israel forces from all territories they have occupied as a result of their aggression on 5 June. The efforts on behalf of peace which would then follow would of necessity be within the framework of this Organization and its Charter. The provisions of our Charter prohibit aggression and require all States to assume in good faith their obligations arising from the Charter as well as from international agreements and other sources of international law.

149. The inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, recognized and continually reaffirmed by the United Nations, belong in the highest and most essential category of the norms and rules of our present international order. These rights should under no circumstances be allowed to fall by the wayside. Historically, legally, constitutionally and morally, this Organization is inescapably committed to the rights of the people of Palestine.

150. In conclusion, the United Arab Republic will be guided by these considerations in its continuous search for a peaceful and just solution of the present crisis in the Middle East.

151. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* I call upon the representative of Jordan.

152. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan): Now that the Security Council has concluded its present discussions, I feel duty bound to make the following remarks. My Government has been following with special interest and appreciation the efforts of the members of the Council to arrive at a positive result. We, for our part, share with the members the genuine desire to establish conditions in our area conducive to peace, based on justice and on the fulfilment of the legitimate rights of our people. Indeed this has always been and continues to be our aim.

153. In the present crisis the basic issue which has to be remedied as an essential step towards peace is the immediate and complete withdrawal of Israel armed forces from all the territories they occupied in the recent conflict. The resolutions which were adopted both by the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as the statements made on the question, have stressed this basic requirement. Whether those resolutions pertain to the cease-fire, to the return and safety of the Arab inhabitants in the occupied territories, to the invalid Israel measures taken in Jerusalem or to the problem in its entirety, they all emphasize the fundamental principle that military aggression and occupation should neither pay nor stay. The discussions and prevailing opinion in the Council and in the General Assembly have made it clear that the United Nations does not accept in full or in part the illegal Israel occupation or any measures taken by Israel from the position gained by this occupation or as a result of it. That would be contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to the rules of international law, to the spirit and letter of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and indeed to peace itself.

154. On these premises the position of my Government is based.

155. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) *(translated from Spanish):* Ever since the outbreak of the crisis in the Middle East my delegation has been active in seeking a basis for a solution to the conflict to enable us to pass beyond this acute stage of indecision and to enter a new phase where real results can be obtained.

156. We have striven tirelessly after formulas for a system providing a proper balance of interests, a real give-and-take. We have felt all along that the road towards final peace was through sound and effective decisions involving mutual concessions such as are normal in this type of conflict.

Basically, this means the withdrawal of troops from the occupied areas on the one hand and the cessation of belligerency on the other.

157. For these reasons we have felt from the outset that peace could not be brought about by withdrawal pure and simple, but that such a step must of necessity be accompanied by other measures to enable the parties, without any coercion, to seek a spontaneous agreement to any commitments to which they may subscribe in the future.

158. These ideas essentially represented the position of my country and the other Latin American countries which submitted draft resolution A/L.523/Rev.1 in the General Assembly. It is with great satisfaction for us today, in the hour of decision for the Security Council, to note the extent to which our ideas have been adopted and used as the basis of the drafts submitted to the Council.

159. Our satisfaction was even greater when we learned, through a number of channels, that one of these drafts, that submitted by the United Kingdom *[S/8247]*, while it did not have the acquiescence of all parties, did at least have the promise of co-operation with the special representative to be sent to the Middle East by the Secretary-General. This implies a large area of agreement with regard to his terms of reference.

160. My delegation has been ready at any moment to submit to the Council another draft resolution framed strictly in accordance with the terms of the Latin American draft. This has been withheld because we did not wish to hamper in any way the success we desired for the United Kingdom draft resolution, once we had knowledge of it and were convinced that the co-operation of the parties could be counted upon. Otherwise my delegation would not have hesitated to present its own draft resolution, which incorporated the principles and purposes of the original Latin American draft while bearing in mind two further points: its adaptation to the new forum in which it had to be submitted, namely, the Security Council, and its drafting in the light of Chapter VI of the Charter.

161. Because of its general acceptability, in the first place, and because it was in large measure based on the ideas we ourselves have been advocating since July, we voted in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution. We cannot, however, help but observe that we would have liked to see some improvements made in the drafting. Thus, for example, it would have been preferable if the preamble had widened the undertaking by the Member States to act not only in conformity with Article 2 of the Charter but also with the Charter as a whole, and particularly with Articles 1 and 33.

162. With regard to the formula for the withdrawal of troops, which reads: "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict", this does not, in our view, reflect a fully rounded-off notion; and although my delegation voted for paragraph 1 (i) of the draft, we would have preferred a clearer text, such as that submitted to the General Assembly by the Latin American countries in July, which provided for the withdrawal of Israel armed forces from all the territories occupied as a result of the recent conflict.

