

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



**1554th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 14 July 1967,
at 3 p.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 5:

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

Page

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. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The Assembly has heard the statements of a number of representatives on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.528/Rev.1, co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Guinea, Iran, Mali, Somalia and Turkey, as well as Pakistan. These statements give expression to the sense of very deep concern universally felt at the non-compliance by Israel with resolution 2253 (ES-V).

2. The defiance of Israel must be met as a matter of the utmost urgency. It would defeat the very purpose of resolution 2253 (ES-V), adopted by the Assembly without dissent, and also of the draft resolution now before us, if we were to afford more time to Israel to continue its attempt to alter the status of the City of Jerusalem. For this reason, I would, on behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/L.528/Rev.1, propose that the draft resolution be voted upon at this meeting of the Assembly. I would hope that the Assembly will agree to this suggestion.

3. The sponsors have been approached by some delegations regarding the present wording of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Several of them expressed the view that the substance of this paragraph is implied and covered in operative paragraph 3, which calls upon the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the resolution.

4. The representative of France, Mr. Seydoux, stated this morning [1553rd meeting] that he would like operative paragraph 4 to be drafted in such a way that the Security Council would be called upon to consider, as a matter of urgency, the situation which would be created by a further refusal on the part of Israel to implement resolution 2253 (ES-V), and to deal with this question in the framework of the broader problem which exists in Jerusalem.

5. The co-sponsors have given due consideration to this appeal. However, since a reformulation of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution—taking

into account the views of France, a permanent member of the Security Council—would require another round of consultations among the co-sponsors and a very large number of other delegations at a time when the crisis precipitated by Israel over Jerusalem is most pressing and when every moment is precious, the co-sponsors have authorized me to ask that draft resolution A/L.528/Rev.1 be put to the vote without operative paragraph 4, its last paragraph. The co-sponsors are confident that they reflect the views of the overwhelming majority of Member States in this Assembly when they express their belief that the Security Council would, in fulfilment of its primary responsibility, examine the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the resolution and the situation that would arise from any new refusal by Israel to comply with resolution 2253 (ES-V) and the present draft resolution, and would take the necessary action to ensure its implementation.

6. For many weeks we have engaged incessantly in negotiations which have so far proved barren. We have not been able to agree on the solution of even a single one of the many grave issues that must be resolved if the Middle East is not to be plunged into war again. It is only on Jerusalem that we have been able to act, and act unanimously. Why? It is because the General Assembly has taken into account on this question the moral issues at stake. It has heeded the still, small voice of conscience. That is why, when introducing the draft resolution, I asked the Assembly for a vote of conscience, not of policy [1550th meeting]. It may well be that the adoption of the present draft resolution and the response that Israel makes to our call will mark the beginning of a movement towards peace in the Middle East.

7. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Assembly have heard the statement just made by the representative of Pakistan. During that statement he proposed that draft resolution A/L.528/Rev.1 be put to the vote at this meeting of the Assembly.

8. In order that our procedure may be clear, I wish to consult the Assembly on this point, before I go on to give Members some information about other aspects of our work. I should therefore like to ask whether there is any objection to the request of the delegation of Pakistan that draft resolution A/L.528/Rev.1 be put to the vote at this meeting of the Assembly. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees that the draft resolution should be put to the vote at this meeting of the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT: Our programme of work for this afternoon has therefore been decided upon unanimously by the Members of the Assembly.

10. In order to give the Assembly an idea of the next order of business—that is, after we have completed our work this afternoon—I should like, with your permission, to read out a letter which I sent earlier this afternoon to various groups of the membership. The first two lines of the letter mention the particular group to which it is addressed. The rest of the letter reads as follows:

"As you are aware, the General Assembly adjourned on 5 July 1967 in order to allow time for further consultations in the interest of the work of the Assembly. When the Assembly reconvened on 12 July, I stated that I had not been formally informed of the result of the consultations for which the General Assembly decided to adjourn on 5 July. I went on to say the following:

"I should like to think, therefore, that these consultations are still going on; and, while I fully understand—as I am sure all Members do—that such serious consultations take time, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to request all representatives engaged in these consultations to inform the Assembly, directly or through the Chair, about the result of their continuing efforts, and to do this as soon as possible, keeping in mind that this is an emergency session on a very important matter of war and peace. No unnecessary delay should be allowed, while at the same time every desirable opportunity should be given for serious and hopeful efforts in the interest of peace."

"We are almost at the end of our consideration of the draft resolution which is before the Assembly, and considerable time has elapsed since the time agreed upon for further consultations. After the draft resolution has been voted upon, the Assembly will proceed to the other phase of the agenda of the emergency special session. As the eventual decision is a matter for the entire membership of the Organization, it is necessary that I draw the attention of the various groups to the fact that the Assembly should be formally informed about the outcome of the consultations. Judging from the list of speakers, I expect that the Assembly will need this information at the beginning of the meeting on Monday morning.

