



Friday, 21 July 1967,
at 3 p.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 5:

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

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Sweden has asked to speak, and I now call on him.
2. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden): The General Assembly has now been in session for over four weeks considering the urgent and grave question of the situation in the Middle East. Intensive efforts have been made by delegations and groups of delegations to work out a draft resolution which could serve as a substantive basis for the establishment of a situation of peace with justice in the area. During the consultations it has become clear that there is in fact broad agreement on many basic purposes and principles. However, as Members are well aware, it has not been possible to formulate these purposes and principles in such a manner as to command the support required for the adoption of a resolution.
3. In these circumstances, the three delegations on whose behalf I have the honour to speak—Austria, Finland and Sweden—have come to the conclusion, after wide consultations, that it would be advisable to adjourn this session temporarily. This does not mean an end to, nor a suspension of, our efforts to reach peaceful solutions through the United Nations. Therefore, in our view, the President of the General Assembly should be authorized to reconvene the session as and when necessary. Furthermore, a recommendation should be addressed to the Security Council, which is already seized of the question, to resume its consideration of the tense situation in the Middle East as a matter of urgency.
4. By these two provisions, the General Assembly would stress that although it has not been able at this time to arrive at a resolution on the substance of the problem before us, the United Nations has a continuing responsibility, as indeed have all Member States, to contribute to the solution of the urgent and grave problems pertaining to the area. We are convinced that such a resolution would in no way be prejudicial to the interests or positions of any Member State.

5. It is in that spirit and in the conviction that the ideas just outlined enjoy wide support amongst the Members that I, speaking in the name of the delegations of Austria, Finland and Sweden, have the honour to introduce the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the grave situation in the Middle East,

"Bearing in mind the resolutions adopted and the proposals considered during the fifth emergency special session,

"1. Recommends to the Security Council to resume its consideration of the tense situation in the Middle East as a matter of urgency;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to forward the records of the fifth emergency special session to the Security Council;

"3. Decides to adjourn the fifth emergency special session temporarily and to authorize the President of the General Assembly to reconvene the session as and when necessary."^{1/}

This draft resolution has been handed to the Secretariat for immediate distribution. In view of the fact that it is not yet in the hands of the representatives in any language, I should like to read it out again.

The representative of Sweden read out again the text of the draft resolution.

6. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden): This draft resolution will be circulated shortly. It is our hope that a decision on it will be taken today.

7. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution introduced by the representative of Sweden [A/L.529] will be distributed within ten minutes. I wish to thank the representative of Sweden for having stated so clearly the wording of the draft resolution and for having read it out twice for the information of the Members.

8. If there is no objection, I propose, on the basis of the remarks of the representative of Sweden, that the Assembly proceed to vote on this draft resolution.

9. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): We are grateful to the representative of Sweden for having read out very clearly the draft resolution which his delegation and the delegations of Finland and Austria have presented to the General Assembly for consideration. In spite of the clarity of my friend's diction, it seems to me that it would be helpful, and indeed necessary, for the Members of the Assembly to have the written text before them before proceeding to a vote. As the repre-

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/L.529.

sentative of Sweden stated at the outset of his remarks, this is a substantive decision, this is not a procedural draft resolution, and therefore it cannot be treated as a simple procedural motion which can be disposed of on the basis of an oral presentation. It is a substantive draft resolution of some importance, with very serious implications for the General Assembly, the United Nations and future peace and security in the area.

10. I would therefore urge that this draft resolution be accorded the importance that it clearly deserves and should not be adopted in this fashion, without representatives having had an opportunity to study and consider the text. After all, the draft resolution was read out in English, and I imagine there are many representatives in the Assembly who heard it through the simultaneous interpretation, which perhaps was not so clear as the text will be when it has been translated and circulated to Members. I therefore request that we defer the vote on this draft resolution until we have had time to study it in written form.

11. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): It will be remembered that, at the beginning of this session of the Assembly, Tanzania expressed its considered opinion regarding the events which have occurred in the Middle East in connexion with the aggression perpetrated against three countries of the Arab world and Africa [1530th meeting]. It was our hope that the General Assembly would execute its clear duty, which was to condemn the aggression, reiterate the principle prohibiting any gains from the fruits of aggression, and seek the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the occupying forces from the occupied territories. To our consternation and dismay, the General Assembly has presented a lamentable spectacle of paralysis and disarray. The circumstances which have led to this state of affairs might be summed up as being the result of undue influence of certain major Powers, and acquiescence, if not appeasement, by a certain section of the membership of this Organization. That unfortunate correlation of forces has led the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly to its present impasse. The draft resolution before this Assembly would put the stamp of formal approval upon this deplorable state of affairs.

12. The Tanzanian delegation would like to pay tribute to the good intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution. However, we have grave doubts about the propriety of the proposals it contains, as well as about its utility and implications. When one takes into consideration the present international situation as a whole and the hopes of people the world over that the United Nations will play a constructive role in the maintenance of peace and the protection of the rights of small nations and States, the present draft resolution is a sad disappointment. We cannot help fearing that, if tomorrow or next week one or another of us were to experience a similar situation, then the Assembly would react in a similar manner. Where, then should lie the hopes of the smaller nations in the protection promised by the Charter of this Organization? Where, then should the countries of the Third World look for a safeguard against rampant imperialism, colonialism, and international forces of neo-colonialism?

13. At this point, my delegation would like to take the opportunity to thank all those delegations that have co-operated with us in a sincere search for a constructive solution to this very difficult situation. We have worked long hours, we have carried out protracted negotiations, and from time to time it seemed as if we might achieve the desired results if it were not for the forces I have already mentioned.

14. To you, Mr. President, our gratitude for your patient guidance of this session and your unflinching efforts to assist the Assembly in its task. The Tanzanian delegation, out of a desire not to encroach too much upon our time, will not enter into a detailed analysis of the present situation, which certainly warrants the concern of all those who have the interests of this Organization at heart.

15. For the reasons given, the Tanzanian delegation will not be able to support the present draft resolution.

16. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): This is a momentous period in the life of the United Nations. I say this because this may turn out to be the crossroads: Either we will have an effective international organization, or—as has been the case since the United Nations was founded and as was the case before, in the League of Nations—we will have an organization that will be sort of a window dressing for power politics, for spheres of influence and for the assertion of policies dictated by the powerful States.

17. I mentioned in the Security Council about a month ago [1358th meeting] that the question of peace and war was the prerogative of that body. I warned the Council that I did not see any reason or wisdom in referring this question of Israeli aggression to a special emergency session of the Assembly. However, pressure was brought upon the membership of the United Nations—and if it was not pressure, at least persuasion was used to convince members that peace would be served by convening a special emergency session. I was not convinced at the time, and I said that the result would be zero. I am sorry to say today that the result is below zero.

18. In 1950, I witnessed none other than my friend, Yakov Malik, walk out of the Security Council. Some Powers seized that opportunity in the Council to transfer the Korean question to a session of this Assembly. The result was the famous Uniting for Peace resolution [resolution 377 (V)], and today there are two Koreas—one people bisected. Furthermore, there is no assurance that this question will not be shuttled between the Council and the Assembly and then between the Assembly and the Council, and a decade from now the question of Israeli aggression will still be before the Council and the Assembly.

19. It would seem that the politicians who direct the affairs of nations have learned nothing from the past. The League of Nations was founded in order to transcend political arrangements, secret treaties and the policies which the spheres of influence dictated. The League of Nations foundered. We would have thought that the United Nations, after twenty years, would learn a lesson from the failure of the League of Nations. I am sorry to say that the United Nations is following the pattern of the League of

Nations—a pattern which I personally observed when I was in Western Europe in the thirties.

20. Why do I speak with such vehemence? It is because I speak with assurance. I do not have to look for the portents on the wall. They are already before us.

21. Through the courtesy of my good friend and colleague, the representative of Sweden, I have a copy of the draft resolution [A/L.529] he has submitted with two other colleagues, the representative of Finland and the representative of Austria. In appearance, this draft resolution is what might be called a procedural resolution forwarding this question back to the Security Council from the Assembly and also keeping this Assembly in abeyance, so that, if the Security Council fails, the question can perhaps be shuttled back into the Assembly; and then if the Assembly fails it will be shuttled back to the Security Council. And year in and year out we will be seized of this question—if the Organization survives such machinations, because I really feel very worried about the health of this international Organization. It is now a sick organization. Organizations can die, like patients. And there is no assurance that if we followed this course of action, this Organization would be immune to disease or even demise.

22. The draft resolution refers to the "grave situation". I should like to remind my good friend, none other than the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, of the letter [A/6717] he submitted—the letter which was the *raison d'être* of this emergency special session. That letter asked for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab lands which they had occupied since 5 June.

23. The same day that that letter was submitted, none other than Ambassador Goldberg, another friend and colleague of ours, broadened the whole question. It was no longer only the aggression of Israel but how to liquidate the whole problem arising from the incursion of Israel in the midst of the Arab homeland. The result is that the aggression has now been watered down to merely a "grave situation"; the aggression becomes a "grave situation". There are grave situations everywhere in the world. There is a grave situation in Rhodesia. There is a grave situation caused by apartheid. There is a grave situation in the Congo. There are multifarious grave situations—and this Israeli aggression has been reduced to a mere "grave situation".

24. Where is the conscience of this Assembly? Is it only a "grave situation" or is it aggression? Or do many of you subscribe to the idea that 2,000 years ago there was a Kingdom of Judea or Israel in that part of the world? I do not have to elaborate on this invalid argument, as I have dealt with it many times throughout the twenty years of my presence in the United Nations.

25. This draft resolution states in its second preambular paragraph: "Bearing in mind the resolutions adopted and the proposals considered...". I suppose that the resolutions referred to here cover the three resolutions that were passed by this Assembly, namely, the so-called humanitarian resolution and the two resolutions pertaining to Jerusalem which are lugged in,

together with the proposals that failed because of the pressures that were used, as they had been used in 1947, on people in capitals of countries to see to it that the resolution which spelt out Israeli aggression and the necessity of Israeli withdrawal would not receive a two-thirds majority. Friends of mine in the United Nations who were 7,000 miles away from Palestine arrogated unto themselves the responsibility to tell us how to act and how to behave—it was if the Arabs, God forbid, even if they had the power, would arrogate unto themselves the responsibility to tell the countries of the new hemisphere or of Western Europe how they should decide their affairs.

26. It is not permissible for the Assembly to lug in the two resolutions pertaining to Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] with the proposals that failed, instead of at least segregating those two resolutions and taking any action that would lead to their implementation. I beg my three colleagues from Austria, Finland and Sweden to take this into consideration. Since when have we taken it upon ourselves to recommend to the Council what it should do in the case of such a momentous draft resolution as the one we have before us? This could easily have been done by the Secretary-General through a consensus which could have been taken by the President.

27. No, this is not such an innocent draft resolution after all, for the reasons I have mentioned. And there are other points which I still have to mention, without having to dissect each word of it—because the obvious cannot be hidden, just as you cannot hide a fire under a bush. We see such words as these in the draft resolution in operative paragraph 1: "Recommends to the Security Council to resume its consideration of the tense situation in the Middle East..." The word "tense" is equivalent here to the word "grave". It is a question of diction; I would not say that they are synonymous in the English language. A war and occupation of the territory of three Member States of the United Nations and the trampling of the dignity of 100 million Arab people have taken place and for people who are 6,000, 7,000 or 8,000 miles away this constitutes only a grave and tense situation, not aggression.

28. I hope that sufficient time has passed to enable the Secretariat to circulate this draft resolution so that every Member can scrutinize in his own conscience the implications that it has. At the same time I must mention, as I have done time and again, that Governments, whether Arab or non-Arab, will come and go, but the Palestine question will remain because the Palestinian people are not negotiable. It would be shameful if we in this international Organization overlooked the self-determination of the indigenous people of Palestine, which since 1945 has been guaranteed in the United Nations Charter.

29. Nor are the Arab people at large negotiable. For your information, secret societies are already banding together to kill and assassinate anyone amongst the Arabs who tried to work out an accommodation such as is envisaged by many of our colleagues either in their statements or by their support of certain resolutions. When I mentioned this to a friend of mine—and I do not have to name him; in fairness to our colleagues from the Soviet Union I must say that he was of the Western camp—he said, "That is your problem".

In other words, let the situation continue as it is and there will be no peace and Israel will remain in occupation of the Arab lands. And when I said, "Suppose the leaders are killed or the Governments overthrown?" He said, "That is your problem". Let other Governments come into being; never mind, change them just like you change your clothes in the morning. That is how cynical certain Western Powers are regarding our people. And if only one of their nationals is insulted, let alone killed, in a foreign land, good Lord, what they do not do in order to obtain redress for a single person.

30. But let it be known from this rostrum that the Arab people are not negotiable. The Arab people, I am sorry to say, will have a long period of instability, of uprisings, of turmoil and turbulence if this Assembly does not treat the case of Palestine with the justice which is due it and which has been due it since 1947.

31. I conclude my statement by saying that inasmuch as I, like all of you, would like to see peace prevail not only in the Middle East but the whole world over—including South-East Asia; however, I must repeat that there shall be no peace in the Middle East if this Assembly still thinks that the indigenous people of Palestine and the Arab people at large are negotiable.

32. The PRESIDENT: May I draw the attention of the representative of Saudi Arabia to the fact that there is now a draft resolution before the Assembly which is a procedural one in the view of its sponsors. Any references to the substance of the whole problem are not proper at this stage. In addition, I am quite sure that all Members would want to avoid discussing other issues which are not before the Assembly.

33. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, may I continue?

34. The PRESIDENT: With the understanding that you will heed my appeal, you may continue.

35. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, you are sitting directly behind me. I was taking up my papers and concluding my statement. But, because of the friendship that once bound us together, and I am sure still binds us together, you seem to have a genius for interrupting my speech thirty seconds or so before I conclude. I was not going to talk about Viet-Nam. All I was saying was that I, like all of you, would like to see peace prevail in the Middle East as well as in all parts of the world, including South-East Asia—and I am not going to discuss South-East Asia. Mr. President, why did you not interrupt Mr. Gromyko or Mr. Goldberg when they talked about that? Poor Baroody, he is your cousin—never mind. This is a Joha story. There was a man called Joha who could only silence his own cousin ...

36. The PRESIDENT: May I appeal to the representative once again.

37. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I stand on my sovereign rights.

38. The PRESIDENT: I do know something about Joha, and the information that I have about him is quite sufficient for me to know that he is not on the agenda of this Assembly.

39. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, allow me to finish my statement once and for all.

40. The PRESIDENT: I shall be very pleased to give you the opportunity to finish your statement if your statement is in order. However, I must tell you that it is my duty to rule out of order any statement which I do not consider to be completely in order.

41. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): May I proceed?

42. The PRESIDENT: You may proceed, Sir, if your statement is in order.

43. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I accept what you say, Mr. President, but, before closing, I request you to use the same yardstick with respect to others who sometimes may take more liberties than I have taken. I believe that I have not been taking liberties, but that I was speaking in my own style.

44. The PRESIDENT: The appeal which I have extended to you I have extended to all delegations, namely, that when they speak they should observe the same requirement that I have asked you to observe.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): All right, I must thank you for your consideration and your forbearance. Let no one think that this incident will in any way vitiate the respect that I have for you as a person. However, if I said what I had to say, I did so standing on my own rights.

46. Having said that, I would conclude by saying that I wish peace to prevail everywhere, and there shall be no peace in the Middle East if this Assembly thinks that the indigenous people of Palestine and the Arab people at large are negotiable.

47. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (translated from French): The delegation of the Republic of Mali would like to express its gratitude to the three delegations of Sweden, Austria and Finland, which, after much serious effort, have produced what is now submitted to the Assembly as a "procedural draft resolution".