163. We trust that the implementation of the formula adopted will achieve these ends; it is the only solution. We have always contended and still contend that, as the Brazilian representative pointed out, no international order be based on the threat or use of force, and that no recognition should be given to any territorial arrangement which has not been arrived at by peaceful means, nor to the validity of any occupation or acquisition of territories accomplished by force of arms.

164. The second point is that of the right "to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries". We take this expression as really meaning to live in security within agreed boundaries. There are many parts of the world where frontier boundaries are not secure, if we attach to this concept a geo-strategic meaning which goes beyond mere legal connotations; yet despite that, the States concerned have the right to live in peace within those boundaries.

165. The United Kingdom Secretary of State, Mr. George Brown, defined this concept in a felicitous phrase when he spoke recently in the General Assembly, as follows—and I quote: "But equally, Israel's neighbours must recognize its right to exist, and it must enjoy security within its frontiers."[9]

166. Subject to the comments I have just made, my country supported the draft resolution in the hope of bringing about an agreement capable of producing effective results within a reasonable time. We wish the Secretary-General's special representative the greatest success and we trust that the parties will give him their full and unreserved co-operation.

167. In concluding the explanation of our vote cast in favour of the draft in question, my delegation wishes to express in the Council its thanks for the efforts made by all the delegations, particularly those of the so-called group of six, composed of Brazil, India, Mali, Nigeria, Ethiopia and my own country, with which we collaborated for so long on a very difficult task. At the same time, I wish to express and place on record our gratitude to the United Kingdom delegation, whose spirit of co-operation, gentlemanliness and ability has made it possible to achieve highly important results which we trust will lay the groundwork for true co-existence in the Middle East.

168. This has also made it possible for the Security Council to meet the challenge with which it has faced, and to show once again that it is an effective instrument for the difficult task of preserving peace.

169. Before concluding, I wish on behalf of my delegation and my Government to thank the delegations of the United Kingdom, Nigeria, the United States and France for their kind words regarding our work and that of the other Latin American countries in the negotiations which have taken place over these many months. We have been guided all along exclusively by the desire to serve the cause of peace and justice.

---

9 *Ibid., Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings,* 1567th meeting, para. 91.

170. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): The Japanese delegation was very glad to vote in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution. The adoption of that resolution by the Council is a very substantial contribution towards the goal of a just and durable peace in the Middle East. My delegation is immensely pleased by this accomplishment and expresses a debt of gratitude to our friend and colleague Lord Caradon and to the United Kingdom delegation for the initiative that has led to this fortunate result.

171. As I said in the Council on 9 November *[1373rd meeting]*, my delegation very much hoped that intensive consultations would lead to a compromise and a consensus that the members of the Council could support. We are delighted that our hope has been realized. We are particularly pleased that this resolution has been adopted unanimously. I should like to express our respect and our warm thanks to all who have contributed so much to the result we have now achieved.

[The speaker continued in French.]

172. To you in particular, Mr. President, I should like to pay a tribute on behalf of my delegation for the wisdom with which you have guided our delicate and difficult work to a successful conclusion.

[The speaker resumed in English.]

173. Peace, of course, cannot be built in a day. But resolution 242 (1967) which we have now adopted states in clear and simple terms the principles and objectives upon which peace in the Middle East must be based. We emphasize "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security". We affirm that "the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East . . . should include the application of both the following principles:

"(i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

"(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force".

174. We are very hopeful that the mandate given to the special representative who is to be designated by the Secretary-General will enable him "to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution".

175. We all know that the mission assigned to the special representative is not going to be an easy one. A very heavy responsibility will rest upon him. At the same time, I would strongly emphasize that the success of his mission demands the utmost support by the Council and, indeed, the full and effective co-operation of all Members of the United Nations. Above all, the co-operation of the parties concerned is essential. On behalf of the Japanese delegation, I should like to offer to the special representative, in advance, our very best wishes and to pledge to him our whole-hearted co-operation.

176. I do not wish to conclude my statement on a note that may seem to be too visionary; but my delegation can foresee the time—and we ardently hope that it will soon arrive—when the dissensions, the belligerency and the war that have so grievously torn asunder the countries of the Middle East for so long a time will give way to an era of peace, an era when those countries will find it possible to co-operate harmoniously for the benefit of the peace and security, the prosperity and the welfare of all the peoples of the area.

177. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): In explaining the vote cast by my delegation on the draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom, I can refer to my statement in the 1373rd meeting of the Security Council on 9 November in which I presented the substance of the policy pursued by my Government in the crisis in the Middle East. But let me, for the sake of clarity, once again underline the importance that we have always attached to the desirability of having a resolution that should be so carefully balanced that the parties to the conflict would be able to feel that they at least could live with it and could reasonably be expected to co-operate under its terms. We voted in favour of the draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom because that text, as it was voted upon and as it stands, meets with our point of view as to procedure and is compatible with our position as to substance.

178. The adoption today of the draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom is indeed a most auspicious development. As Lord Caradon stated the other day, the text is based upon a number of ideas and views that were brought up during the long and arduous consultations among members of the Security Council during the last month. It is a compromise in the best sense of the word. It does take into account all the essential interests of the parties involved. In the words of my Canadian colleague, which I fully endorse, this resolution represents a fair, balanced and non-prejudicial basis for the dispatch to the Middle East of a special representative of the Secretary-General.

179. The Government of Denmark would strongly urge all the parties involved to extend their full co-operation and goodwill to the special representative in the exercise of his most difficult and equally important task and in the realization of the high principles embodied in the Council's resolution of today.

180. Lord Caradon has on various occasions been generous in his appraisal of the contribution made by other members of the Council. As a newcomer to this table I cannot conclude these brief remarks without giving expression to my admiration and respect for his essential contribution at the right time to the successful and constructive result of the deliberations.

181. Mr. LIU CHIEH (China): During the past weeks, indeed months, members of the Council, particularly the

elected members, have been busily engaged in consultations in search of the principles and procedures by which a just and enduring peace could be established in the Middle East. Those consultations have been useful in providing the common ground as a basis for the resolution which has just been adopted. We owe these members of the Council a debt of gratitude for their untiring and persistent efforts in this difficult task.

182. We realize that the issues in the Middle East are extremely complex and deep-rooted and that they cannot be resolved overnight by a single resolution of the Security Council. We are encouraged, however, by the fact that the parties involved, while they have certain reservations in regard to the resolution, have shown a willingness to co-operate with the Council in its efforts to bring about the necessary conditions for peace in the Middle East.

183. My delegation is particularly gratified that the Council, thanks to the timely intervention of the representative of the United Kingdom, has arrived at a formulation which commanded unanimous support. Surely issues involving war or peace are too serious to be viewed simply as a voting contest in this Council. On a question as vital and difficult as the present one, anything short of unanimity would not carry the kind of weight needed for effective implementation.

184. The special representative to be appointed by the Secretary-General can now press forward in his important assignment backed by the full weight of this Council and with the support of responsible opinion throughout the world.

185. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that the parties concerned will not allow the intensity of their feelings to impair the prospects for constructive steps on the long and tortuous road to peace in the Middle East.

186. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I shall be very brief. I should like merely to observe that in explanation of vote various members of the Council, as is their right, have expressed views of their own for supporting the United Kingdom draft resolution. I should like to repeat what I said earlier. The voting, of course, has taken place not on the individual views and policies of various members, but on the draft resolution. I, and I assume other members of the Council, voted for the draft resolution and not for each and every speech that has been made. Of course, I hastily add that I have voted for my own speech, and I assume others have done likewise with respect to their speeches.

187. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* I should now like to speak on behalf of the delegation of MALI.

188. Mr. KANTE (Mali) *(translated from French):* Allow me first of all to express to the representative of Japan my appreciation of the kind words he addressed to me just now. His thanks and kind words go surely beyond me and include all of you, all the members of the Council, with whom as President for the month of November I share the credit for the result we have achieved today. On your behalf, therefore, I should like to thank the representative of Japan once again.

189. In the name of the delegation of the Republic of Mali, I should like to say that the adoption by the Security Council of draft resolution S/8247 should in no way be construed as indicating that my country abandons the fundamental principles which throughout the centuries have guided men who cherish peace and justice, to which all mankind has constantly aspired throughout history, and which are embodied in the noble ideals of the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation therefore wishes its vote today to be interpreted in the light of the clear and unequivocal interpretation which the representative of India gave of the provisions of the United Kingdom text, namely: first, that the withdrawal of all the armed forces of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 5 June cannot be made subject to any condition whatever. Secondly, in its view the just solution of the refugee problem lies in the effective implementation of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council with a view to restoring the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

190. We have constantly stressed, here and wherever the occasion has arisen, that it is the perpetuation of a flagrant injustice against that people which is the root cause of the tragedy that has been acted out in the Middle East for the last twenty years. In my delegation's opinion, the solution of this problem must be based above all on the need to recognize that every people has a natural right to a homeland and to a decent life within the great human family.