"If the representatives may see fit to inform the Assembly through the Chair, I would appreciate receiving the result of the consultations not later than 10.30 on Monday morning, 17 July—along with other views, if any, that the Member States may wish to express.

"Once again, I appeal for the exertion of every effort to bring the work of this emergency special session of the Assembly to a fruitful conclusion."

The letter was, of course, signed by me.

11. Therefore, on Monday morning, 17 July, I hope that the Assembly will be informed about the outcome of the consultations, before we take up the next phase of the item before the emergency special session. We also have the report of the Credentials Committee [A/6742 and Corr.1] pending on our agenda.

12. I have on my list the names of two representatives who wish to speak in the general debate. After that, I have on my list the names of eight representatives

who wish to explain their votes before the vote is taken.

13. I shall now call on the representatives who wish to speak in the general debate.

14. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): Before adjourning its work for a week, the General Assembly unanimously adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V), on the measures taken by the Government of Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem. In that resolution, the Assembly declared that those measures were invalid and it called upon the Government of Israel to rescind them and to desist from any action which would alter the status of the City.

15. Instead of complying with the General Assembly's requests, Israel declared at once that it had not the slightest intention of taking them into consideration.

16. This resolution—conceived and adopted as a result of the measures taken by the Israel authorities on 27 June with a view to annexing the city of Jerusalem to the territory of Israel—was a unanimous expression of international opinion. Not one voice—not even that of Israel—was raised in the Assembly in opposition to it.

17. During the debates in the Assembly and in the Security Council on the question of Israel's aggression, the representatives of Israel have often used such terms as "international conscience", "international public opinion" and so on, to try to show that Israel's aggression and its annexationist activities had met with approval.

Mr. Csatorday (Hungary), Vice-President, took the Chair.

18. To seek to present a particular Press and other propaganda media, admittedly very powerful but orchestrated by imperialist circles and the emissaries of the aggressor as the expression of international opinion, when they are simply means of trying to form it, is to try to make use of a hired claque and to identify this with the international conscience in the face of and in defiance of a unanimous vote by the General Assembly, where even the representative of Israel did not dare to raise his voice against a resolution in fact condemning Israel, and is, it must be admitted, the height of cynicism. However, the aggressor, like all aggressors—and history has furnished us with some striking examples—follows a logic too different from that of ordinary people for us to dwell on this matter.

19. In his letter to the Secretary-General in which he tries to justify the annexation of Jerusalem, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel tries to use the same arguments as those he had presented previously to the General Assembly. In this reply, as in those he made in the Assembly, he adduces arguments in favour of the attack on the Arab countries. According to him "during the previous nineteen years there has been no such legislation to protect the Holy Places in Jerusalem" [see A/6753]. Providing protection for the Holy Places has been an excuse for many aggressors in the past. But it cannot excuse the death and destruction dealt by the Israel troops, the thousands of victims and the terrible suffering of the civilian population, still less the annexation.

20. The protection of the Holy Places supposedly represents, however, only part of Israel's effort to secure respect for universal interests in Jerusalem, we are told from Israel's side. If Mr. Eban is to be believed, Israel occupied Jerusalem and annexed it to its territory in order to bring the Arabs freedom "to renew or initiate contacts with their Jewish neighbours in Jerusalem and elsewhere in Israel" [ibid.], to be able to provide them with a regular water supply, to give them maternal and child welfare clinics, and to extend to them the social rights enjoyed by the inhabitants of Israel. This is a list of the benefits promised to the Arabs which Israel thinks it can present to the international community as an excuse for occupying their territory. In such circumstances, marvels the Foreign Minister of Israel how can anyone use the term "annexation", which is quite out of place? According to him, the measures taken in no way constitute annexation but are concerned purely and simply with "the integration of Jerusalem in the administrative and municipal spheres". [ibid.]

21. How, grumble the Tel Aviv leaders, can integration at the municipal and administrative spheres be confused with annexation? That they sent aircraft and used napalm bombs to achieve their ends and destroy the population is of little importance. The theory which they seek to introduce into international relations, after of course succeeding in imposing their rule by fire and sword on certain Arab territories, is not a new one. It is fabricated solely to allow them to proceed, they hope, to consolidation and annexation, and, what is more important, to the annexation of other Arab territories.

22. Again, it matters little that the method being used by the present occupier has been used by other conquerors and oppressors, by Hitler's hordes which invaded countries near and far in search of living space and to bring German order to them, and by the imperialists and colonialists on the pretext of bringing the subjugated peoples the fruits of western civilization.