48. At this point, my delegation would like to say the following: to begin with, we are not, we have not been and we shall not be in favour of referring this matter back to the Security Council, on the one hand because we think that the question is still before the Council, and on the other because we know perfectly well, as do all those here, what the situation is in the Security Council.

49. We all know that it is because no solution could be found in the Security Council that an appeal was made to all the States Members of the Organization to come together and reach a decision on a very important matter. As the fifteen members of the Security Council were unable to find a solution, all Member States were asked to study the problem with a view to finding a solution for it.

50. The delegation of Mali would like to point out that during the discussions in the corridors and in the course of unofficial contacts, we often heard it said "We are agreed on the withdrawal". But it was never possible, either in the Security Council or at this emergency special session of the General Assembly, to secure the withdrawal of the Israel occupation forces. It seems to me, therefore, that the impasse in the Security Council has been reflected in

the General Assembly. And this cannot but be very disquieting, particularly for the small countries, the young nations. In point of fact, this inability to secure the withdrawal of the Israel troops from the territory they have conquered and which they are now occupying is, as we see it, a reward for territorial conquest. We are not ready to endorse this and we do not think that anyone here who claims to respect the spirit of the Charter can in honesty endorse it.

51. All the States represented here, and more particularly the small States which have followed the work of this Assembly and seen the results that have been achieved, feel anxious when they realize: "Tomorrow it might be my country. Here they will amuse themselves with talking; stories will be told in the Security Council and capped here, before this Assembly. After which: nothing. Our country will still be occupied, the occupier will still be there". Such is the lesson to be drawn from these discussions, for the small countries.

52. We said in the Security Council that we are not anti-Jewish, or anti-white, or anti-yellow, or anti-red. From the start of this matter we have emphasized, in the Council, that it must be studied seriously and in its fundamental aspects. That means that the right of the people of Palestine who have been driven from their land to return to their native soil, to the home of their forefathers, must be recognized. We continue to stress this point. We have never claimed that the Jews must be driven out of Palestine or put to the sword. We say that they are human beings. But we consider that the Palestinians must recover their national territory. This is what has not been done, and until this problem is dealt with there will be bloodshed and disturbances.

53. Here, through our inertia, which I shall not hesitate to dub complicity, by our collusive inaction, we are demonstrating to the whole world that aggression does pay. Thus anyone, any State, may tomorrow engage in aggression. We shall hear the same speeches; we shall see the same comings and goings, the same contacts, the same little groups; and the aggressor will remain in the territory he has conquered.

54. It is a different task that we are asked to perform here, and we, for our part, are ready to set about it at once.

55. I want to stress this point: as long as there are still troops occupying foreign territory, there will be no peace. We must realize this. All those who admire and support Israel, those who want to do something for it, should understand, that they would be doing it a disservice by encouraging it to remain in the conquered territories. They must understand that the true owners of these lands will never allow this occupation to continue indefinitely and they would be creating a permanent state of war for Israel. They must realize that the occupied Arab lands cannot remain in Israel's hands. Those who really wish to do Israel a service must therefore put pressure on it to restore the lands which it now occupies. By doing so they would be proving that they love Israel, that they want to see it live and develop, that they have its interests at heart. But to encourage it to stay in lands conquered by force is an ill service, a bad lesson, no

proof of friendship for Israel on the part of those who seem or who claim to be its friends.

56. This must be made clear, for the situation cannot remain as it is. No country can occupy another's lands by force in the hope that the victim will do nothing, will stay with his arms folded. This is not possible.

57. The Assembly has before it a draft resolution [A/L.529]. It may look like a procedural resolution, but my delegation thinks that in fact it also touches on the substance of the matter to a certain extent. For the substance of the question is that shortcoming of which we are all guilty. Why not say so? We have shown ourselves wanting, we have not succeeded in being honest either with ourselves or with the Charter. Yet this failure incites us, instead of seeking the true remedy, simply to flee our responsibilities. This is the point we have reached. We have not honestly accomplished the task that was entrusted to us. And now we are looking for a way to escape our responsibilities; we are talking about suspending the session, adjourning, because we have not succeeded in finding a solution. This is why I consider that the draft resolution does to some extent touch on the substance of the question. From the point of view of individual morality as well as international morality, each one of us should tell himself that this is not what was expected of us.

58. For this reason, my delegation does not and will not support a draft resolution of this kind, which bears witness to weakness, incapacity and discouragement on the part of all States. If I say discouragement, it is because the draft resolution in fact accepts things as they are. It is tantamount to saying: "This is how the situation stands; we can do nothing to change it; let us leave it as it is." It is exactly what the Security Council has already done and it is this which has permitted the occupying troops to go on with their occupation; it is this which has encouraged the occupation. My delegation, I repeat, is not willing to accept this once again in the General Assembly.

59. I have already spoken of the question of referring the matter back to the Security Council. We all know in advance what the situation there would be. We therefore find it rather ridiculous that we should now say that we must go back to the Security Council. In saying this I am not prompted by any desire to slight the good intentions of our friends of Finland, Austria and Sweden, who have made this effort to enable the Assembly to get out of its difficulty one way or another, to save face in regard to the ordinary task which was entrusted to it.

60. I shall simply say this. Let me remind you of the attitude adopted in the Security Council: aggression is a good thing, aggression pays; when you are strong, you can occupy small countries and impose your will upon them.

61. In this Assembly, all Member States, large and small, on an equal footing, have been asked to gather together to study a problem which the Security Council was unable to solve and to find a solution for it. Unfortunately, it looks as though we have taken the same road as the Security Council, that is to say, the road of endorsing victories and territorial conquests achieved

by force, of admitting that might is right. This is why I have been at pains to point out to all the delegations here how great a responsibility we in the Assembly had. In fact, we were all given an opportunity to reflect upon this problem, first by ourselves and then as the United Nations, in order to find the proper solution. Unfortunately, our weakness seems to have been such that not only have we been unable to solve the problem which was put before us but we are now trying to shirk our responsibilities, to find some way out, no matter what; in point of fact, we are no longer looking for results, positive or otherwise; we are only looking for a way to get rid of the problem.

62. It is for the reasons I have just stated that my delegation does not and will not support the draft resolution before us.

63. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker on my list, I should like to inform Members that draft resolution A/L.529 has now been distributed to the Assembly in written form.

64. I would also inform Members that, after the list of speakers is exhausted, I shall wish to ascertain from the authors of the draft resolution whether or not their motion to have it put to the vote at this meeting was a formal one. That was not quite clear to me from the statement which was made on this point. We shall then, of course, have to consider and deal with the situation in the light of the statement of the representative of Iraq.

65. Mr. BUDO (Albania) (translated from French): After the setback which the work of this emergency special session of the General Assembly culminated in on 4 July, we were forced to the conclusion that no really positive results could be achieved during this new phase of the Assembly's work. In fact, everything that has happened in these three weeks of work, both in the Assembly and in the corridors and even outside the United Nations, has provided enough evidence to convince any honest man of the deplorable state of affairs in this Organization and the inability of the General Assembly to carry out its duties in the face of the situation that has been created in the Middle East by Israel's imperialist aggression against the Arab peoples.

66. The fact that the General Assembly has not condemned the aggression of which the Arab peoples are the victims, and that attempts have been made to impose conditions on the evacuation of the Arab territories usurped by Israel by means of armed aggression, is the high point of all the injustice and perverseness that we have witnessed in this international institution, one of whose principal purposes, according to the Charter, is to prohibit the use of force against the territorial integrity or independence of a State and to condemn and punish any act of aggression.

67. It is well known, and we have brought this out on many occasions, that all this is due to the pernicious hold which the United States of America has on the United Nations and to the collusion between that imperialist power and the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union, in accordance with their co-ordinated plans to stifle the revolutionary movement for the liberation of peoples and nations, to share between them zones of influence and world domination

and to use the United Nations as an instrument of that policy.

68. It should be noted, however, that this criminal policy on the part of the two great Powers and their open or clandestine supporters has been upheld here, to our deep regret, by certain small countries which, deliberately or not, have so to speak fallen in with that policy. In fact, the ignominious stand taken here in regard to the Arab countries, the object of the most perfidious treachery and of Israel's imperialist aggression, a stand which disregards in the most scandalous fashion the fundamental principles of the Charter and of international law, has been defended here in this Assembly with unprecedented zeal precisely by the representatives of the small countries. The danger of such an attitude on their part, not only for peace and general security but also for the security of their own countries, cannot be overemphasized.

69. The result of this whole lamentable situation, in which the United Nations, faced with so grave a problem, has proved powerless and incapable of concluding its work with any positive action such as the adoption of just and effective measures, has been to encourage the United States and its tool, Israel, the American imperialists in their hateful intransigence and insane pretensions, and the Zionist racists in their vanity and covetousness and their defiance of world public opinion and of the United Nations and its decisions, as in the case in particular of the resolution on Jerusalem [2254 (ES-V)]. We have been given typical evidence of this on many occasions here by the representatives of the Zionists of Israel who, drunk with the temporary military gains which their imperialist masters have procured for them, and disregarding all the lessons of history, have made speeches full of arrogance and hateful insolence that remind us of the shouting of Hitler's fascists.

70. Thus, whether we like it or not, the United Nations, because of the pernicious sway that the United States of America exercises over it, finds itself embarked upon a course diametrically opposed to that laid down for it in the Charter, encouraging and supporting aggression, and supporting and protecting the gains resulting from aggression. Is not this a very important service to the policy of aggression and domination of the United States imperialists and their chief collaborators? Today the world is faced with a monstrous situation. Israel, this fascist creature and tool of imperialism, primarily of the United States of America, is installed on the Arab territory it invaded by armed aggression and, enjoying the support of the United States imperialists and their open or clandestine partners, does not scruple to exploit the situation and to try, from a position of strength, to impose on the Arab countries so-called peace negotiations and other arbitrary conditions in accordance with its expansionist ambitions. Are not these the same sinister tactics as those the United States aggressors and the Soviet revisionists are practising against Viet-Nam, where they are trying, by threats of the most savage war and the cruellest bombardments and devastation, to bend the iron will of the heroic Viet-Nameese people and force them to accept the trick of "peace negotiations" so that they will capitulate and lay down their arms?

71. These vile practices were recently most cynically confirmed when Kosygin, arriving in Paris after his secret bargaining with Johnson, declared that it lay with the Viet-Nameese people and the Viet-Nameese Government to choose between war and peace, ignoring the fact that it is the United States aggressors who have travelled thousands of miles to invade this country where they are waging the most savage war, and forgetting that the heroic Viet-Nameese people are fighting the invaders for their freedom and the welfare of their country.

72. The Albanian delegation cannot do other than see things as they are and give them their true name. This is in accordance with the basic principles of our Government's policy. In particular we consider that it is our most pressing duty to warn the small peace-loving and freedom-loving countries of the threat that this criminal conspiracy between the two great Powers constitutes for peace and security in general and for the security of each of them.

73. Draft resolution A/L.529, which as everyone knows has been concocted by the two great Powers, is entirely unacceptable to us. The proposal to transfer to the Security Council the question of the imperialist aggression of Israel against the Arab countries in no way contributes to the settlement of this problem in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Charter and of international law. On the contrary, it would be tantamount to leaving the settlement to the discretion of the two great Powers which dominate the Security Council, where they can manoeuvre more easily in order to impose a settlement in conformity with the decisions already taken by Johnson and Kosygin at Glassboro.

74. In our view, the adoption by the General Assembly of such a resolution, after all that has happened at this session, would signify its abdication in favour of the Security Council, which would be highly dangerous not only for the question at issue but also for the future of the Organization and the cause which according to the Charter it ought to serve. For our own part, we cannot agree to subscribe to such an act, for it would be contrary to our presence here, contrary to the struggle of principle which we wage constantly in this Assembly, which is the highest tribunal of the Organization, the tribunal on which all Member States are represented; it would be contrary to our efforts for the adoption of a just position in respect of Israel's imperialist aggression.

75. Some representatives, while recognizing the impasse in which the General Assembly finds itself, claim that nevertheless something must be done, some resolution must be adopted in order at least to save the faces of the Soviet leaders, who took the initiative of convening this session of the General Assembly.

76. But why are we here? Is it to serve the ends of the internal or external propaganda of the revisionist Soviet leaders, which their Foreign Minister here is worrying about, resorting to every kind of pressure and to every means at his disposal so that he can, as The New York Times says this morning, "go home to Moscow with something"? Are we here to save the faces of the leaders of a particular Government and to work for their propaganda, regardless of the merits

of the proposals that would thus be adopted and the consequences that would ensue from them? We cannot envisage the role of Members of the United Nations in this way; it would be contrary to the dignity and sovereignty of the sovereign Member States and contrary to this Organization's mandate under the Charter.

77. We for our part shall never agree to play such a role, and still less in the case of the Soviet revisionist leaders, who bear a heavy responsibility for events in the Middle East and for all that they are plotting with the United States imperialists at the expense of the Arab peoples. On the contrary, we regard it as our highest duty to denounce all those who have any responsibility for the imperialist aggression of Israel against the Arab countries, so that the peoples of the world may become better acquainted with them and may be able to recognize who are their enemies and who are their friends. In the present state of international affairs, this is a very important contribution to the cause of peace and freedom.

78. The Albanian delegation has tried to present the problem on this session's agenda in its true light, in regard both to the events in the Middle East and to the provisions which the General Assembly should adopt concerning the Israel imperialist aggression against the Arab countries and the consequences which have resulted from it.

79. In submitting to the General Assembly the proposals in document A/L.521, the Albanian delegation was guided above all by the necessity, more urgent and vital than ever before, of condemning aggression and not allowing its perpetrators to benefit in any way from the results of force, and of eliminating all its consequences. It is unthinkable that the General Assembly should remain indifferent or impotent in the face of a perfidious and intolerable armed aggression perpetrated by the imperialists and Israel, their tool, an aggression which has resulted in the occupation by Israel of large parts of the Arab territories and the submission of thousands of human beings to the most savage racist tyranny.

80. The rejection of our proposals is one more proof that in the present circumstances here at the United Nations, because of the hold exercised over it by the United States, the Organization is incapable of adopting the measures that are called for by the imperialist aggression of Israel.

81. It should be noted, nevertheless, that in presenting this problem in an objective and realistic light and in submitting to the Assembly the proposals which are called for under the Charter, the Albanian delegation has done a great deal, together with other delegations to demonstrate who are responsible for the situation that has been created in the Middle East, who, in one way or another, support the aggression, and who condemn and oppose it. This is very important. It is, moreover, the only advantage that has been derived from the discussions of this session of the General Assembly.

82. In point of fact, in the present international circumstances this achievement is of great importance to all the small countries which, like Albania, are the constant targets of threats and conspiracy on the part of the imperialists and their collaborators. This

is of prime importance, for, by strengthening their resolve in the face of United States imperialism, as the number one enemy of the peoples, and of the treachery of the Soviet revisionists and of all those who work in favour of the criminal policy of those two Powers, the peace-loving and freedom-loving countries will realize even better that the only way of salvation open to them at this juncture is for each to count above all on its own resources, to prepare constantly for future struggles, and for all together to strengthen their solidarity and close their ranks, to fight bravely by every means against the common enemy until the final, certain victory.

83. The Arab peoples, like the people of Viet-Nam and all freedom-loving countries and peoples throughout the world, understand today better than ever that this is the only way open to them. They know that final victory will be theirs provided that they shrink from no difficulty and that they fight with resolution. The Albanian people proclaim their complete solidarity with their Arab brothers and stand firmly by their side. They are sure that their just cause will triumph.

84. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): May I first of all state the view of my delegation on the status of the draft resolution [A/L.529] presented by the representative of Sweden.

85. The representative of Sweden himself said that the draft resolution deals with matters of substance. It is a substantive draft resolution in the sense that, in its operative paragraph 1, it recommends to one of the principal organs of the United Nations that it consider a question of grave importance to international peace and security. Under Article 10 of the Charter, as you know, one of the first and most important duties of the General Assembly is precisely to make such recommendations. Therefore there can be no question at all that this is a substantive question of the highest importance. If there was any doubt, it of course was dispelled by the statement of one of the sponsors of that draft resolution. I say this in order to remove any doubt or ambiguity regarding the procedural aspect of the problem.

86. May I say that we are fully aware of the good intentions and worthy efforts of the three sponsors of the draft resolution in order to have the Assembly adopt a draft resolution that, in their opinion, would be acceptable to the majority of the Members of this Organization. Unfortunately, however, in spite of their good intentions, I think they have erred in one or two very serious respects.

87. There is an inherent contradiction in the draft resolution. The representative of Sweden, in introducing it, stated that the Security Council at present is seized of the problem, but that fact is not reflected in the draft resolution before us. It is not mentioned at all. I submit that this was not accidental because this omission, considered in conjunction with operative paragraphs 1 and 2, means that the sponsors of the draft resolution had in view not a procedural aim but an important substantive aim which, as I said in my previous statement, has the most serious implications for this Organization and indeed for the powers and prerogatives of the General Assembly.

88. If the Security Council is indeed seized of this question, one is entitled to ask: why the insistence upon including a paragraph in the draft resolution recommending to the Council that it resume its consideration? It is true that, while this Assembly was in session, the Security Council met to consider certain aspects of the problem that had been before it since last May. Why is it, therefore, that there is in the draft resolution a specific recommendation to the Security Council to resume its consideration of the situation? This recommendation read in conjunction with operative paragraph 2, which requests that the records of this emergency special session be forwarded to the Council, means that the impression is that the work of this Assembly has really ended for all practical purposes. There is no better proof of that than the provision that its records are to be transferred to the Security Council and that the Council is asked specifically to resume its consideration of the problem. This is obviously the aim of this draft resolution. Had this not been the aim, there would have been no necessity to include a specific recommendation to the Council to resume its consideration. Therefore, these two operative paragraphs, in conjunction with the omission of any mention of the fact that the Council is presently seized of the matter, nullify, in our view, the effects of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. It is clear that operative paragraph 3, which asks that the emergency special session be adjourned, really becomes a meaningless and empty phrase with no practical application, since the Council not only would be seized of the question but would have the records of this Assembly before it when it resumed consideration of the whole problem.

89. What are the implications of this? The most serious implications are an admission of failure by the General Assembly, an abdication of responsibility, an acknowledgement of hopelessness. This is very serious because it is in the General Assembly that the small countries of the world have a voice. It is in the General Assembly that the small countries of the world feel that they have protection more adequate than that afforded to them in the Security Council. Can we forget the efforts made by the very sponsors of this draft resolution, in other circumstances, to strengthen the prerogatives and functions of the General Assembly in matters relating to the preservation of international peace and security? Now, however, with this recommendation to the Security Council, we are weakening for all time the efforts of this Assembly to discharge its very important responsibilities under the Charter.

90. But over and above all these serious implications for the Organization, there is another very serious implication: that the General Assembly, having for more than a month debated a question resulting from a premeditated and planned attack on Member States of this Organization—and I have not yet heard one single word in this Assembly denying that the attack was planned beforehand and carried out according to predisposed military operations—has left untouched the two very important questions which go to the very core of the Charter of the United Nations: the fact that an attack occurred on Member States, and the fact that territories of Member States have been occupied by the armies of another. The implication is that the

General Assembly—and, indeed, the United Nations—has recognized its impotence to deal with a matter of such great concern to humanity and to international peace and security.

91. Where do we go from here? The representative of Mali, who is a member of the Security Council and perhaps in a better position to know, has informed the Assembly how difficult it is for small countries that have been subjected to aggression to obtain any help and succour from the Security Council. If there is any hope in the United Nations, it is here in the General Assembly, which represents the collective conscience of mankind and which perhaps can afford some hope to the small countries that have been subjected to aggression.

92. We may be asked, then, why did you vote in favour of a draft resolution which asked that the Security Council take up all the questions relating to this situation? Yes, we voted in favour of that draft resolution but in the context of a decision of the Assembly that would have asked for immediate withdrawal of the occupying forces from Arab territories. Then, and only then, would the Security Council have been in a position to take up all the questions and ramifications of this problem in a clear-cut context, and not without the guidance and expression of view of the General Assembly.

93. The representative of Sweden stated that there has been a wide measure of agreement on certain aspects of this situation. May I state that the wide measure of agreement evidenced in the debates of the General Assembly has been precisely on the question of withdrawal of the occupying forces from Arab territories. It is on this point, and this point only, that there has been a wide measure of agreement in the General Assembly. And yet it is not reflected in any way in this draft resolution, which thereby fails to give the Security Council the proper guidance and a proper context in which it can do its very important work in the future.

94. For all those reasons, I wish to ask for a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution. If that is done, then my delegation will vote against this operative paragraph. If that operative paragraph is removed as a result of the vote, then the draft resolution automatically becomes a procedural one, because it would merely contain two decisions—the first, to forward records to the Council and the second, to adjourn this session of the Assembly temporarily. But the recommendation to the Council—a principal organ of this Organization—presumably under Article 10 of the Charter, is a matter of substance and must be treated as such. On the other hand, if operative paragraph 1 is retained, then my delegation will be compelled to withhold its support from the draft resolution and vote against it.

95. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): It is a sad commentary on the General Assembly that, after six weeks of debate, it should not be able to find a solution acceptable to the majority of the Assembly based strictly on the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. My delegation is not convinced that the proposal by the representative of Sweden [A/L.529] to transfer the matter to the Security Council is the right one or one

which has particular merit. We witnessed the ineffectiveness of the Security Council during the period in which the aggression was committed. It may be recalled that, when Israel launched its aggression, two things began to emerge with startling and disturbing clarity as the Israeli war machine grew more confident and Israel secured its expansionist aims: first, we witnessed that some members of the Security Council seemed to disregard the necessity of labeling the aggressor State; second, there was a cynical acceptance of what many commonly term the realities of the situation. The principle of the *fait accompli* had taken the place of the application of those principles of the United Nations Charter which many piously evoke when their own immediate interests are involved but which in this particular situation were obviously disregarded.

96. The situation in the Middle East is not beyond solution, and it is certainly not beyond the capacity of this Assembly to find a solution which will give justice to the victims of this aggression. Most speakers in the course of this debate have expressed agreement on two points: first, that no rights can flow from an act of aggression; second, that there can be no reduction of tension, no elimination of danger, and no hope for peace while a Member State continues to occupy the territory of other States by force and in defiance of the United Nations Charter.

97. My delegation is of the opinion that, consistent with the practice already established by the United Nations, this Organization's call for a cease-fire in the Middle East should have been followed by the withdrawal of the aggressor forces. Such withdrawal is absolutely necessary if it is desired to create an atmosphere conducive to a settlement of the issues involved in the dispute.

98. Throughout the negotiations that have taken place in the corridors of the United Nations, there has been an attempt to force resolutions upon the victims of the aggression which would impose conditions or which would exact from the victims rights which are highly debatable.

99. Only when the aggressor withdraws its forces would it be acceptable for this Assembly and its appropriate organs to enter into the legal and political aspects of the problem with all the firmness, urgency and justice which the situation demands. My delegation believes that the responsibility of the General Assembly in this particular situation has neither diminished nor ended. Furthermore, we do not believe that it can be transferred. The work of the General Assembly is still incomplete and cannot be disposed of in the manner proposed in the draft resolution.

100. For those reasons, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution.

101. Mr. BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria) (translated from French): The Algerian delegation had not intended to intervene at this stage in the debate. However, before embarking on the comments which I find myself compelled to make in connexion with the so-called procedural draft resolution now before the General Assembly [A/L.529], I should like to thank my friend, the representative of Iraq, for intervening so that

you, Mr. President, could give us time to examine the draft resolution in writing.

102. The sponsoring countries have friendly relations with my country that go back to the time before it was a legal entity, and before it began to take part in the work of this Assembly. They also share with my country a deep attachment to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

103. Nevertheless, this profound attachment of ours to the principles of the Charter compels me to say that we are at a moment in the history of this Organization when, because of our inability to take decisions, we must tell ourselves some home truths. I shall try to state these home truths as simply as possible.

104. It is unimaginable that we should be talking about a procedural resolution when the Assembly has met in emergency special session precisely because the Security Council—which, incidentally, still has the famous Middle Eastern question before it—had not arrived at any specific and positive decision.

105. When the Soviet Union asked for the convening of this Assembly [see A/6717], its positive action was hailed by all the Members of this Organization—all or almost all, since only the allies of the aggressor were opposed to the convening of this session. That is to say that all the Members of the Assembly sincerely expected that we should be able to work out a resolution which would reflect the reasons for which the General Assembly had been called into emergency special session.

106. If you will allow me, I shall say that the aims in view were: (1) to condemn aggression, and I am deliberately using an impersonal tone in order to remain within the spirit of the United Nations Charter; (2) to secure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of troops; and (3) to obtain material compensation for the damage caused by the aggression.

107. We have lived through some fascinating weeks; we have lived through busy weeks; we have lived through weeks that have taught us how far our apprehensions at the beginning of the session, great as they were, were justified. On 19 June, the Algerian Chief of State, even before this session was convened, stated publicly that the international situation was such that unfortunately we could not expect all that we were entitled to expect from international institutions and more particularly from the General Assembly of the United Nations.

108. This was not sour grapes, still less was it scepticism. Algeria's position was the outcome of long analysis. Inevitably since the nineteenth session we have submitted to you all the complaints which we have against the General Assembly, which we also have against the Security Council; and I owe it to myself to say that although we have complaints against the Assembly, we could have still more against the Security Council, which is very far from reflecting the true face of the world's peoples.

109. The Soviet Union, in requesting the convening of this emergency special session, went somewhat beyond the doctrine of the great Powers, which is to uphold the notion of the government of the world by

the great Powers, and for once gave the General Assembly an opportunity to state its opinion, as it had been unable to do on other problems that were just as burning and which still prick our consciences; I am thinking particularly of Viet-Nam; for once, therefore, a great Power gave the Assembly the chance to pass judgment on the problem of peace in the Middle East.

110. I can only regret, as the representative of a small country which is a Member of this Assembly, that the non-aligned countries did not think it appropriate and necessary to seize this exceptional opportunity to bring out, to emphasize and to demonstrate how increasingly necessary and urgent it is to secure a fairer balance and a more equitable sharing of responsibility between the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

111. But I must state quite simply that the fact that we were unable to achieve any result, is attributable to the pressure, visible to the naked eye, which we witnessed here, in the corridors and elsewhere, being exerted upon the Members of this General Assembly.

112. It is indeed paradoxical that countries which are morally bound by regional organizations and charters, which have very deep common interests, can find themselves suddenly separated in the face of situations which ordinarily would have elicited extremely simple responses needing little imagination for they would merely have reflected the principles of the Organization.

113. Thus the unanimity which was demonstrated on behalf of convening this session crumbled as the days and weeks went by, and the solidarity which was a natural bond between most of the Members of this Organization—particularly the countries of the Third World—dwindled day by day to the point at which we presented a lamentable spectacle of disunity. But this lamentable spectacle does not represent the failure of any particular group; I regret that I must say with all due solemnity that this spectacle of disunity represented the bankruptcy of the United Nations as a whole. It is my duty to emphasize with all the necessary force that the United Nations has failed a test and that the Assembly has been unable to work out any resolution on the problem of the threat to peace in the Middle East.

114. I do not see how, in the presence of this failure which might perhaps inspire us to more pertinent reflection, deeper and more serious reflection on the future of international institutions, my delegation could associate itself with an attempt to camouflage it by a procedural resolution, the more so in that if we, the representatives of the non-aligned countries, were to accept this situation, I do not for myself believe that our attitude could for a moment deceive the people whom we represent as regards the lamentable failure of this session.

115. It please me to point out that those who were the aggressor's allies have continued to be so, according to an implacable logic.

116. It pleases me, too, to note the fervent attachment of the forces of peace and progress in the world to

legality, their immense and admirable faith in international institutions and in the principles of the Charter. But it also pleases me to say that this attachment to the principles of the Charter so admirably demonstrated by the forces of peace and progress in the world cannot authorize us now to endorse this failure in one way or another, and to find ourselves once again in contradiction with one of the fundamental principles of our policy, namely the need to restore a balance of responsibilities between international institutions.

117. I must therefore endorse wholeheartedly the comments of the representative of Iraq, who said that, once the question had been placed before the Security Council, there was no point in saying publicly that the General Assembly—having failed—had no resort other than the Security Council.

118. This is an extremely serious conception of international responsibility, conception which it is our duty to denounce in the strongest terms, a conception which cannot satisfy either our consciences or our peoples, above all the peoples whom we represent here and who constitute an overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world.

119. These peoples of the third world—called so probably because they represent more than two-thirds of mankind—will be able to say one day that these stylistic manoeuvres are no longer in keeping with the traditions of international relations.

120. This is why I wished to emphasize that the Algerian delegation—which fully appreciates the good intentions of the distinguished sponsors of the draft resolution—cannot, for the reasons which I have been at pains to state, subscribe in any way to paragraph 1. If we were to do so, it would run counter to our policy, to our conscience, and to the hopes and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of this General Assembly.

121. The PRESIDENT: I should like to seek the cooperation of the Assembly at this stage by asking Members to agree with me that the list of speakers for those representatives who wish to speak before the vote should be considered closed at 6 o'clock this evening. If there is no objection, the list of speakers before the vote will be closed at 6 p.m.

It was so decided.

122. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) (translated from French): It is strange to see how procedural manoeuvres can lead our Assembly to turn away from its essential concern. At the moment when an African land is occupied by an aggressor, at the moment when the Arab peoples are laid low by injustice through Israel's aggression, it is at this precise moment that our Assembly is encouraged to subside comfortably into a procedural manoeuvre.

123. The delegation of Guinea, for its part, has no intention of settling down into this manoeuvre; its mind is preoccupied with the tragic fate of the Arab peoples under the occupation of the aggressor, Israel.

124. On looking at the draft resolution submitted by Austria, Finland and Sweden (A/L.529), we must say we are touched by the spirit of generosity in which it was drafted. But after a serious examination of the text and after critical scrutiny of the nature, the ob-

jectives and the very essence of the draft resolution, we asked ourselves—and do so again—whether its adoption may not bring about the irrevocable decline of this Organization.

125. For countries such as Guinea, which has been fighting for ten years for the greater democratization of United Nations structures, it is strange to see some countries desiring and provoking a decrease in the prerogatives of the General Assembly. In our eyes, this Assembly is the most democratic organ and we think that the small countries should unite their efforts to strengthen the structures of the Assembly, which is, as it were, the epicentre of our concern and our anxieties.

126. This draft resolution is bound to give jurists food for reflection, for when we look at it closely we see that in both form and content it is a juridical monster whose political consequences are incalculable, sapping the very foundations of the Organization, particularly if we remember the differences of position between Member States regarding the constitutional considerations surrounding the interpretation of the Charter, with one group of countries insisting on pre-eminence for the Security Council because of their power, and a majority of small countries, as I recalled earlier, fighting to ensure that the General Assembly, being more representative, can play a responsible role in the destinies of mankind.