191. Motivated by the same desire for justice, my delegation further wishes to stress the special obligations which flow from the adoption of this resolution for the parties to respect the Charter, that is, to renounce belligerency, since this would ensure each of the States in the area the right to live in peace and security, free from threats or acts of war, in respect for their sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity.

192. As to the guarantee of freedom of navigation through the international waterways in the area, it must be granted to all States, in accordance with the international conventions and agreements currently in force.

193. The delegation of Mali wishes to state that its country can in no circumstances accept in the eyes of men and of history any part of the responsibility for endorsing the violation of the territory of States. This represents a serious infringement of the Charter and would have grievous consequences for the international community.

194. If we fail to live up to our vote fully in accordance with the duty of each and every one of us scrupulously to see to it that all nations, large and small, respect the Charter, we shall surely be helping to bring about new order based exclusively on the principle of "might is right". Such a trend would undoubtedly block the laudable efforts by the international community to curb the arms race, and it would create a temptation for the countries of the Third World to increase their military potential to the detriment of their economic and social development programmes. Their peoples would thus be doomed to become even poorer. We cannot allow the role of the Organization to be

limited henceforth to noting and condoning *faits accomplis*. The lesson of history is that the most powerful State today can be the weakest tomorrow; that is the way of the world. The danger which hovers over us therefore concerns all the States Members of the United Nations, however powerful and whatever their level of technological development.

195. For all those reasons my delegation, in voting for the draft resolution on the Middle East submitted by the United Kingdom, was anxious to record its unshakable adherence to the principles of the Charter. My country therefore continues to believe more than ever that the withdrawal of forces from territories occupied by military conquest is a prior condition for any solution of any armed crisis. This is a deeply held conviction on its part. Mali is a country of peace and is in favour of peace, that is to say, peace based on justice and equity. It therefore expresses a most fervent wish for peace, true peace this time, in the Middle East.

196. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* I call upon the representative of Syria.

197. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The test of the success or failure of any major resolution can be measured only by its results. The future will prove whether or not the resolution adopted today will secure the cause of peace in the Middle East.

198. I have listened very carefully to Mr. Eban's statement and his interpretation of the resolution, but not equally so to the acrimonious part about Syria, which is to be expected. His interpretation of the withdrawal only confirms, but in a very roundabout way, the full intent of Israel to consolidate its gains as a result of its aggression, which was amply explained in my statement to the Council. Again, the words spoken are denied by the intent expressed and the deed achieved. I should have liked Mr. Eban to have denied some of the facts and occurrences which I brought out in my statement. However, it is to be noted that the following sentence occurred in Mr. Eban's statement: "Peace . . . cannot be imposed" [supra, *para. 92*]. I should like to quote what I said in my statement about peace, which was the following: "A lasting peace cannot be imposed by force. One does not open the way for it by seizing another's property and demanding certain concessions before that property is given back to its legal, lawful owner." [supra, *para. 25.*] Mr. Eban went on to attribute aggressive acts and intentions to Syria. I need not go into the details of what happened on 7 April 1967, which we put before the Council when an attack was perpetrated against Syria, and which included seven sorties by the Israel air force, with a battle ensuing that took place over Damascus, the capital of Syria.

199. Finally and briefly I should like to comment on the description given by Mr. Eban of my statement as a "hymn of hate" [supra, *para. 83*]. That is really an amazing interpretation because, reduced to its basic principles, my statement invokes two of the Ten Commandments: "Thou shalt not kill"; and "Thou shalt not covet" other people's property. That two of the Ten Commandments should be interpreted as a "hymn of hate" is really beyond my understanding, but the twisting of words and meanings can result in anything. We condemn killing and the stealing of other people's property most strongly and most vehemently, whether it has been committed by Nazi Germany against the innocent Jews, the French, the Danes or the people of any other country which it occupied, just as we condemn it most strongly and vehemently when it is committed by the Israelis against the Arabs—by Dayan and Begin and justified by Mr. Eban.

200. The PRESIDENT *(translated from French):* I call upon the representative of Israel.

201. Mr. EBAN (Israel): I do not propose to maintain the discussion with the representative of Syria, except to say that if he is interested in the document of Hebrew literature to which he referred I recommend that he should not stop short with two commandments but should also study the statement "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour", because the quotations which he put in my mouth were not there.

202. I intervene for another purpose, which is to say that I am communicating to my Government for its consideration nothing except the original English text of the draft resolution as presented by the original sponsor on 16 November. Having studied that text, document S/8247, my Government will determine its attitude to the Security Council's resolution in the light of its own policy, which is as I have stated it.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de *Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.*

Litho in U.N. Price: $U.S. 0.50 (or equivalent in other currencies) 35888—January 1971—2,100