23. All these theories, no matter how new they pretend to be, serve only to promote and instal colonialism pure and simple in a new form. Moreover, they have been used in the past by the spokesmen of the leaders in Tel Aviv. There is nothing new in these theories, therefore, to astonish the world, nothing save the aggressor itself, a small State, a State brought into being by the United Nations. All the rest is old and classic. I say again, in all imperialist aggressions we have first the violation of signed agreements, devastation, famine and death, and then the annexation of the occupied territories, oppression of the people of those territories, and all that follows from these.

24. The case of Jerusalem is merely the first link in the chain of the policy of aggression, annexation and colonization practised by the leaders of Tel Aviv. It was even announced in a statement by one of the Israel's leaders and summarized as follows in the News of the Week in Review of The New York Times of Sunday last:

"What is becoming increasingly clear is that Israel is settling in for an extended occupation of its Arab lands and that she intends this time to pursue her policies in her own way."^{1/}

25. Thus, Israel's new form of expansionism and aggressive policy is justified by old imperialist and colonialist arguments, presented under cover of bringing peace and social justice to the victims of the aggression.

26. Upheld by his friends and backers the representative of Israel has confined himself to declaring that the aim of Israel in committing aggression in the Middle East was simply to ensure peace in that region. Starting and waging a war is a strong way of ensuring peace! Once again the old imperialist adage has been applied by Israel to justify its aggression against its neighbours. All the statements of the Israel leaders and their champions in the imperialist countries on the so-called policy of peace are for the sole purpose of trying to show that it was not Israel but the Arab countries which were the aggressors.

27. It has been demonstrated, however, that these statements of peaceful intentions on the part of Israel could not stand up to the facts. While the statements of the Arab Heads of State, in particular President Nasser, that they would not take the initiative of direct military action have been corroborated by the facts, those of Israel have been given the lie. All the explanations painstakingly built up by Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs in his intervention of 21 June [1529th meeting], taken separately and together, are proved false in the face of the statements of more responsible leaders of Israel, as reported in The New York Times of 8 July, where it says:

"Mr. Eshkol acknowledged that he had put off military action at the request of President Johnson ..." and goes on:

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

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

28. Thus, Israel's leaders were waiting to strike two days before the date on which President Johnson and the Vice-President of the United Arab Republic were to meet to find a solution to the question. It would be pointless to seek a better demonstration of their intentions and their deliberate plans of aggression.

29. At the present moment, Israel troops are attacking along various sectors of the front, in violation of the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council and accepted by the parties. These actions are being undertaken to spread panic and if possible to consolidate the occupying force's positions. Through local manoeuvres at one part of the front or another they are trying to impose their territorial demands founded on aggression—as is the case now in Jerusalem—and to make the international community accept them.

30. Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs has also informed us that the Israel authorities have started talks with certain international religious institutions, with a view to granting them facilities in Jerusalem,

^{1/} Quoted in English by the speaker.

This has been done in order to spread the belief that these institutions have no objection to the annexation of Jerusalem by Israel's leading circles. This tactic is not new; although it has been used in the past, we are sure that it will hang fire now. It is doing a disservice to the religious institutions concerned to use the conversations with them as an argument, before the General Assembly and before the international community, favour of annexation. It is not the religious institutions or the conversations with them which will determine to which State a particular piece of territory should belong; the decision lies with the people who have lived on that territory for centuries.

31. All the conflicting statements and theories invented by Israel's representatives have but one aim: to force the seizure of another State's territory on the Arab peoples and have it accepted by the international community.

32. The United Nations must not allow aggression to be used as a means of settling international disputes, thus opening the way for a new kind of colonialism practised by small States as proxies for their imperialist protectors.

33. The case of Jerusalem is important, because it is the first step taken in this direction by those leading circles in Tel Aviv with an eye to the annexation of the Arab territories. The aggressors must not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of their aggression; otherwise, the United Nations would be rewarding aggression and encouraging future aggression.

34. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that it is absolutely necessary to force the leading circles of Israel to comply with the provisions of the resolution adopted on 4 July 1967, calling for the annulment of all measures connected with the annexation of Jerusalem. For this reason it will support the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan and co-sponsored by a number of other Asian and African delegations [A/L.528/Rev.1], a draft resolution which aims at barring the way to future acts of aggression which might occur in the world.

35. Mr. BEAULIEU (Canada) (translated from French): Canada has made it quite plain that it regards the withdrawal of forces as one of the cardinal factors in any lasting settlement in the Middle East. As the Canadian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said in the Assembly on 23 June [1533rd meeting], respect for the territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East, including steps to ensure the security and international supervision of frontiers, is one of the principles that Canada believes must be adhered to if a just and lasting settlement is to be found for the present crisis. The Secretary of State emphasized, however, that the withdrawal of forces could not be considered in isolation but must be linked with the other fundamental questions involved.