127. The real nature of this text emerges, I am sorry to have to note, from a historical contradiction, which history itself in its ineluctable march forward will not fail to correct and clarify. I will not expatiate further on this point, but I am sure that history will bring out the meaning of the actions of all sides and will reveal to us the profound reasons which lie behind the attitude of certain powers.

128. In any event, we for our part interpret this draft resolution as collusion between the Great Powers with a view to imposing their will on the small Powers. My delegation's attitude will be determined by the considerations I have just outlined.

129. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): The draft resolution [A/L.529] presented by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the three co-sponsors appears to my delegation to pose too many problems for us to consider it as a merely procedural draft. In the first paragraph of its preamble, it takes account of the grave situation in the Middle East, and then it proceeds, in its first operative paragraph, to recommend that the Security Council should resume its consideration of the situation. But this special session of the General Assembly was held because the Security Council had been unable to come to a decision condemning the Israeli aggression and demanding the withdrawal of Israel's aggressive forces. It was on that understanding that my Government supported the convening of this emergency special session. We had hoped that the General Assembly might succeed where the Security Council had failed.

130. The draft resolution before us seems to suggest that the 121 Member States of the United Nations were unable to condemn aggression and were unable to affirm their adherence to the Charter of the United Nations. That, in fact, is the case. It is sad and re-

grettable, but it is important to acknowledge it. The remedy for that situation, it appears to my delegation, is not to shuffle the issue back to the Security Council.

Mr. Tinoco (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

131. Secondly, the Assembly need not in its emergency special session remind the Security Council of the gravity of the situation. The situation, let us remind ourselves, is one where the Charter of the United Nations has been violated and where aggression and unlawful occupation have been perpetrated and have not been condemned. The General Assembly has failed to condemn aggression. We should acknowledge that failure and not try to cover it up by advancing and by adopting a draft resolution that says: we are aware of the situation, but let the Security Council deal with it. The Security Council has been aware of the situation. And when the Security Council dealt with the situation, it was unable to do so effectively.

132. Perhaps this truth of our failure is not palatable, particularly to the smaller nations whose only hope for justice is in the United Nations. But to acknowledge this truth and to acknowledge this failure is the first step in the right direction which the smaller nations must take, if they are to conduct their policies in the future with full awareness of the realities that obtain within this Organization. The smaller nations should not be concerned about the failure of this special session. They should not be concerned that the United Nations has failed on this question. It is important for them to know the reasons why the United Nations has failed.

133. My delegation is prepared, for one, to face the facts and to acknowledge with regret the failure of the General Assembly to deal with aggression. But we are not prepared to say that this is a matter for the Security Council and therefore think that we have relieved ourselves of all responsibility, because we are as responsible for this failure as any of the other delegations.

134. My delegation, therefore, in honesty will not be able to endorse referring this matter by a decision of the General Assembly to the Security Council. We shall vote against this draft resolution if it is put to the vote as a whole, and if it is voted upon paragraph by paragraph, my delegation will vote against the first operative paragraph.

135. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) (translated from French): My Government responded favourably to the request from the Soviet Union [see A/6717]—circulated to the delegations by the Secretary-General and concerning the convening of an emergency special session on the crisis in the Middle East—and sent the following reply:

"The Government of the Republic of Rwanda has no objection to the convening of an emergency special session, in view of the fact that the parties directly concerned do not seem opposed to it."

136. In making this reply, the Government of Rwanda cherished the hope that the General Assembly would play the part of mediator and conciliator and thus assist the parties to solve their problem by means of a

negotiated solution. In fact, my Government counted on the interest which the parties involved have always shown in the cause of peace and world stability.

137. I repeat: a negotiated solution. Indeed, my Government thinks that this is the only means of overcoming the present crisis and that it is possible—my Government is still convinced—to find a solution through this approach. It is encouraging, for example, to find in the General Armistice Agreement of 24 February 1949 between Egypt and Israel, the principle whereby "the right of each party to its security and freedom from fear of attack by the armed forces of the other shall be fully respected".^{2/}

138. We believe that the spirit which presided over the preparation and signature of this agreement is still alive, among both our Egyptian and our Israel friends.

139. Since the debate on the question opened, more than a month ago, we have heard official statements and we have heard accusations directed against one or other of the parties involved. Many of the delegations here have accused the General Assembly, or the Security Council, or the Organization itself of being powerless. These delegations are right, if they are considering the results which our discussions generally achieve. But they are also wrong, and why not say so, if they think that the States which make up this Organization and which belong to different ideological families must necessarily have the same approach to problems. Nevertheless, our role here is first of all to have confidence in those who represent this Organization and who represent their countries on the Security Council, because their concern—we know—is for peace and security. To accuse our institutions is to accuse ourselves, which is not a good approach to the solution we are seeking.

140. My Government and my delegation have always been guided by realism. Our position on the Middle Eastern question is realistic. That is why we are convinced that the role of this Assembly is not to adopt resolutions which cannot be applied, but to seek out realistic approaches which can bring an acceptable and lasting settlement of the crisis.

141. We consider that the elements of the Middle Eastern problem are all inter-connected and must all be the object of a comprehensive settlement, and we think that the proper framework for this—even if it is institutionally imperfect—is the Security Council, because under the Charter it is the Security Council which is competent to deal with problems which relate primarily to international peace and security, and it is the Security Council which has the power to take steps to see that its resolutions are applied.

142. We therefore greet with special interest the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Sweden on behalf of three delegations [A/L.529]: We should, however, have liked the draft resolution to include an express recommendation to the Security Council to study all the aspects of the problem and to apply to it the measures prescribed in the Charter of the United Nations.

^{2/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 3, document S/1264/Rev.1, para. 3.

143. We think, therefore, that we should adjourn our work at this juncture, leaving it to the Security Council to pursue the study of the problem and find a solution to it, for I am convinced that within that framework a solution is possible.

144. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait): I should like to announce and explain the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.529.

145. We shall vote against this draft resolution because, in our opinion, it is a mask and a disguise, and, by their very nature, masks and disguises are reprehensible. But in this instance what this draft resolution is designed to disguise is even more reprehensible.

146. Not only is this draft resolution, then, an attempt to conceal a fact, but also the fact which this draft resolution attempts to conceal is in itself deplorable. What is the fact that it attempts to conceal? It is none other than that on 4 July this Assembly passed a vote of no confidence in the Charter of the United Nations; on 4 July this Assembly refused and failed to give its vote of confidence to the Charter of the United Nations; on 4 July this Assembly announced in the eloquent language of the unerring arithmetic of the vote and in the eloquent symbolism of the electronic green, red and yellow of our voting machine, that two thirds of the Members of the Assembly could not be prevailed upon to uphold the Charter of the United Nations.

147. This is all the more reprehensible inasmuch as there was no reason why our proclaimed faith in the Charter should not have been accompanied by an active translation of that faith into a practical resolution. None of the explanations advanced for our failure to translate the Charter into a resolution can stand the scrutiny and tests of our reason. It is not that the facts are not known, because, as the representative of Iraq said a short while ago, there was hardly a voice in this hall that expressed any doubt about the facts of the situation: the fact that there was a resort to armed force; the fact that that resort to armed force was premeditated and calculated; the fact that that resort to armed force, contrary to the Charter, resulted in the occupation of territory; the fact that that occupation still exists; the fact that in part of the occupied territory, annexation—by whatever name it has been called—has been put into effect; and the fact that in the remainder of that territory there have been statements made by leading representatives of the aggressor indicating possible annexation in the future and actual reluctance to give up the occupied territory. All these facts are not in dispute, not in question; so we cannot say that we failed to apply the Charter to the case at hand because the case at hand was not clear and the factual elements of the case were not well known. Nor can we advance another explanation: that there were some of us who failed to apply the Charter to the case at hand because we lacked guidance, we lacked principles to guide us in what to say, we lacked precedents for the United Nations to guide us in what to do. On the contrary, the principles of the Charter are clear and the precedents of the United Nations are such that in every single instance, without exception, in which a similar case has been brought before the Organiza-

tion, the United Nations has ruled for immediate withdrawal to take place, without linking such withdrawal to distracting and diversionary arrangements or requests. Therefore we cannot say that we have failed to uphold the Charter because the facts are now known; nor can we say we have failed to uphold the Charter because the guide-lines are lacking.

148. Nor can we say: We have failed to apply the Charter because the practical results of a suspension of the Charter might serve the spirit of the Charter better. There have been some who have argued that if unconditional and complete withdrawal is requested, we shall go back to the conditions obtaining before 5 June, and that as a result of this, the explosive situation in the Middle East would be back with us again. But do those delegations really believe that, by not ensuring the withdrawal of the aggressor, we are going to have tranquillity in the Middle East? Do they really believe that, by not requesting the complete, unconditional and immediate withdrawal of the aggressor, the aggressor will withdraw voluntarily, or that the victims will indefinitely acquiesce in the continued occupation of their lands?

149. No, none of the explanations that might be advanced in justification of the failure to uphold the Charter can stand the test of scrutiny. Therefore, a resolution designed to conceal the fact that we have failed to apply the Charter is only one that conceals from our eyes the reasons for our failure. And the reasons for our failure are evident: we failed to uphold the Charter because some Powers—unfortunately, founding Members of the United Nations, Powers that participated in working out the initial draft on which the Charter was based—have chosen to use their considerable power and influence not responsibly, not judiciously, and not in furtherance of respect for the Charter, but irresponsibly, arrogantly and uncharitably. And we have failed because there were among us Members that were willing to be accomplices, willing to be docile followers of those great Powers that pre-empted the will of the General Assembly and sought to manipulate its decisions. We have failed because there were great Powers that abused their power, and because there were small nations that surrendered their sovereignty when it came to standing up for the Charter, when their attitude was put to the test of the vote.

150. But there has been a heartening number of delegations which, under pressure, under cajolery, under inducement, under all these influences, have nevertheless chosen to stand by the Charter, to maintain its principles and to apply them forthrightly to the case at hand. To these delegations that withstood every pressure in order to remain faithful to the Charter, we say that we in the delegation of Kuwait are proud to have served with you in this sincere upholding of the Charter; for by maintaining the Charter and by standing against aggression, even though we have not been that majority that could give the Charter a vote of confidence, we have nevertheless proved that there is an independent-minded group in the United Nations that still believes in the United Nations.

151. It is this fact, and the opposite fact that a majority was not found to reaffirm the Charter, that

this draft resolution is designed to conceal—and we are opposed to the concealment of the truth.

152. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): For the past four weeks the General Assembly, meeting in emergency special session, has been considering the question of the aggression committed against its neighbours by a country that owes its very existence to a United Nations resolution against its neighbours.

153. It cannot be said that the discussions and the opinions expressed by the representatives who have spoken from this rostrum one after another have not shown quite clearly that an act of aggression has been committed and who committed it. The aggressor is perfectly well known. The existence of the aggression has also been clearly demonstrated by the fact that part of the territory of the Arab countries is now occupied by the forces of the aggressor.

Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan) resumed the Chair.

154. The Security Council, too, discussed the question of Israel's aggression for a whole month without arriving at any solution worthy of the United Nations, without being able to adopt a resolution opposing the aggression and without being able to condemn the aggressor. The Security Council's inability to come to a decision on such a clear and unmistakable case of aggression as that committed by Israel against the Arab countries is not due to any lack of desire on the part of international public opinion to see aggression and the aggressor condemned. It is due exclusively to the pressure exerted by certain circles and certain western States, in particular and above all by the United States of America, on other countries with which they have specific connexions and over which they are able to exercise enormous influence and pressure.

155. Despite the ardent desire of the peoples of the whole world and, despite international public opinion, which the powers of wealth have tried to work upon through the propaganda media available to them, even trying to substitute propaganda for opinion, the medium for the message, the imperialists have mobilized all their forces and have for the time being succeeded in blocking the adoption of an effective resolution by this emergency special session of the General Assembly also.

156. During the discussions, however, and in the light of the draft resolutions submitted, it has become apparent that a vast majority are in favour of the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops and against the occupation by the aggressor of the territory of other countries, against rewarding aggression.

157. This finding emerges also from the two resolutions which the General Assembly has adopted in connexion with the measures taken by Israel to annex the City of Jerusalem, a decision which is illegal according to the Charter but which was taken in order to serve as a precedent for the policy of annexation, conquest and colonization which the leaders of Tel Aviv are promoting in the Middle East and carrying out on behalf of others and on their own behalf.

158. If the General Assembly is now reduced—I might say driven—to trying to adopt a procedural resolution,

it is because it has not so far been able, and is still unable, to overcome the pressure and the opposition of those imperialist circles which are siding with the aggressor and have come to the aid of aggression.

159. The present draft resolution (A/L.529), though procedural, would nevertheless enable the General Assembly and the United Nations to pursue their work in regard to the settlement of the question before them. From the way in which the people of the whole world have reacted, it is obvious that they condemn the aggression—and the aggressor too in this case—organized by extremist circles in Israel against their neighbours, the Arab peoples, despite the fact that the General Assembly has been prevented from taking a decision by the underhand manoeuvring of the imperialists, in particular the United States. World opinion has condemned the aggression, and the delegations which have spoken here have also condemned it. Both in its discussions and in the draft resolutions, the General Assembly has expressed a desire not to see aggression rewarded.

160. There has certainly been evidence of a deep desire to preserve world peace by maintaining it in the Middle East and by muzzling Israel's aggression and the aggressor itself. At the same time, the Assembly has stressed the fact that it is absolutely essential to find solutions to the burning problems that have been caused by developments in the Middle East, particularly the aggression that is still developing, the permanent aggression constituted by the occupation of Arab territory by Israel troops.

161. Despite the momentary setback caused by the pressure of imperialist circles in some countries, especially the United States, every effort must be made to find a solution to this problem within the framework of the United Nations. Failing a solution by the international community, there would be no solution for the peoples struggling against aggression save on the battlefield and we do not at this point want a solution on the battlefield for that would be a world catastrophe. That is why the international community, the United Nations, must find a way to check Israel's aggression and the aggressor, instead of rewarding it.

162. The PRESIDENT: As members are aware, the list of speakers was closed at 6 o'clock.

163. I indicated previously that I would attempt to clarify the situation with regard to how the Assembly should now proceed. The representative of Sweden, when he introduced the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said, "It is our hope that a decision on it will be taken today". I would ask the representative of Sweden to state his delegation's formal position, so that the Assembly may have a clear understanding of it.

164. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden): In response to the question which the President put to me as one of the three sponsors of the draft resolution, I should like my earlier remarks expressing our hope that the vote would take place today to be interpreted as a motion to have the vote today. Should any delegation wish the Assembly to act otherwise, it is for that delegation to say so.

165. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has heard the clear statement just made by the representative of Sweden.

166. Mr. TILAKARATNA (Ceylon): The Assembly received this draft resolution only a short while ago, and different views have been expressed. I would plead with you, Mr. President, to allow a short recess, perhaps of about an hour, to consider the draft resolution before the vote is taken.

167. The PRESIDENT: I consider that the representative of Ceylon has made a suggestion under rule 78 of the rules of procedure, which reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote. We shall now vote on the motion of the representative of Ceylon.

The motion was adopted by 36 votes to 34, with 40 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 6.40 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.

168. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): May I say first that I am speaking on behalf of the three delegations sponsoring the draft resolution [A/L.529] before the General Assembly, the delegations of Austria, Sweden and Finland.

169. We listened, of course, with close attention to the statements made here this afternoon, and we have taken note of the arguments presented and the objections and doubts expressed in those statements.

170. During the period of the recess, the three sponsors have reconsidered the draft in the light of those arguments, and we now wish to propose a revised text, which we hope will remove the objections and the doubts that were expressed here. We do so in the same spirit of co-operation and understanding that has animated our three delegations throughout these discussions.