36. This is the context in which Canada has studied the draft resolution of Pakistan [A/L.528/Rev.1] on the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Jerusalem. From the outset we have opposed any precipitate action which might prejudice the preservation of the special spiritual and religious interests in Jerusalem and have suggested that inter-

national responsibility for safeguarding those interests might be entrusted to the United Nations. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/L.523/Rev.1, submitted by a group of Latin American countries—a resolution which Canada supported—is equally relevant to these considerations. In fact, this draft resolution, had it been adopted, would have reaffirmed the conviction of this Assembly, that "no stable international order can be based on the threat or use of force" and would have declared that "the validity of the occupation or acquisition of territories brought about by such means should not be recognized".

37. My delegation thinks that, in considering the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan, the Assembly should be guided both by the principles quoted earlier and by a considered estimate of the practical means which the Assembly and the Security Council can adopt in order to work out a settlement for the dangerous and unstable situation in the Middle East.

38. We must stress, however, that the future of Jerusalem and the protection of the Holy Places are a matter of special concern to all Members of the United Nations and that this Organization has a legitimate interest in any step which is taken, an interest deriving both from the profound importance of Jerusalem to many countries and religious communities and from the historic responsibility of this Organization for measures on behalf of peace in this region.

39. The draft resolution submitted by Pakistan clearly establishes the principle embodied in the earlier resolution on this subject [2253 (ES-V)], to the effect that there must be no unilateral action regarding Jerusalem which might prejudice the international interest in that city. In the light of this principle, my delegation can support the first three operative paragraphs of the resolution. We recognize the efforts that Israel has made, as described in document A/6753 of 10 July 1967, to satisfy international anxiety over Jerusalem and the Holy Places, but we do not think that this should be the last word on the matter or that the international interest can be satisfied by measures of that kind. There is an obvious need for further consultations and discussions at the international level on this matter within the United Nations framework and we hope that the Government of Israel will be ready to pursue further the study of practical measures which might prevent the status of Jerusalem and the Holy Places from becoming a permanent source of grievances and complaints.

40. We listened with interest to the statement of the representative of Pakistan informing the Assembly, on behalf of all the sponsors of the draft resolution, that paragraph 4 will not be put to the vote. In view of the fact that it had reservations on that paragraph, my delegation is glad that this difficulty has been smoothed out.

41. Before ending my remarks, I should like to stress the need to take up the problem of Jerusalem and the Holy Places in the context of the other measures required to bring about a just and balanced settlement. We cannot consider any international measure which might be required to bring about a practical and fair settlement of the question of Jerusalem without, for

example, taking into account arrangements in the adjacent territories. The danger of letting the present situation linger on is clear and considerable. We must therefore in all urgency bend our efforts to finding the means to enable the consultations necessary for the establishment of a just and lasting peace to open. According to my delegation, the General Assembly should ask the Security Council, which already has the whole question before it, to continue its study of means of eliminating the dangers and instability in the Near East, in the light of any broad outlines which might emerge from the Assembly. In our view, that is the best and most promising method of proceeding, in the present circumstances.

42. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): Through Israel's fault, a tense situation, which is a cause of alarm to all peace-loving peoples, continues in the Middle East. Israel's ruling circles, with the support of the imperialist forces of a number of Western countries, especially the United States, are doing their utmost to consolidate the results of their treacherous aggression.

43. The Israel aggressors, who are acting in the Middle East as the shock troops for United States-United Kingdom imperialism, are anxious to deal from a position of strength. They are brazenly trampling underfoot the lawful rights and interests of the Arab peoples. The imperialists of the United States, United Kingdom and Western Germany are covering up and trying to justify these acts of the Israel militarists. With every passing day we see more clearly that the design of the aggressive Israel forces and their imperialist protectors is to strike a blow against the national liberation movement in the Middle East and to bring to their knees the peoples of the Arab countries which in recent years have made great progress in their fight for independence.

44. The United Nations must frustrate these insidious designs of the imperialists and help the Arab States to defend their freedom and independence.

45. Thanks to the energetic action of the socialist countries and other peace-loving States, military operations in the Middle East have been halted. However, the reckless conduct of the Israel military may at any time give rise to a new conflict. The main task of all Members of the United Nations now is to secure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israel troops from the captured territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. The Members of the United Nations cannot permit the aggressor to benefit with impunity from his perfidious attack.

46. It is precisely the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from the captured territories that can stop the annexation of Jerusalem by Israel and put an end to this latest act of brigandage on the part of Tel Aviv.

47. As we all know, on 4 July 1967 the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution [2253 (ES-V)] which expressed deep concern at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the annexation of that city by Israel. As can be seen from the text of the resolution, the United Nations "considers that these measures are invalid" and calls for the rescinding of all measures taken by Israel to annex Jerusalem.

48. Not even the most vehement supporters of Israel's aggression dared to vote against that resolution. Each "Yes" that resounded in this hall during the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan and other countries was a demand for the elimination of the consequences of the annexation of Jerusalem by Israel. But Israel, which did not participate in the voting, bluntly and insolently rejected this demand, thereby displaying its complete contempt for the General Assembly's decision. It is perfectly obvious that such defiant conduct on the part of the Israel leaders, who have run amok, can be explained by the support they receive from ruling circles in the United States. It is no accident that the United States delegation abstained in the vote on the resolution regarding Jerusalem, although twenty-four hours previously the United States representative, referring to high governmental sources, declared from this rostrum that the United States did not recognize the unilateral acts of Israel designed to alter the status of Jerusalem. In this case, as in others, the aggressor and its patrons acted in concert, completely failing to take into consideration the will of the ninety-nine States Members of the United Nations which had supported the Pakistan draft resolution [A/L.527/Rev.1].

49. The Foreign Minister of Israel so firmly believed that his country's aggressive acts would go unpunished that he even had the audacity to inform the Secretary-General officially of Israel's intention [A/6753] not to carry out this resolution. He referred to his statements of 21 and 29 June [1529th and 1541st meetings] which were rejected by the overwhelming majority of representatives who spoke from this rostrum and who on 4 July voted for the adoption of a resolution calling for the rescission of the annexation of Jerusalem.

50. At the same time, the Prime Minister of Israel openly advocated the seizure of Arab lands. In an interview published in the West German magazine Der Spiegel he referred directly to the final annexation of all Jerusalem and the alienation of other territories of the Arab countries. Thus, the Prime Minister brazenly declared—I quote—"The Gaza Strip must remain in Israel's hands."

51. My delegation cannot remain indifferent to such annexationist statements, especially when made by no less a person than the Prime Minister of Israel. The Prime Minister advances a programme and the military authorities in the occupied Arab territories are taking steps to "legalize" the seizure of the Arab lands. Even now they are considering the question of the future of the western provinces of Jordan. How much longer can the Israel aggressor be permitted flagrantly to disregard the resolutions of the United Nations and to proceed with its annexationist policies? It is time to take decisive measures to terminate Israel's shameless aggression and compel it to withdraw its troops from Arab territories.

52. The Israel representative has spoken profusely about the so-called problem of free access to Jerusalem. In this respect, we should like to emphasize that Israel is not showing concern for the religious feelings of the faithful, but is adopting a purely commercial approach and wants only to line its pockets.

According to Le Monde of 18-19 June 1967, the Israel tourist office announced that it would begin receiving organized tourist groups in Jerusalem from 25 June, that is, even before Israel passed the illegal bill on the annexation of Jerusalem. The Israel tourist officials are now carefully computing the tens of millions of dollars they hope to receive as a result of Israel's annexation of Jerusalem. This fact alone reveals the real aims of the aggressor: to obtain, with the support of the imperialist Powers, territorial, political, economic and other advantages by maintaining its illegal occupation of foreign territories.

53. The facts also show that the Israel military are not complying with the General Assembly's resolution [2252 (ES-V)] on humane treatment of prisoners of war and the civilian population in the Arab territories occupied by Israel. Can such acts by the Israel invaders as compelling tens of thousands of Arabs to leave the places of their birth on the west bank of the River Jordan be termed humane? According to the Press, more than 150,000 refugees have crossed the Jordan and are now in exile. Such a mass eviction of the Arabs is part of the implementation by Israel extremists of a pre-conceived plan, not only to seize the very rich and fertile land in this part of Jordan, but also to drive out the Arab population, for racists as well as other reasons. This is clearly illustrated by the statement of the Defence Minister of Israel on 11 June, to the effect that the presence of Arabs on the west bank of the River Jordan creates social and economic problems because—and I quote—"The people of Israel would run the risk of becoming a Jewish-Arab people". What course, then, has been taken by the Israel militarists, those staunch defenders of racial purity? Israel is driving the Arabs from the land they had owned for centuries and making it impossible for them to live where their ancestors lived. On 24 June Le Monde reported in this connexion:

"... the occupying troops deliberately created an atmosphere of terror and insecurity, firing at regular intervals and encouraging the Arabs to flee along the Jerusalem road to Amman...".

54. On 11 July the United States newspaper The New York Times said that the refugees were continuing to cross the River Jordan eastwards, being driven by fear of the numerous searches and by food shortages. The same newspaper pointed out that the Israel guards on the cease-fire line refused passage to Arab refugees who were trying to return to the west bank of the Jordan. Hundreds of people cannot rejoin their families, even despite the efforts of Red Cross representatives. Again according to The New York Times, Israel has declared that the more than 150,000 persons who fled into Jordan during the Israel aggression must, in order to return home, present identity documents and health and customs clearance certificates, and undergo a so-called reliability check. But how can identity cards be requested of people who fled for their lives, leaving their homes in flames? Is it not a mockery to ask hungry and exhausted people, who are returning home, for documents concerning their health? It is sheer blasphemy. It is perfectly obvious that by setting such conditions for the refugees, the Israel authorities can prevent any one of them from returning home.