171. The revisions we have made are as follows: firstly, to add the following new preambular paragraph after the first paragraph:

"Considering that the Security Council continues to be seized of the problem,"

Secondly, to delete operative paragraph 1; thirdly, to add to the present operative paragraph 2 the following words, at the end of the sentence: "in order to facilitate the resumption by the Security Council, as a matter of urgency, of its consideration of the tense situation in the Middle East." The operative paragraphs will have to be renumbered accordingly.

172. I should now like, for the sake of clarity, to read out in full the revised draft resolution, which I believe will be circulated to delegations very shortly. The revised text [A/L.529/Rev.1] is as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the grave situation in the Middle East,

"Considering that the Security Council continues to be seized of the problem,

"Bearing in mind the resolutions adopted and the proposals considered during the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly,

"1. Requests the Secretary-General to forward the records of the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly to the Security Council in order to facilitate the resumption by the Security Council, as a matter of urgency, of its consideration of the tense situation in the Middle East;

"2. Decides to adjourn the fifth emergency special session temporarily and to authorize the President of the General Assembly to reconvene the session as and when necessary."

173. The three delegations sponsoring this draft resolution hope that this new text will remove the objections which have been expressed here and that the Assembly can now proceed to a vote.

174. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): Since the beginning of this emergency special session there have been delegations that have sought to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and to support its principles. They have worked untiringly and have endeavoured, through various means, to reach a solution that would preserve the dignity of this Organization. To those delegations I say, as the representative of Sudan, and perhaps speaking on behalf of the other Arab countries, we must be grateful. We must acknowledge our indebtedness to them because of their untiring efforts.

175. However, with respect to the revisions just submitted, we find that we still have certain difficulties because the draft, even as revised, in actual fact takes the matter from the General Assembly to the Security Council. We have the situation in this case where both the Security Council and the General Assembly are seized of the same question, and we find some difficulty in that. We find that we are really unable to vote for the draft resolution as revised. To enable us to show that we are co-operating in this matter, I would request a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 in order that we may be able to vote for the rest of the draft resolution.

176. The PRESIDENT: A separate vote has been requested by the representative of Sudan on operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution before us.

177. Under rule 91 of the rules of procedure:

"A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon."

178. Is there any objection to the request made by the representative of Sudan? There being no objection, we shall proceed to vote first on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/L.529/Rev.1. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal.

Against: Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Burundi, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Guinea, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco.

Abstaining: Nigeria, Panama, Portugal, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, Uganda, Venezuela, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Kenya, Malta.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 62 votes to 27, with 27 abstentions.

179. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution [A/L.529/Rev.1] as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia.

Against: Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Guinea, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Burundi.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Kenya, Malta, Nigeria, Panama, Portugal, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville).

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 63 votes to 26, with 27 abstentions.

180. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who have asked to speak in explanation of their votes after the voting.

181. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): It is now in order to ask ourselves what are the results of the work done at the emergency special session of the General Assembly.

182. In our opinion, there are ample grounds for saying with confidence that something positive has been accomplished at this session of the General Assembly. There is reason for satisfaction at the course taken by the discussion concerning the question of Israel's aggression against the Arab States.

183. On behalf of the States they represent, the overwhelming majority of delegations have in one form or another condemned the aggressor and his seizure of territory, censured the use of force in international relations and urged the prompt removal of the invaders from the occupied Arab territories.

184. Although the delegations of some States may not have been firm enough in voicing their opinions, casting, as it were, wary glances all about them, they too condemned Israel's policy of aggression and, at the same time, those who are backing Israel.

185. Let us look at the results of the voting on the specific proposals considered at this session.

186. The USSR draft resolution received the votes of 45 States—certainly an impressive number.

187. The draft resolution of the group of non-aligned countries, actively supported by the Soviet Union and other socialist States, received the votes of 53 countries, while 46 voted against it. Thus, this proposal, which like ours contained a demand for the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from the occupied territories, was favoured by the majority of States that participated in the voting.

188. Moreover, is not evident on whose side really stand those twenty or so States whose delegations abstained in the vote? They held back only because they lacked the determination to demonstrate clearly their support for the Arab States and their disapproval of the aggressor's actions, and to dissociate themselves from the imperialist forces which encourage Israel. These are the facts, and we are all well aware of them.

189. I know that, according to the rules governing voting in the Assembly, these resolutions failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority. But, over and above this formal sum total there is a political sum total, and it shows unequivocally that the aggressor has been branded as such.

190. The discussion and the voting in the Assembly show that the majority of the States Members of the United Nations are for the immediate withdrawal of Israel's forces from the territories they occupy for the time being. The resolutions on Jerusalem [2253 and 2254 (ES-V)] adopted by the General Assembly amount not only to a condemnation of Israel's actions in that city but also to a rejection of all its other attempts to entrench itself in the occupied Arab territories.

191. The USSR delegation expresses its confidence that the Security Council will duly take into account these opinions of the overwhelming majority of Member States when it resumes its consideration of questions relating to the situation in the Middle East.

192. What prevented the General Assembly from adopting a resolution on the main issue—the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from the occupied territories? The stubborn resistance of the imperialist forces which are backing Israel. It was the aggressor and his patrons, primarily the United States of America, that voted against the adoption of resolutions based on the principles of the United Nations Charter.

193. The United States Government bears the principal responsibility for actions dictated by hostility towards the Arab States. In this it was supported by most of the members of the NATO military bloc, as well as by some other countries, most of which are situated thousands of miles from the Middle East area.

194. A few words about this latter group, which is mainly composed of the countries of Latin America. The Soviet people have a profound respect for the peoples of the Latin American countries. The Soviet Union strives to maintain good relations with them. It was depressing for us, and we are sure for others too, to witness what was done almost openly—to witness the pressure crudely brought to bear by the United States of America on the Governments of the Latin American countries, with all levers of coercion brought into play.

195. We told these countries, and we tell them now, that we understand their position and their difficulties. But we must tell them also that in questions of war and peace one cannot renounce principles, disregard for which is tantamount to the partial or complete loss of independence, tantamount to making mock of the principles of the United Nations Charter, to which their signatures too are affixed.

196. All countries, irrespective of where they are situated, which gave in to the pressure and took up positions that suited Washington, cannot but realize that they may have jeopardized their own future interests. History does not end today.

197. The States whose representatives said "No" to the proposal for the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor's forces from the occupied territories may themselves on more than one occasion need a kind word and support from the Arab States.

198. Attempts are now being made to slight the peoples of the Arab countries and to whitewash and laud the aggressor. The only possible response is indignation. The Arabs gave to the world great scientists and writers and made an invaluable contribution to the development of society and culture. The Arab peoples who shook off the yoke of colonialism are now experiencing a renaissance. Nothing can stop them from successfully defending their right to freedom and to social and economic progress, some of the very things at which the Israel aggression was aimed.

199. Are the countries whose representatives said "No" to the proposal for the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces, the condemnation of the aggressor

and compensation for the material losses inflicted on the Arab States, really sure that they will not themselves be in a position where they will have to look hopefully, as they have more than once done in the past, to the Kremlin in Moscow for support, if not rescue?

200. Now as to Israel and its policy. The people who stand at the helm in Israel today are obviously intoxicated with their successes in the military sphere. But so were the nazis in the early days of the Second World War. This comparison may not seem entirely appropriate from the point of view of magnitude and scale. However, no one can deny that there is a similarity.

201. Would it not be better for the Israel leaders, whose names are highly publicized in the United States of America, to live not for today alone but at least to think about the next day as well? Time will show whether or not they are capable of doing that.

202. Everyone knows that Israel would not have dared to lift a finger if its patrons had not wished it to embark upon aggression. Consider the behaviour of Israel today, during the meetings of the General Assembly. Encouraged by its patrons near and far, and primarily by the United States, it haughtily ignores the view of the majority of States as expressed from the rostrum of the General Assembly. It does not implement even the resolutions on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], which condemn its unilateral actions.

203. We should like to emphasize that if the United States wants peace in the Middle East, as its Government sometimes declares, that can be achieved without difficulty. What must be done to that end is, first of all, to secure the withdrawal of Israel's forces from the occupied territories, eliminate the consequences of Israel's aggression and compel Israel to respect the rights of other peoples. The future will provide the answer to the question whether the United States Government wants peace in the Middle East or whether it is determined to bring about another war.

204. Irrespective of where the situation in the Middle East is considered—in the General Assembly or in the Security Council—the task confronting the United Nations is one and the same: to bring about, as a first step, the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor's forces from the territories of the Arab States. Each Member State must make its contribution to the solution of this problem.

205. The continued presence of Israel forces in the territories of the Arab States is fraught with serious danger to the cause of peace in the Middle East and to universal peace. The provocative conduct of Israel in the zone of direct confrontation between its forces and the forces of the United Arab Republic along the Suez Canal indicates that the aggressor is nurturing further plans of conquest.

206. The continued occupation by Israel of the territory of Arab countries is and will remain the principal obstacle to the solution of a number of pressing problems, including such problems as the resumption of navigation through the Suez Canal and the rehabilitation of refugees.

207. All this goes to emphasize how urgent is the need for all peace-loving States to continue their struggle for the elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression and, first and foremost, for the expulsion of the aggressor's troops from the territories they have seized.

208. No one can afford to forget how the Second World War crept up on mankind. Those Governments which presume to solve questions of war and peace with no thought of the past and little care for the future lose the confidence of their peoples.

209. The USSR delegation takes this opportunity to express on behalf of its Government its appreciation to the Governments of all States which supported both its initiative to convene this session of the General Assembly and its proposals at the session. We are also gratified by the adoption of the decision that the General Assembly should continue in session. This means that if circumstances should require, the meetings of the Assembly can be resumed immediately.

210. The Soviet Union will continue, in its approach to the dangerous situation prevailing in the Middle East, to be fully aware of its responsibilities in the sphere of international policy. The Soviet Union, together with other States which champion international peace and security and the just cause of the Arab countries victims of aggression, will continue to render to those countries comprehensive help and assistance in political and economic matters, as well as in strengthening their defence capability.

211. The Soviet Union, like other socialist States, pursues a foreign policy based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, respect for the rights of nations large and small, and opposition to aggressors. This was Lenin's policy, and the Soviet Union is fully determined to continue it.

212. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): As every representative here knows, the United States had its reservations about the advisability, in the circumstances, of convening the General Assembly in this emergency special session. Nevertheless, from the moment the decision was taken, we endeavoured to the best of our ability to co-operate in the hope of bringing about a constructive outcome.

213. In the further consideration of this matter by the Security Council, I pledge the best efforts of the United States, sharing as we do the conviction voiced by the Secretary-General nearly two months ago:

"that with the co-operation of all parties concerned the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, must continue to seek, and eventually to find, reasonable, peaceful and just solutions."^{3/}

Indeed, the proceedings of this Assembly during the past month have clearly shown, above all other things, that such solutions are needed by the parties and by all the world.

214. The United States profoundly believes that such solutions must be founded on the cardinal principle of all international peace—the principle of live and let live, the principle which our Charter expresses

in the simple injunction to Member States and their peoples "to practise tolerance and live together in peace." The necessary corollary of that principle is also found in the Charter, namely, that all States must "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State".

215. From the outset of these debates, both in the Security Council and here in the General Assembly, we of the United States have taken those Charter principles as our guide. We have held, and we still hold, to the view that, if the United Nations is to keep faith with these principles, more must be achieved in the Middle East than a return to the precarious armistice of eighteen years; more must be achieved than the withdrawal of Israel's forces from territories occupied during the recent conflict, necessary though that is. What is required is to deal creatively with all the underlying issues and all departures from basic Charter principles that have troubled the Middle East for a generation, and to resolve those issues in a new spirit of conciliation. In short, the structure of a stable and just peace must at last be built in the Middle East.

216. The elements of such a structure were well summed up by President Johnson in his address on 19 June, in which he said:

"Certainly troops must be withdrawn but there must also be recognized rights of national life, progress in solving the refugee problem, freedom of innocent maritime passage, limitation of the arms race and respect for political independence and territorial integrity."

217. In building this structure of peace, the primary task falls to the parties themselves with such outside assistance as they may find desirable and necessary. But we, the Members of the United Nations, also have a deep interest in the growth of peace in the area and an inescapable Charter responsibility to do all in our power to promote it.

218. As this session comes to a close, we must candidly face the fact that the General Assembly has not resolved the fundamental differences that have plagued the Middle East for twenty years. It is not surprising, nor is it a derogation from the efforts made by nearly all the Members of the Assembly, that this has proved to be the case. Even before the recent conflict the problems were many and complex, the differences of view were deep and genuine, the commitments to one course or another on all sides were strong. And now there has been added the intensely emotional aftermath of the recent tragic conflict. It would be contrary to all historical experience to expect that, in such circumstances, the foundations for peace in the area could be easily or quickly laid despite this Assembly's best efforts. Still less could the Assembly, through a resolution, attempt to draw a detailed blueprint for peace.

219. My Government fully recognized, nevertheless, that there was a strong desire among Members to reach agreement on some resolution which could serve a general guide for peace, both for the parties and for the United Nations, in the difficult period which lies ahead, and we did all within our power to help trans-

^{3/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June, 1967, document S/7906, para. 19.

form that sentiment into reality. And now the allegation is made by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union that the United States stood in the way of a constructive resolution. I shall not deign to reply to that comment. The representative of the Soviet Union, more than any other man in this hall, can bear witness that the United States made every effort, even at the last minute, to arrive at a meeting of minds with which this Assembly could concur. The United States has been flexible throughout on the language of several draft resolutions that have been proposed. We remain flexible to this very last hour. But we could not be so flexible, nor could any other Member of this Assembly, as to give away fundamental Charter principles. We could not go so far as to blind ourselves to the fact that peace in the Middle East is indivisible, and that the withdrawal of troops must be linked to the acknowledgement by every Member of the United Nations in the area that each enjoys the right to maintain an independent national State of its own and to live in peace and security, and to a renunciation of all claims and acts inconsistent therewith, including claims or acts flowing from an asserted state of belligerency. We would have been very glad to join in a resolution in this Assembly stating that principle. Surely those two principles of our Charter go hand in hand. Both as a practical matter and as a matter of equity, one side cannot be called upon to abide by the rules of peace while the other side is left free to continue to assert the rights of war. That was the belief which was the foundation of our view held at the beginning of the Assembly and continuously held throughout its deliberations, and that was the belief which underlay the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1], which the United States supported.

220. Reference has been made to the great States of Latin America by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. The charge that he levelled that the great States of Latin America could be pressured by the United States scarcely warrants comment by me. That is a ludicrous charge, as anybody familiar with Latin America knows, and its bizarre nature is demonstrated not only by the history of the Latin American States in their international relations, but also by their votes many times in this Assembly. Indeed it has been demonstrated tonight by the votes of the Latin American countries on the resolution which the Assembly just adopted. It was demonstrated by their votes on the resolutions on Jerusalem.

221. I think this Assembly has made constructive contributions. We should and must realize that there are times when the refusal to take a wrong step is in itself an important achievement, and this can truly be said of the Assembly's refusal to adopt not only the Soviet draft resolution but also the one-sided Yugoslav draft resolution which was submitted. The basic defect of those proposals was that they urged a return to the situation as it was on 4 June. Therefore they were a prescription not for peace but for renewed hostilities, and their rejection was a wise decision by this Assembly.

222. We in the United States look ahead, not backward, and we owe the Members of this Assembly a statement of our own course in the future as we deal with

the situation in the Middle East both in and outside the Security Council. We shall persevere in our efforts to have good relations with all States in the Middle East. Although our efforts toward this end in the past, as our President has said, have not always been successful, we continue to believe that our differences with individual States in the area, as well as the differences between them, can and must be worked out peacefully and in accordance with international practice and the injunctions of the Charter of the United Nations.

223. Guided by that spirit and belief, the United States will do its full share to help find a just and final solution to the refugee problem. The United States will make a full contribution in support of regional co-operation in the Middle East. The United States will do its share, and more, to see that the great promise of peaceful nuclear energy is applied to problems of critical importance to all the countries of the Near East—the desalting of water, the irrigation of arid deserts.

224. And this is perhaps most important for our future deliberations: while others may be tempted to engage in vituperation and entirely unfounded charges and accusations, we rather would appeal to all to exercise vision. While some may feel malice, we would appeal to all to be magnanimous. And we shall try, with determination, to abide by what we ask of others.

225. In such a spirit, rather than in a spirit of hostility to any nation, large or small, we offer our help to all the peoples of the Middle East. If others will do likewise—if the nations of the area themselves will seek to make this their spirit in the future—then we know that an area of the world known to us all as the birthplace of great religions and great teachings can and will flourish once again in our time.

226. The United States will do all within its power to help make it so.

227. Mr. EBAN (Israel): Israel leaves the General Assembly with strengthened resolve to work for the attainment of a just and durable peace. The Assembly has had many moments of tension and even of vehemence. But there is no reason to regard the result as one of paralysis. The rejection of unjust and intemperate charges against a Member State is not an act of abdication; it is an act of considered judgement.

228. Despite the intense and powerful pressure brought to bear upon it, the General Assembly has declined to violate justice or to betray truth. Thus, it has refused to misrepresent Israel's fight for survival as "aggression". A majority of its Members have seen the recent hostilities in the long and sombre context of the events which preceded them. Nineteen years of implacable hostility reached a climax in May 1967, when a small State found itself encircled, besieged, blockaded and openly menaced with destruction.

229. Nothing in contemporary history is comparable with the intense and virulent belligerency which has beset Israel in the first two decades of its independence. No other State in our time has been required to live on such a slender margin of security or in the shadow of such a constant threat. When the

noose was tightened around its neck two months ago, Israel's lonely resistance became the only alternative to a disaster which would have weighed intolerably upon the conscience of mankind. For if the openly avowed plan of Israel's extinction had succeeded, there would have been nothing practical for the United Nations now to discuss. Israel has in fact been denounced here by its adversaries for having energetically refused to die. The solid majority votes, first in the Security Council and then in the General Assembly, against the charge of Israeli aggression, bear witness to the inherent sense of justice and truth which has swept across world opinion and found its echoes in this hall.

230. The central theme discussed at this session has been the relationship between two problems: the withdrawal of forces and the establishment of peace. The Soviet Union, the Arab States and those closely associated with them have sought to establish a separation between these two concepts. Nearly all other Members of the General Assembly declined to endorse this separation. They saw the two issues as integrally and inseparably linked. They understood the dangers of restoring the situation which had given rise to active hostilities. For there would have been no Middle Eastern crisis had not Israel's right to peace, to security, to sovereignty, to economic development and to maritime freedom been forcibly denied and aggressively attacked. It is impossible to eliminate the symptoms of the Middle Eastern tension while leaving its basic causes intact.

231. That is the central lesson of this Assembly for Middle Eastern States. The lesson is plain: Member States which maintain a doctrine and practice of war against another Member State cannot receive from the United Nations the help and consideration which they could otherwise expect.

232. The General Assembly session has ended as it has for one reason alone: that Arab States and others refuse to tolerate any resolution which speaks seriously of peace. That is the only reason why no resolution of a substantive character could be adopted. If the Arab States accept the principles of peace, there can be not only resolutions, but, what is more important, solutions.

233. There have been many efforts in recent years to maintain a minimal tranquillity, even within the context of Arab belligerency. We co-operated with those efforts right up to May 1967. It is now evident that such efforts cannot long succeed. There is no method of avoiding a constant brooding tension, with constant danger of explosion, unless one condition is fulfilled. The condition is that all Middle Eastern States render, each to the other, the full rights which States possess under the Charter to which we are all signatories.

234. Under the Charter, Israel's neighbours owe it the full recognition of its independence and statehood. Under the Charter, all Israel's neighbours are committed to refrain from the use of threat or use of force against that statehood and that independence. Under the Charter, all Arab States are bound to regard Israel as a State endowed with sovereignty equal to their own. Under the Charter, they are pledged to

practise tolerance and live together with Israel as good neighbours, and to harmonize their efforts with Israel's for the maintenance of international peace and security.

235. These are the principles of the Charter. These are the accepted principles of international coexistence and of regional security. These are the principles which govern the American hemispheric system and other systems of peaceful regional security and co-operation.

236. Can anyone imagine that, if Israel's neighbours had guided their relations with Israel by these principles, we should be faced today with a crisis which still afflicts the Middle East and darkens the world? The strict application of Charter relationships between sovereign States is the beginning and the end of international wisdom in the Middle East. The replacement of the doctrine and practice of war by the doctrine and practice of peace is the central issue. I repeat: the replacement of the doctrine and practice of war by the doctrine and practice of peace is the central issue. It cannot be evaded. It cannot be sidetracked. If it is faced and solved, all other problems fall into place. For if there is peace instead of belligerency, such problems as the determination of agreed frontiers, the disengagement of forces abstention from the threat of constant violence, and the normal use of international waterways all find their solution through the processes of peaceful settlement which the Charter prescribes. It is impressive to notice and to record how great a body of opinion exists in favour of attempting not a return to insecurity, nor a temporary palliative, but a radical and permanent remedy.

237. Once the Arab States acknowledge to Israel those rights which all other Member States acknowledge to each other, the foundations of a peaceful Middle East will become firmly laid. The time has come—indeed, it is long overdue—to adapt the Arab-Israeli relationship to the accepted rules of international conduct amongst sovereign States. Many delegations have understood and affirmed that Israel's neighbours cannot at one and the same time deny its sovereignty, threaten its existence and refuse its basic rights to peace and security while demanding that Israel respect their sovereignty, their existence and their rights. The key to the Middle Eastern future therefore lies in the principle of reciprocity. Those who respect Israel's sovereign interests and rights will encounter from Israel a reciprocal respect of their rights and their interests.

238. It remains for me to discuss the application of these principles to the tasks which lie ahead. The cease-fire has been instituted. It must be meticulously observed. Agreed arrangements for its supervision are in force. But the cease-fire is, of course, an interim situation. It should be replaced as soon as possible by an agreed and viable peace ensuring security for all States. Peace should be negotiated freely between the parties in accordance with the procedures of pacific settlement prescribed in our Charter.

239. Israel stands ready to negotiate a peace settlement with Egypt, with Jordan, with Syria and with

Lebanon. In such negotiations all parties are free to present and examine any proposals in an effort to reach mutual agreement.

240. In addition to the issues, which lie within the responsibility of Middle Eastern States, there are universal religious interests which demand satisfaction and respect and which should be settled in consultation with those directly concerned. It is our hope and our policy that universal spiritual concerns in the Holy City will find agreed expression.

241. The war of 1948 and the subsequent belligerency have created and perpetuated humanitarian problems whose solution, as experience shows, can be achieved only in the context of normal inter-State relations. Hundreds of thousands of people—Arabs and Jews—have been affected by the population movements generated by two decades of war, belligerency and hostility. The lesson of experience is clear. The conditions necessary to transform homeless refugees into productive members of society can reach full expression only if there is peace. A situation in which States are arrayed and embattled against each other; in which the violent destruction of one State is the avowed policy of others; in which an armaments race consumes scarce economic resources; in which refugees are envisaged by certain Governments as a spearhead for the destruction of a sovereign State—such a situation is not one in which Governments and international agencies can successfully undertake enterprises of resettlement. Indeed, the clearest lesson of experience after twenty tormented years is that nothing in Arab-Israeli relations is soluble without peace, while everything is soluble with it.

242. While the main responsibility falls on sovereign States within our region, States outside the Middle East, especially the most powerful amongst them, can do much to affect our destiny for good or for ill. They can affect it for good by respecting the policy of non-intervention; by making an equal distribution of their friendship; by avoiding any identification with hostility; by giving no indulgence to belligerency; and by concerting their action with the States of our region for the promotion of peace and welfare.

243. It was, after all, in the Middle East in ancient times that the idea of a universal human destiny was expressed with incomparable force. It is there, more than anywhere else, that the need is compelling for a new atmosphere of relations on the international plane. Such new relationships are urgently needed for the highest human ends. There should be in the Middle East no belligerents, no victors or vanquished, but only the vision of peoples who have suffered greatly through the errors and illusions of those who have rejected peace as though it were an alien and forbidden word, to be banished from the international vocabulary. For the sake of countless people in the Middle East for whom there is no answer but peace, the world community should continue to set its face against the tensions and rancours of the past two decades. It is in our region that statesmanship now faces its heaviest challenge and its brightest opportunity. To meet the challenge and to fulfil the opportunity will require the utmost dedication of our hearts and minds.

244. The PRESIDENT: In order to expedite the work of the Assembly, I would ask representatives to be as brief as possible, at this stage of explanations of vote after the voting.

245. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly is temporarily suspending its meetings and authorizing the President to reconvene the session as and when it becomes necessary. In this connexion, my delegation deems it necessary to make the following statement.

246. We regret that the General Assembly has not been able to adopt a resolution requiring the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from the territories seized by them in the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. In this most important question of the restoration of peace in the Middle East, the United Nations has been paralysed as a result of the attitude taken by the United States of America, a number of other imperialist Powers, and a small group of countries which were blackmailed and browbeaten by the instigators and organizers of Israel aggression. They managed to muster just over one-third of the votes and thus prevent adoption of both the USSR draft resolution [A/L.519] and the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3].

247. It will be remembered that the USSR draft resolution proposed a decisive condemnation of Israel aggression, and contained a demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel forces from the captured Arab territories and for full reparation by Israel for the losses and damage sustained by the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan as a result of Israel aggression. The draft resolution of the non-aligned countries called for the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops to the positions which they had occupied before 5 June 1967. These fair and legitimate demands are in keeping with the spirit and principles of the United Nations Charter. Those who voted against those draft resolutions demonstrated to the entire world their disrespect for the obligations they had assumed under the United Nations Charter, one of whose articles reads:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace...".

248. Recent events in the Suez Canal zone and the statement which we have just heard from the Israel Foreign Minister show that the Israel militarists are following a perilous course. Israel is expanding its aggressive activities, and, being drunk with military success, seems to overlook the fact that such acts cannot go unpunished. The ruling circles of Israel should clearly understand, from the General Assembly's debates and resolutions, particularly the resolutions on Jerusalem [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], that any attempt on Israel's part to derive benefit from its aggression is doomed to failure. There is but one right course open to Israel, and that is to withdraw its forces to the positions which they occupied before 5 June and to adhere strictly to

the principles of the United Nations Charter in its dealings with neighbouring States. We must compel Israel and its supporters, the United States and certain other imperialist Powers, to abandon those imperialist acquisitive aims which prompted the attack on the Arab countries.

249. It is heartening to note that the overwhelming majority of Member States have correctly appraised the situation prevailing in the Middle East, and have reacted accordingly in calling for the removal of the Israel forces of aggression from the territory seized by them in the neighbouring Arab States. These Member States have made it plain that, until the Israel forces withdraw, there can be no settlement of any of the other problems in the Middle East.

250. We share the opinion of the majority of Member States that further consideration of the situation in the Middle East, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, must be based on the premise that Israel's aggression and seizure of territory are in violation of the United Nations Charter, that the aggressor must withdraw its troops immediately and unconditionally from the occupied Arab territories, that all other problems relating to the Middle East must be settled in strict compliance with the Charter and that the rights and interests of the Arab peoples, which were violated by Israel aggression, must be restored.

251. The Byelorussian SSR will continue to support the friendly Arab nations in their legitimate struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israel aggression and, above all, to secure the unconditional withdrawal of Israel forces from the occupied Arab territories.

252. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Although I come to this rostrum for the explanation of my vote on the resolution that has just been adopted by this Assembly, I do sincerely hope, Mr. President, that you will accord me the same courtesy and generosity that you have given to others whenever they saw fit to deviate once in a while, perhaps rightly or wrongly, from the subject matter of their speeches. On no other basis will I agree to speak from this rostrum again. And I must remind my colleagues that it is not only Baroody who is speaking, but the representative of a sovereign State. We expect the same courtesy to be accorded to us as a Member of this Organization.

253. We voted against the draft resolution for the following reasons.

254. Firstly, we believe it opens the door for a long drawn-out discussion of the Israeli aggression without giving any assurance whatsoever that the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the usurped territories will be brought about either by this Assembly or by the Security Council.

255. Secondly, we voted against the draft resolution because, judging from past experience, when the two major Powers, which, I must say, to a large extent dominate the United Nations, do not take any action singly or in concert to compel the aggressor to withdraw his forces, any substantive resolution or resolutions adopted by the General Assembly or the Security Council would be of only academic value and could in no way be made effective. I humbly speak from my

personal experience in the United Nations during the last twenty years.

256. Thirdly, we voted against the draft resolution because we believe that it paves the way for a protracted period of futile deliberation which may very well render the issue before us not too dissimilar from that of Korea, which is still on the agenda of the United Nations.

257. Fourthly, we voted against the draft resolution because we had no assurance with respect to the indigenous people of Palestine, who constituted over 90 per cent of the inhabitants of the land during the first years of the British Mandate, and who have been sadly ignored since the partition of Palestine in 1947.

258. The persistence of certain Powers—and I do not have to name them—to exploit the Palestine question in order to serve their national interests was wrong in the beginning, and it is still wrong today to sacrifice the original natives of Palestine, after they were robbed of their patrimony and scattered to the four winds.

259. Two wrongs cannot constitute a right. The partition of Palestine was wrong from the beginning, as it flouted the principle of self-determination enshrined in the Charter. The United Nations today has ignored those principles on the premise that what has been done could not easily be undone. Again I must say: two wrongs do not constitute a right.

260. We voted against the resolution just adopted because there are certain Powers that still think peace can be imposed on defeated Governments on the battlefield, forgetting that the Arab people, like peoples everywhere, can defy any Government that submits, and can topple it if that people sees its inalienable rights trampled underfoot.

261. Mr. Eban talks of a solution, and not United Nations resolutions. How can there be a solution, Mr. Eban, except by restituting the homes and the land to the indigenous—and I look you straight in the eye—to the indigenous—go ahead, laugh—to the indigenous people of Palestine? How can anyone recognize and make peace with another person who has robbed him of his patrimony?

262. If this is true of a person on an individual basis, how does our colleague Mr. Eban expect a whole people—and I mean the native people of Palestine—to accept being denied their inalienable rights?

263. Mr. Eban spoke of Israel's sovereignty and the need for respecting it on the part of the Arab States. But what about the sovereignty of the native people of Palestine? Did the people of Palestine have no sovereignty, under the British Mandate, guaranteed by the Treaty of Versailles? Where is the sovereignty of the Arab people of Palestine? Forget that they are Arabs. They were the people of Palestine who had lived there for centuries. What about their sovereignty?

264. The universal human destiny to which Mr. Eban referred in explaining his vote should be attained not by the establishment of a State which has jeopardized the primordial rights of the people of Palestine. Forget that they are Arabs. The universal human destiny referred to by Mr. Eban could have been attained by the

Jews by living with their Moslem and Christian brothers—not under the flag of a movement which has used a noble religion—and here I was not making fun of Judaism, as he said—which has used a noble religion as a motivation for a political end. I never make fun of religions, because I am a religious man. How can I make fun of a religion, as was reported in The New York Times—and this was done surreptitiously, not from this rostrum—when I am a student of the Bible, the Old Testament as well as the New? Such slanderous remarks made against me were intended to confuse the issue.