55. The mass expulsion of the Arabs is a weighty indictment of the Israel militarists. Moreover, as Le Monde reported on 7 July:

"... according to a recent Israel decision, no Arabs who leave the west bank starting Wednesday (5 July), will be able to return".

56. These facts testify to the inhuman treatment of the peaceable civilian population by the Israel invaders, to the implementation by Israel of its monstrous plans to expel the Arabs from the west bank of the Jordan, to the failure of Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolution and to its violation of the United Nations Charter and the generally recognized rules of international law.

57. The height of cynicism is reached by the Israel Government's statement that it is sure it enjoys the support of world opinion. Israel is supported only by the ruling circles of those countries which prepared and encouraged its aggression against the neighbouring Arab States. We can confidently say that these imperialist forces not only do not reflect world opinion, but do not even reflect the opinion of their own peoples or that of decent people within Israel itself.

58. Genuine world opinion has been expressed at this session of the General Assembly and in the Press of various countries, and it calls for the condemnation of Israel's aggression and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the occupation forces from all the seized territories. We are confident that the peoples of the world will achieve this aim and will frustrate the predatory designs of Israel and its patrons.

59. My delegation considers that the General Assembly must condemn Israel for its failure to comply with Assembly resolutions and must call upon it to carry them out to the letter, including the resolution on Jerusalem; the Assembly must also prescribe action to ensure the removal of the aggressor's troops from all the occupied territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. Such a decision, and it alone, would promote the restoration of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East.

60. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who has expressed a wish to make a statement in exercise of his right of reply.

61. Mr. EBAN (Israel): It is not intention to answer in detail all the virulent attacks made on my country by Arab and Soviet representatives and those closely associated with them. These representatives have all but monopolized several meetings on this debate.

62. The range of misrepresentation was broad. For example, the Byelorussian representative totally misrepresented both the policy and the practice of Israel in relation to population movements. The opposite of what he said is the truth. Steps have been taken both to stem the eastward movement and also to organize the implementation of the Israel Government's decision to allow the westward movement, of which information was given to the General Assembly.

63. Similarly, it is lamentable that the Syrian representative should have exploited deep religious emotions

in order to bring totally false charges about the situation in certain of the Holy Places. The security and peace of those Places are open to the contemplation of all interested to come and see. Indeed, the testimony of authoritative religious leaders is available for all who wish to arrive at truthful appraisals.

64. Nor will I argue with the Syrian representative about his personal references. There was a time when personal denigration was, by convention, renounced in the General Assembly, where we appear as the spokesmen of our sovereign States.

65. To Arab and Soviet spokesmen, I would only say that aggressive oratory is not the path to peaceful settlement. The intemperate tone of utterances in United Nations organs can only diminish the public respect in which the international discourse should be held. It would be well for all of us to remind ourselves what the United Nations is intended to be. It is intended to be an instrument for solving conflicts, not an arena for waging them.

66. I refer especially to the charges repeated this morning and this afternoon by the representatives of Bulgaria and the Byelorussian SSR and others who have spoken of Israel aggression. Here is a State which was encircled, blockaded and openly threatened with extermination, which was in a situation in which multitudes throughout the world thought that its days were numbered, which defended itself successfully. Israel is now denounced for having refused to die.

67. The question whether Israel is an aggressor is not even an open question in the viewpoint of the United Nations organs, for twice—once in the Security Council [1360th meeting] and once in the General Assembly [1548th meeting]—has this question been put, and on both occasions this monstrous charge of Israel aggression has been overwhelmingly rejected by the majority of Member States.

68. Instead of lingering on all the speeches on which a right of reply could be exercised, I take this opportunity of briefly restating my Government's views on central issues raised in this debate.

69. First, I refer to the general situation in our region, to which many speakers have made reference. A few weeks ago, Israel faced perils so great that it is still difficult to contemplate them without emotion. The survival of our State and the physical existence of its individual citizens were in acute and imminent danger. We had to meet this peril without any prospect of physical assistance. We were strongly supported by the opinion of peace-loving Governments and peoples, but we faced the issue of collective and individual survival in solitude.

70. The gravity of this experience has deeply affected the national mood. It explains why we cannot be asked to put ourselves in so precarious a situation again. The proceedings of the General Assembly last week revealed a wide measure of understanding of this position, as well as a general desire to construct a peaceful and stable situation in the Middle East, based on the total renunciation and abandonment of belligerent claims and actions.