265. The universal human destiny to which Mr. Eban has referred could have been attained by Jews and Christians and Moslems living as brothers, without allegiance to a foreign flag which has been hoisted by the incursion of Western Zionists who came from Europe into Palestine. This question of Palestine is twenty years old, and I am sorry to say that it will not be resolved by resolutions of this Assembly or of the Security Council. It is only when the Jews of Palestine realize that they cannot impose peace on the indigenous people of Palestine, nor, I must say, on the Arab Governments that have been the spokesmen of the people of Palestine, only when they forget the flag of Israel, that they can live there as brothers, without that foreign flag. Then and only then can Christian, Moslem and Jew, and others, live in a country called Palestine.

266. Mr. BELOKOLOS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has today adopted one more resolution [2256 (ES-V)] on the situation in the Middle East arising from Israel's aggression against the Arab States.

267. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic voted for that resolution. We feel that the United Nations would be remiss in its duty if it did not take the necessary steps to put an end to Israel aggression and to eliminate all its consequences.

268. The United Nations Charter, in strict accordance with which all Member States are bound to act, duly provides for effective measures to put an end to aggression; those measures must be applied in this particular situation.

269. The General Assembly and the Security Council are required to deal with a State which has committed acts of aggression against other States; in doing so, they must strictly observe and implement the principles of the Charter. There must be no hesitation or indecision on the part of these principal organs of the United Nations at a time when peace and security, and the national independence and territorial integrity of several Arab States have been dealt a severe blow by Israel. That Israel, on 5 June 1967, launched a war of aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan cannot be doubted by anyone who evaluates the actions of the Israel leaders in the light of the clear and unambiguous provisions of the United Nations Charter and of contemporary international law.

270. This was conclusively proved during the debate on the item placed on the agenda of the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly at the re-

quest of the Soviet Union. No one—apart, of course, from the Israel representatives themselves—could deny that aggression had been committed by the Israel leaders and military.

271. An overwhelmingly majority of the States which took part in the debate called for an end to the aggression, the elimination of all its consequences, and the withdrawal of the aggressor's forces to the positions they had occupied before 5 June 1967. This is the outstanding feature of the present session, a feature whose importance no one can minimize. It is a point which the gentlemen from Tel Aviv must bear in mind.

272. The peoples of the world follow with deep concern the course of events in the Middle East. The Israel military, by a treacherous armed attack, have seized sizable territories in three Arab States. The Israel leaders have openly declared their obviously adventurous plans to re-draw the boundaries of the Arab States; they overlook the fact that they are living in times when the tide of the people's struggle for national liberation is washing away the last foundations of colonialism. The Israel imperialists would like to stem that tide; they will not succeed.

273. The resulting situation is one fraught with serious consequences for all the peoples of the Middle East, and not for them alone. Therefore, the elimination of Israel aggression and all its consequences is the prime condition, at the present time, for the settlement of the current situation in the Middle East.

274. It is essential that the United Nations should not cease from actively seeking a settlement of the problem, a settlement which would put an end to Israel aggression and restore justice.

275. The United Nations cannot pass over in silence the fact that, instead of gradually returning to normal, the situation in that part of the world is growing ever more inflammatory.

276. It is the duty of the United Nations not to allow events to continue on a perilous course, but to deal a rebuff to the aggressor and to help his victims.

277. We consider entirely sound and reasonable the proposal that the General Assembly should suspend its session, on the understanding that it may be renewed at the appropriate time.

278. The emergency special session of the General Assembly has studied in full detail the inception and the subsequent stages of Israel aggression against the neighbouring Arab States, and has laid bare before the whole world the true intentions of the Israel expansionists; we feel that, by this time, even those members of the Security Council who at earlier Council meetings expressed certain doubts in that connexion, must see the actions of the Israel Government in their true light and call for an immediate end to aggression and for the withdrawal of the Israel armed forces from all the territories they have occupied.

279. We trust that the Security Council will take account of the view expressed here by the majority of delegations and will take a decision worthy of the United Nations by calling on the Israel leaders to turn back from their hazardous course of aggression and expansion.

280. Finally, the Ukrainian delegation ventures to hope that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly will bring about the speedy elimination of the consequences of Israel aggression against the Arab States and the establishment of peace in the area.

281. Mr. FAWZI (United Arab Republic): It was a month ago that I tried to express, from this rostrum, how deeply grateful we all were to the Government of the Soviet Union for its taking the initiative in proposing that this emergency session of the General Assembly be convened. This gratitude remains and will ever remain with us, and the course of events and of our deliberations during the last few weeks will not detract from it but will rather add to it. This gratitude too extends to the many Governments which, in the stormy weather we are all aware of, have remained unshaken and have stayed robustly and steadfastly by the side of truth.

282. We are also most grateful to you, Mr. President, to the Secretary-General, and to all your aides, for your selfless and devoted contribution to the Assembly's endeavours. History will be able, far better than we are, to see our present work in perspective and to judge it dispassionately. Yet history is something for tomorrow, and we can readily excel it as the photographers of today, before objects and light and colour fade away. May we, therefore, be allowed to register here some facts.

283. In this connexion, and during this closing meeting of the Assembly, I shall not comment on certain travesties of facts put forward here today by Mr. Eban and one or two others. But I take leave to ask a question: Why does not "wordologist" Eban try once, for a change, to tell the Assembly the truth?

284. It is clear beyond cavil that Israel, with others aiding and abetting it, is guilty of aggression against Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic, and is sustaining and intensifying this aggression day after day. It is avowedly as clear, even from the formal statements made here by its spokesmen, that Israel is still guilty of retaining territories, sanctuaries and properties which it has no right to retain, and driving away from their homes and their homelands hundreds of thousands of new refugees.

285. This is mainly why we are all convened here. Yet what have we done or failed to do when so convened? The record is eloquent. Realists, pessimists, cynics or whatever we wish to call them may say that this has been a lame Assembly limping its way to an unheeded though repeated resolution concerning Jerusalem and to a few final words accompanying the act of handing the task over to the Security Council. To some ears, this may sound like a cry of victory, like another success for their pressures, intimidations, cajolings and bribery. Success indeed—if ever there was success in reverse, if ever anybody could wisely and nobly serve his country by projecting for it a personality of evil and sowing for it widespread seeds of hate. Then let success assume the name of failure and let victory call itself defeat.

286. Some of those who have erred in their judgement are undoubtedly sincere and we owe them both respect and understanding. As for those others who succumbed to bribery, who yielded to arm-twisting and who were

frightened away from truth, we have pity and commiseration. They may wake up some day.

287. For our part and while fully aware that the Assembly's work during this emergency special session has fallen short of some principal objectives, we are equally aware of several aspects of this work and in connexion with it which have been particularly constructive and of great significance.

288. In sharp contrast to a jungle of irresolution, there have been adopted by the Assembly the laudable resolutions regarding Jerusalem and the humanitarian problems which have stemmed from the recent developments and from the huge number of Governments which stood by truth and condemned aggression, and which represented the vast majority of the peoples of the world.

289. Even in the defensive aspect of its work, the Assembly has soundly rejected all Israeli, Western-rigged advances and attempts to have it accept unprincipled proposals which were violently opposed to the very principles of the United Nations. And when the Assembly considered the draft resolution based on principle which was sponsored by a large number of Asian, African and European countries and which called for the unconditional withdrawal by Israel from Arab territories occupied as a result of the recent Israeli aggression, the picture that evolved was such as to require careful study. It was a dusty emaciated picture as if it had come—nay indeed it had come—through the din and from under the ruins of battle. Yet it had a great story to tell. It read like a report on a medical checkup of the sickly world in which we live, a world quite capable, nevertheless, of regaining its health by adopting proper means and by living on a sane diet of sound principles and honest accomplishment, a world of dignity and of hope. Toward that we must aim, and for it we must pray.

290. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (translated from French): This afternoon a draft resolution (A/L.529) was placed before us and we were asked to vote on it as a matter of urgency.

291. My delegation appreciates the efforts of the sponsors of this draft resolution, who have endeavoured to improve it from the psychological point of view at least, but it was obliged to abstain both on paragraph 1 and on the resolution as a whole. As soon as the vote was taken on the two main draft resolutions—that of the non-aligned countries (A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1) and that of our colleagues from Latin America (A/L.523/Rev.1)—it was obvious that no agreement on substance was possible, since the Assembly was divided into two almost equal camps. In the circumstances, it became apparent that here in the Assembly there was hardly any hope of finding an area of agreement on which a majority large enough to have any political significance could come together. That was why my delegation did not participate in the discussions which took place these last few days on various draft resolutions, either on the substance of the matter or on procedure.

292. Moreover, we were not convinced, I must admit, of the necessity of a resolution asking the Security Council to take up a matter which is already before it and which it will obviously go on to examine in the

very near future. Similarly, my delegation could not see the need for a resolution to enable the Assembly to suspend its work and to meet again at a later stage if it saw fit.

293. Our views were shared, moreover, by the considerable number of delegations which abstained in the vote this evening.

294. We have also noted that among those voting against the draft resolution submitted by Austria, Finland and Sweden were certain States very directly concerned with the recent, and unfortunately still current, events.

295. In any case, we must not be hypnotized by this last meeting and its outcome. It will be better to turn our minds to the future, and we know already that much will depend on the constructive spirit in which the United Nations resumes its consideration of this problem in a part of the world where the situation is still fraught with danger.

296. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia): Our deliberations at this emergency special session have been completed tonight at their present stage by the adoption of a procedural resolution. This resolution was adopted instead of a resolution which should have been and was widely expected to be of a meritorious character. The aim of this emergency special session which dealt with the consequences of the Israeli aggression in the Near East was to take measures directed toward the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from occupied Arab territory. However, this aim was not achieved.

297. Allow me, in this connexion, to express the position of my delegation. The dangerous development of this situation in the Near East which took place as a result of the unleashing of aggressive actions by Israel against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan has provoked serious and deep concern throughout the whole world.

298. The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Governments of other socialist countries have taken resolute steps directed toward a solution of the dangerous situation in that region by peaceful means. However, the militarist forces of Israel, which unleashed a premeditated, treacherous, and unexpected attack against Israel's Arab neighbours, did not comply with repeated appeals of the Security Council to stop military operations, and their military units subsequently even seized the major part of presently occupied territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. The development of those events has shown that Israeli aggression could only have taken place with the help and direct support of the imperialist forces of the West, primarily the United States and some of its allies. Thus, a new and dangerous hotbed has been created in the Near East which threatens world peace and security.

299. The present emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly was convened following the failure of the Security Council—caused by the stand of the Western imperialist countries supporting Israel in its aggressive actions—to adopt any decision on an immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces from occupied territories of the Arab coun-

tries. The task of this emergency special session of the General Assembly could be only a speedy liquidation of the consequences of the Israeli aggression so that the aggressor should not be allowed to profit from the advantage gained by its aggression, and compensation of the neighbouring Arab countries by the aggressor for the damage inflicted upon them. The attainment of this goal implied an immediate withdrawal of the Israeli military forces behind the line that existed before 5 June of this year. That was the fundamental sense of our deliberations which lasted more than a month.

300. Although practically all delegations which participated in the debate expressed their agreement with this fundamental requirement—that is, the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli military forces—it proved impossible to accomplish the adoption of a resolution which would contain that requirement. It is regrettable that, in spite of protracted deliberations, the General Assembly has been unable to fulfil the fundamental tasks for which it was convened. That is so because the same imperialist forces supporting Israel that hampered the adoption of a similar draft resolution in the Security Council obstructed the passage of such a draft resolution here.

301. We have seen that the friends of Israel, and foremost the United States, in the course of the whole session of the General Assembly—particularly during its closing period when the elaboration of a compromise draft resolution was being discussed—exerted strong pressure so that no relevant draft resolution should be adopted. This activity can be characterized only as direct support of the aggressor in an effort to ensure for it the results of its aggression, so that the aggressor could subsequently dictate conditions for the settlement of the conflict to the Arab countries from that position. Yet by this procedure the United States and its allies have created a situation that may produce grave consequences in the development of further events in the world as well as in the United Nations itself. If our Organization is not able to adopt a decision on the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli military forces from occupied parts of the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan—either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council—and if the occupation forces of the aggressor are not withdrawn soon, then this may encourage other aggressor forces toward new conquests without ever fearing punishment.

302. The fact that neither the Security Council nor the General Assembly has so far been able to adopt a resolution on the withdrawal of the aggressor's military forces has induced the Israeli ruling circles to pursue their aggressive goals still further, to the point that they have dared illegally to annex Jerusalem and its environs. That annexation constitutes a gross violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the norms of international law. The case of Jerusalem again attests to the far-reaching and wider aims of the Israeli ruling circles that are striving to expand the territory of Israel. At the same time, we have witnessed systematic violations of the armistice line by the Israeli military forces. In the course of the emergency special session of the General Assembly, some grave violations of the cease-fire took place in

the Suez Canal area, particularly from 13 to 15 July. There the Israeli forces launched large-scale attacks against the west bank of the Suez Canal, and tried to further extend the positions under their occupation. The Czechoslovak delegation holds the view that these new grave military provocations by the Israeli armed forces are pregnant with the danger of a wider military conflict.

303. The case of Jerusalem and the continued armed attacks of Israeli military units against Arab States, in violation of the resolutions of the Security Council on a cease-fire, make clear the one goal that the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of Israel has: to keep and enlarge the seized territories to the detriment of its Arab neighbours.

304. The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that our Organization should object that a grave violation of the fundamental provisions of the Charter of the United Nations has been committed by a Member State by perpetuating aggression against other Member States, and that it has found its protectors among the Members of our Organization. We are seriously concerned at the inability of our Organization whose fundamental task is the maintenance of international peace and security. The fact that the General Assembly has been unable to adopt measures to bring about the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces is regrettable, but the Czechoslovak delegation believes that not all possibilities that are available to our Organization have yet been exhausted.

305. A great deal of responsibility continues to lie with the Security Council, which bears the main responsibility, according to the Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security, and which is rightfully expected to fulfil its duty in liquidating all the consequences of Israeli aggression and in helping to bring about the solution of urgent problems in that region.

306. In our opinion, however, the responsibility continues to be the General Assembly's, but the Assembly unfortunately was not permitted to play a positive role in the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression. We associate ourselves with operative paragraph 2 of the resolution which has been adopted that decides to adjourn the present session temporarily and authorizes the President of the General Assembly to reconvene the session when necessary.

307. The treacherous attack of Israel against its Arab neighbours has provoked great indignation throughout the world and created sympathy for the struggle of the people of Arab countries against imperialist forces which are insidiously trampling on their freedom and independence. The Czechoslovak people have expressed their full solidarity with the struggle of the Arab people, to whom they are tied by bonds of sincere friendship and co-operation. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is convinced that the people of Arab countries shall successfully defend their rights in their just struggle against imperialism.

308. The Socialist countries reaffirmed at their meetings in Moscow and Budapest that they supported and would continue to support the friendly Arab countries in their just struggle to eliminate the conse-

quences of Israeli aggression and, above all, to bring about the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli military forces from occupied Arab territories. At the same time, the Socialist countries are prepared to grant the Arab countries maximum economic assistance to overcome the difficulties that have arisen as a result of the Israeli aggression. We believe that the just cause of the Arab people will finally triumph and that the aggressor will rightfully be punished.

309. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Trinidad and Tobago in exercise of his right of reply.