71. The fact that we have emerged from immediate danger does not affect our ardent wish and our per-

manent need for a just and final peace. This prospect would be fatally prejudiced by restoring the conditions and situations out of which the conflict arose. That is why so many representatives have understood and affirmed that the total renunciation and abandonment of all claims and forms of belligerency is an essential condition of any movement towards a better future.

72. The cease-fire agreements are the first stage in the transition to a peaceful Middle East, but it is of course an interim stage to be followed by a negotiated settlement designed to ensure peaceful co-existence between the States of the Middle East. The final peace settlement should be a mutually negotiated and mutually agreed settlement in which truce lines are replaced by recognized boundaries, in which there are agreed security arrangements, mutual recognition of rights, co-operative solutions of humanitarian problems, and the satisfaction of universal spiritual interests through an effort to concert definitive arrangements with those directly concerned.

73. Every Arab State that embarks with us upon a peace discussion will find Israel willing to exchange ideas and proposals, taking account of the mutual rights of the parties. It is in that spirit that we shall approach the task of attaining reciprocal peace and security. It is urgent that this matter be transferred from the realm of public denunciation to frameworks and circumstances conducive to fruitful discussions.

74. In Jerusalem, the objective is to achieve a situation giving an effective and acceptable expression to universal spiritual interests. We hope that the status of a peaceful Jerusalem, in which the universal spiritual concerns of mankind are effectively safeguarded, will gain ultimate recognition. We have made it clear that measures of an administrative nature do not prejudice our readiness and our intention to work towards the goal of safeguarding those universal spiritual interests. In fact, we have in recent days pursued an intensive dialogue over a wide field in an effort to give effective expression to universal concerns. In this process, we have examined and are examining various proposals.

75. We have a deep and respectful understanding of the concern of Moslems for their Holy Places. It goes without saying that the custody of the Moslem Holy Places in Jerusalem should be in the hands of authoritative representatives of Islam, with free access fully ensured for all Moslems. Accordingly, we shall welcome consultations with Moslem representatives in the vicinity of our country and throughout the world.

76. Jerusalem is a word which stirs the deepest emotions of our people. In ancient times this nation converted a barren hill into a spiritual metropolis which has never ceased to communicate a message of nobility and grandeur to all mankind. But Jerusalem, which so poignantly touches the national memory and the national hope, is also the focus of a universal reverence which commands our scrupulous respect. For this reason we have proposed to replace the assertion of exclusive and unilateral control of the Holy Places by arrangements giving effective expression to the universal interest. This is the positive and salient innovation in the statement which my Govern-

ment conveyed to the General Assembly a few days ago [see A/6753]. It is because the Pakistani draft resolution [A/L.528/Rev.1] ignores this affirmative aspect, as well as because it does not describe the factual situation with accuracy, and also because of its juridical weakness, that we have taken a negative attitude towards it and refuse to participate in the vote upon it.

77. However, we believe that further and deeper examination of the ideas and the proposals contained in the communication that I submitted to the General Assembly earlier will increasingly come to bear upon world public opinion. I hope that, on closer and more deliberate consideration, Israel's proposal for replacing unilateral and exclusive control by effective arrangements for expressing the international concern will be more perceptively seized for its significance within the total Middle Eastern context and that the effective satisfaction of universal interests in the Holy City may inaugurate an era of progress and peace for the historic region at whose centre Jerusalem stands.

78. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting begins.

79. Mr. SCHUURMANS (Belgium) (translated from French): The Belgian delegation is one of those which voted in favour of the recommendation adopted by this Assembly on 4 July in regard to the status of Jerusalem [resolution 2253 (ES-V)].

80. It was not that we found the text completely satisfactory. On the contrary, we had certain reservations in regard to its formulation which we made known to the sponsors at the time. However, we wished to stress by our vote our refusal to accept any unilateral alteration in the status of the Holy City.

81. These considerations are just as valid today. We are particularly grateful to the sponsors of the new text for agreeing to drop paragraph 4, the wording of which, in our view, was open to serious objections. As it stands now, the text of the draft resolution is more acceptable to the Belgian delegation, although it would have liked other amendments, taking more into account the essential distinction, according to the provisions of the Charter, between the resolutions of the Security Council, which have executive force in themselves, and the recommendations of the General Assembly which are not stricto jure binding on the Members of the Organization.

82. Despite these reservations, the Belgian delegation will again vote in favour of the draft resolution. In doing so, it wishes to emphasize once again its devotion to the principle that military operations cannot justify territorial conquests, whatever the circumstances.

83. Mr. DEVENDRA (Nepal): When the entire question of the crisis in the Middle East was being discussed by the General Assembly, it was not proper for Israel, on its part, to take a unilateral action in changing the status of the City of Jerusalem. In an earlier intervention [1546th meeting] my delegation expressed its strong disapproval of that action of Israel. The question of the changed status of the City

of Jerusalem and the question of a peaceful settlement in the Middle East are inseparable, and in this context my delegation has maintained that the first priority should be concentrated on achieving the withdrawal of the occupying forces. My delegation has also maintained that direct negotiations between the parties concerned will help in bringing about an enduring peace in the Middle East, failing which an effective United Nations action should be agreed upon and undertaken.