310. Mr. P. V. J. SOLOMON (Trinidad and Tobago): I had no intention to take part in this debate. In my view, this emergency special session of the Assembly has already lasted far too long and has achieved far too little.

311. But there has been a war in this Assembly, just as there has been a war in the Middle East. And somebody has lost this war in the Assembly. As happens in many cases when there has been a defeat in a war of words, the loser looks around for a scapegoat.

312. Who called this emergency special session? The Soviet Union. What did the Soviet Union achieve as a result of this emergency special session? Certainly not what it set out to achieve. And for this defeat, it has blamed the United States of America and the Latin American group.

313. I do not care what the Soviet Union says about the United States of America or what the United States of America says about the Soviet Union. When these two super-Powers start hurling rocks at each other, it is well that the rest of us stand by and watch the battle and not participate. But it is an entirely different issue when the great super-Power of the East—the Soviet Union—decides to attack the poor little Latin American countries in the Caribbean, South America and Central America, the combined power of which could not even begin to rival that of one tenth of the Soviet Union. Why have we been singled out for this great honour? Simply because we have differed from the Soviet Union on a matter of tremendous importance. And this is what they say about us. I am quoting the words of the Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko:

"The United States Government bears the principal responsibility for actions dictated by hostility towards the Arab States." [*Supra*, para. 193.]

If he wants to say that about the United States of America, that is all right with me; I could not care less. But he says as well:

"In this it was supported by most of the members of the NATO military bloc, as well as by some other countries, most of which are situated thousands of miles from the Middle East area." [*Ibid.*]

314. Mr. Gromyko singles out among the latter group particularly the countries of Latin America. Who gives the Foreign Minister the right to accuse Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados, Jamaica, Guyana, the countries of Central America and the countries of South America of harbouring hostility toward the Arab States? Who gives him that authority? On what evidence does he base this ridiculous statement?

315. We might just as well say that the Soviet Union bears a particular hostility towards the people of South West Africa, because, when the chips were down—when that very important issue was here before the Assembly and the Latin American group introduced a resolution designed to relieve those suffering people from their pain and tribulation under the racist régime of South Africa—what stand did the Soviet Union take? Did it support the resolution? History will give the answer. It opposed it—a simple resolution designed at least to take the first steps towards relieving these suffering people from their disabilities. But the Soviet Union, for reasons best known to itself, opposed the Latin American resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1].

316. We did not accuse them of hostility towards the people of South West Africa. But because we do not agree with them on the Middle East affair, they say that we have hostility towards the Arab States.

317. Our friends in the Arab areas know quite well that we bear them no hostility. I can speak personally for my country, Trinidad and Tobago. I can also speak for my friends in Latin America. In my country, as I have said before, we have people of all races, all nationalities, all creeds, all colours and all classes, including Arabs and Jews. Jordanians, Lebanese, Syrians: they are all there. And we live in peace and harmony—all of us. None one accuses the other of hostility towards himself or his brother.

318. We resent this attack by a major Power against smaller Powers which could not, even if they tried—even if they wanted to—stand up to a military barrage from the Soviet Union, but which can and will and do now stand up to the verbal barrage from any member of the Soviet Government, including the great Mr. Gromyko.

319. Let us examine further the statements of Foreign Minister Gromyko. He talks about the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.3 and Corr.1] receiving so much support from the United Nations General Assembly—the draft resolution which was supported by the Soviet Union. That resolution received fifty-three votes in favour. It received a majority, but not a two-thirds majority. And of those fifty-three countries which voted in favour, thirteen were Arab States and ten were Soviet-bloc members, totalling twenty-three. That left thirty.

320. The Latin-American-group draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1] received fifty-seven votes in favour, and forty-three votes against. Of the forty-three, there were thirteen Arab States and ten Soviet bloc countries. This left twenty independent votes against ours, and fifty-seven in favour. Israel did not participate in the voting on that resolution. So there was no interested party supporting our resolution.

321. But we do not boast that we received more votes than anybody else, because the resolution was not carried by a two-thirds majority. We know that we failed in our objective—and it was not for want of trying. But we did better than the Soviet Union, whose personal resolution [A/L.519] was ignominiously defeated by this Assembly. I do not know what the figures are. Refer to them in the records. But that resolution of the Soviet Union, that extreme and

ridiculous resolution, was ignominiously defeated by this Assembly.

322. Let us examine the situation a bit further. In spite of this attack on small, defenceless but independent sovereign States, Foreign Minister Gromyko says:

"The Soviet people have a profound respect for the peoples of the Latin American countries." [*Supra*, para. 194.]

323. How do you show that respect? How do you strive to maintain these good relations you talk about? By insulting us? By casting aspersions upon our integrity, our honesty, our independence? If I wanted to make friends with someone, I would not insult him first and try to shake his hand afterwards. And Mr. Gromyko goes on to say that we were subjected to rude pressure brought to bear upon us by the United States. The Soviet Government and the Soviet Foreign Minister know perfectly well that our draft resolution was vastly different from that presented by the United States of America. They know further that after our draft was defeated, we negotiated with practically every group at the United Nations, including the Soviet representatives. If they thought that we were merely the pawns of the United States, why did they bother to negotiate with us? We had more meetings with them than with any other delegation on this issue. If they thought that we were being subjected to this rude pressure, why did they bother to talk with us?

324. I might suggest, of course, that they, too, were subjected to other pressures, but I do not propose to swap insults with anyone, large or small, great or insignificant.

325. Mr. Gromyko goes on to say:

"We told these countries, and we tell them now, that we understand their position and their difficulties—thank you very much, Mr. Gromyko—but we must tell them also that in questions of war and peace one cannot renounce principles, disregard for which is tantamount to the partial or complete loss of independence, tantamount to making mock of the principles of the United Nations Charter, to which their signatures too are affixed". [*Supra*, para. 195.]

326. Did the Soviet Union sign the Charter of the United Nations? Did the Soviet Union support South West Africa in its plea and its cry for independence? Are these two things compatible or incompatible?

327. In the Latin American draft resolution we asked for two things: first, withdrawal of the Israeli forces, on the understanding that the permanent occupation of territory by force is inadmissible under the Charter; and secondly, a cessation of belligerency. Are we wrong in asking that there should be peace in the Middle East? Are we wrong in saying that war should cease? Is that inadmissible under the Charter? Is that a renunciation of the principles of the Charter? There are people who disagree with our point of view and we disagree with theirs. But we do not by that token accuse them of violating the Charter. They have their own reasons for acting as they do, and we accept in good faith that they mean well. Although we are told

that the road to tell is paved with good intentions, we believe that they mean well. We disagree because we have firm convictions of our own and we act as independent, sovereign States.

328. We do not yield to pressures from the Soviet Union or from the United States or from anybody else. We yield to pressures from our own Governments, our own foreign ministries, we here at the United Nations, we Ambassadors to the United Nations. We yield to pressures only from our Governments, not from anybody else.

329. The States of Latin America are small. Many of them are desperately poor. But there is one thing we all have in common. Throughout our long history of conquest, colonialism, oppression and suppression, we have never lost sight of the need for courtesy in our dealings with other people. We cannot of course give the Soviet delegation a lesson in politics. I hope it will be possible for us to give it from this forum a lesson in good manners.

330. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): I have asked to make a statement in order to reply to certain remarks we heard from the representatives of the United States and Israel. They seem to be under the wrong impression that the fifth emergency special session has ended. It has not. Both of them have said: "Now that this session has ended, we are going to do this and that". The session has not ended. The resolution adopted by the Assembly was to the effect that the session shall be adjourned temporarily and that it shall be reconvened by you, Mr. President, whenever the need arises. And the need will arise.

331. Two resolutions have already been adopted on Israel's attempt to annex Jerusalem, and those two resolutions were adopted by overwhelming majorities without a dissenting voice. Members of the Assembly will not abdicate their responsibility by ignoring those two resolutions. We shall hold them and their supporters accountable before this Assembly, and not before the Security Council, for any infringement, for any violation and for any disregarding of those resolutions. The Assembly is in session because the aggression of Israel continues and the occupation of Arab territories continues.

332. The representative of Israel stated to us very clearly, I think, but very ominously that this occupation—although he did not say it in so many words, the meaning was very clear—shall continue until peace is concluded and until all the problems outstanding between Israel and the Arab States are finally settled.

333. That is a view that has been categorically rejected by the General Assembly. Speaker after speaker in this debate has stated that it was inadmissible for any State to occupy the territory of other Member States through acts of war and to use that occupation in order to achieve political and territorial objectives. So this General Assembly shall remain in session—and not only in theory. It shall remain in session, it shall debate, it shall speak and it shall state its opinions on this continued, flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter, on this continued occupation of our territory.

334. So I advise the representatives of the United States and Israel not to be too happy too soon. They have not heard the end of the discussions in this Assembly.

335. The representative of Trinidad and Tobago took exception a little while ago to some of the remarks of the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union regarding the draft resolution which his group presented to this Assembly and the leading part which that group played in the deliberations which led to the impasse in which we find ourselves today. The Latin American group has done us grievous harm—I do not care what anybody says. That is the truth and you have to face it. You yourselves said that you were in favour of withdrawal, that it was inadmissible for territory to be occupied through war. Yet you insisted that such withdrawal of foreign troops from occupied territories should be contingent either upon the solution of certain problems or the acceptance beforehand by the Arab States of a certain type of relationship between them and Israel.

336. They could not have been so blind as to expect the Arab States to renounce belligerency towards Israel while their own territories were under occupation. They could not have been so blind as to expect the Arab States to accept the implicit prolongation of occupation until all problems were solved. Therefore, I do not think very much of the statement, to tell you very frankly, that the draft resolution presented by the Latin American group [A/L.523/Rev.1] was animated by the best of intentions towards the Arab people, that the group was, in the words of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, even-handed in its treatment and unbiased in the way in which it looked upon the Arab-Israeli conflict. I am sorry, but that is not the case and they know it as well as I do. It is not the case because they equated a juridical relationship with that of military occupation and of the subjection of hundreds of thousands of people to military rule.

337. But who will be the one to suffer from all this? It will be the United Nations, and it will be the small Powers, precisely those Powers of Latin America. There will come a time, I think, when every single small Power will regret that this Assembly has not taken a forthright and clear decision against the admissibility of occupation of territories by foreign troops. They will regret the fact that the Assembly has not taken a forthright and clear decision on the inadmissibility of using occupation through military means in order to obtain political and territorial objectives. We all know that Latin America, like other continents in the world, has its own territorial problems, its own disputes, its own claims and counter-claims. But what have you done? You have allowed the occupation to be prolonged, and it is continuing today. You heard Mr. Eban this evening state very clearly that nothing is going to be done, but nothing, until and unless peace through direct negotiations with the Arab States is finally completely concluded, along with the settlement of all problems, which really means an indefinite prolongation of occupation. You cannot wash your hands of that responsibility. We shall hold you accountable for the failure of this Assembly to take a forthright decision. I think the time

has come to speak frankly and clearly. You have done yourselves and this Organization a great disservice. But the struggle will continue and the efforts will continue.

338. This madness, which has prevented the Assembly from taking a sane decision on matters of such direct importance to the Charter, will end one day, and the membership of the United Nations will be able to look at this problem in a sensible and dispassionate way in which the only consideration to be taken into account will be upholding the principles of the Charter, the principle that there shall be no territorial acquisition through the use of force, that a country that plans and perpetrates a military attack against other members of the United Nations shall not go unpunished and unpunished. When that is done, then the faith of humanity in this Organization will be restored.

339. The PRESIDENT: There are no more speakers on my list. I realize that the hour is very late. However, I should like, with your permission, to make a brief statement.

340. I cannot sum up the Assembly's work because the Assembly has not concluded its work and it remains in session. I merely want to recall certain facts as I have seen and understood them personally, particularly for the information of those who are not well acquainted with all the details of the very complicated work of the Assembly.

341. When this emergency special session of the General Assembly was convened on 17 June, the world was faced with a major crisis in the situation in the Middle East. It still is. The very large majority of the Members that concurred in the proposal to convene this session represented a recognition of the seriousness of the situation and the necessity to have a discussion in a wider forum where the views of the entire membership could be expressed. Those who did not concur also participated, I feel, to the best of their ability, in the work of the Assembly in the prevailing circumstances. This is significant as far as the United Nations is concerned.

342. No one, I am sure, at the outset of these proceedings expected that the session would resolve all of the very difficult problems of which the Organization has been seized for nearly two decades. Indeed, at this stage of our deliberations, there will no doubt be some observers who will ponder over the results.

343. For my part, I feel—and this is certainly not my feeling alone—that there have been a number of achievements. The guide-lines and principles which have been touched upon during the discussions in this session can, if they are properly pursued, be of considerable assistance in achieving the purpose for which the emergency special session was convened—through the Security Council and the General Assembly.

344. There has been a wide recognition that the situation in the Middle East must be further considered and that the solutions must be found within the framework and through the machinery of the United Nations.

345. I would recall, in particular, the resolution [2252 (ES-V)] which this Assembly has adopted by an overwhelming majority, on the humanitarian prob-

lems of the area, and the concern which has been expressed for the victims of the recent fighting. I am sure that I speak for every one of us here when I express the hope that the concern embodied in this resolution will shortly find practical manifestation in deeds.

346. I would also recall the two resolutions [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] on the status of Jerusalem which the Assembly has adopted. Those resolutions are important expressions of the most widely held views, particularly among the Members of the United Nations.

347. During this emergency special session there have been signal witnesses to the importance which the Members have attached to the solution of this critical problem. It is renewed evidence—if such additional evidence were necessary—that the problem of the Middle East is not merely regional, but is of universal concern. The catastrophe which has engulfed the area in recent weeks has, in one way or another, been a source of deep concern for every Member Government represented here. Thus, it was desirable to provide the opportunity, through these meetings of the emergency special session, for all Members to define their policies and place upon record their views as to the ways and means by which solutions might be reached.

348. By the adoption at this meeting of the resolution [2256 (ES-V)] which provides for keeping the Assembly in session, the desirability of such deliberations has been reaffirmed. The problems of the Middle East will continue to be discussed, not only in the Security Council, but also in the General Assembly, when necessary and appropriate.

349. As I have said previously: "The question before the Assembly has, with all its ramifications, never been a Council case or an Assembly case, but the problem of the United Nations as a whole. The deliberations, therefore, cannot be divorced from the larger United Nations picture in which this problem has been framed for the past nineteen years." [1549th meeting, para. 2.]

350. I am sure that the future discussions, regardless of the United Nations forum in which they may take place, will benefit from the deliberations and consultations held during the past month.

351. The long and continuous consultations have demonstrated a unique interest on the part of the entire membership in seeking a solution to the problem facing the General Assembly and in searching for an agreement. Such efforts are possible only in an organization like the United Nations, and can be achieved only in the General Assembly, where all Members have an equal opportunity and a direct voice through which each Member can make a contribution to the solution of international problems for the cause of peace. This has been done with a general feeling of continued concern on the part of the Members of the Assembly up to the present stage of its deliberations.

352. It is the general feeling that between now and the time when the matter may be discussed again, the Members should continue their search for a solution of the problems connected with the situation, and that the Security Council should also, with an utmost

sense of urgency, continue its efforts by giving full and urgent consideration to all aspects of the question, with a view to finding ways and means for a peaceful solution, through appropriate channels, guided by the discussions in the General Assembly, and bearing in mind the principles of the United Nations Charter.

353. To conclude, I wish to thank every one of you for the co-operation you have always extended to me.

Since, by the resolution adopted today, you have placed a greater responsibility on me, I maintain complete confidence that you will also extend your full co-operation to me in future.

354. The fifth emergency special session is temporarily adjourned.

The meeting rose at 10.40 p.m.