84. My delegation believes that although a separate decision by the General Assembly on the City of Jerusalem cannot by itself help in solving the whole question of the Middle East, it can at least focus world public opinion on the necessity of protecting the rights of all peoples belonging to the Judaic, Christian and Islamic faiths to free and unrestricted access to their Holy Places. With that understanding in view, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.528/Rev.1, as further revised by the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan) resumed the Chair.

85. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Nepal was the last who wished to speak in explanation of his vote before the voting.

86. I should like to draw the attention of Members to document A/L.528/Rev.2, which contains the second revised text of the draft resolution before the Assembly and which has now been distributed. I now put that draft resolution to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call. 2254

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.^{2/}

87. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wished to explain their vote after the voting.

88. Mr. VINCI (Italy): Allow me first of all to express my sincere appreciation to the co-sponsors of the resolution we have just adopted for the spirit of goodwill, understanding and conciliation they have shown in meeting our views on the wording of the text they submitted to the General Assembly this evening. In fact, by accepting to strike out paragraph 4 of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.528/Rev.1, they made it possible for a number of delegations, including my own, to vote in favour of the draft resolution itself. As a matter of fact, we had some doubts about the formulation of that paragraph, which appeared to my delegation to be not fully consistent with the provisions of the Charter.

89. The Assembly had already given strong support to the very idea that nothing should be done to alter the present status of Jerusalem, and in spite of our abstention from voting on resolution 2253 (ES-V), my delegation shared the spirit of that resolution. The amount of support given to that idea has thus been not only confirmed, but indeed also increased, enlarged and strengthened by the resolution now adopted.

90. I would like to put on record that my delegation also had some reservations and misgivings about the words used in the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph of the draft resolution [A/L.528/Rev.2]. In addition, we felt that the last preambular paragraph was actually not necessary as it stressed a concept which was also stated in the ensuing operative paragraph 1. In our view, one or the other of the two paragraphs is really redundant, and we would have liked only for reasons of logic and balance to see it omitted. Nevertheless, if it is an unnecessary repetition, it does not, from a constitutional point of view, run counter to any relevant provision of the Charter, as was the case with operative paragraph 4. I was very glad, therefore, that my delegation was finally able to join the great majority of the Members in supporting the draft resolution.

91. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The goal of the United States in the Middle East, one which is shared, we believe, by the great preponderance of the world community, is a durable peace and an enduring settlement. We conceive of this goal as requiring throughout the area far more than a return to the temporary and fragile truce which erupted into tragic conflict on 5 June. We are convinced, both by logic and the unforgettable experience of a tragic history, that there can be progress towards a durable peace in the entire area only if certain essential steps are taken. One immediate, obvious and imperative step is the disengagement of all forces and the withdrawal of Israeli forces to their own territory. A second and equally immediate, obvious and imperative step is the termination of any claims to a state of war or belligerency on the part of Arab States in the area.

^{2/} The representative of Malaysia subsequently stated that if he had been present when the vote was taken he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution [see below, para. 119].

92. These two steps are essential to progress towards a durable peace. They are equally essential if there is to be substance and concrete meaning to the basic Charter right of every State in the area—a right to which the United States remains firmly committed—the right to have its territorial integrity and political independence respected by all and to be free from the threat or use of force by all. The United States stands ready to give its full support to practical measures to help bring about these steps: withdrawal of forces and termination of belligerent acts or claims as soon as possible.

93. But if our goal is a durable peace, it is imperative that there be greater vision both from this Organization and from the parties themselves. It is imperative that all look beyond the immediate causes and effects of the recent conflict. Attention must also be focused, and urgently, on reaching a just and permanent settlement of the refugee problem, which has been accentuated by recent events; on means to ensure respect for the right of every Member of the United Nations in the area to live in peace and security as an independent national State; on arrangements so that respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the area is assured; on measures to ensure respect for the rights of all nations to freedom of navigation and of innocent passage through international waterways; on reaching agreement, both among those in the area and those outside, that economic development and the improvement of living standards should be given precedence over a wasteful arms race in the area.

94. In each and every one of the separate but related imperatives of peace we recognize fully that agreement cannot be imposed upon the parties from outside. At the same time, we also believe that the machinery, experience and resources of the United Nations can be of immeasurable help in facilitating and implementing agreements acceptable to the parties. The offer of such assistance by this Organization is dictated not only by the roots of United Nations responsibility and involvement in the Middle East which have grown deep and strong over two decades, but also by our common determination, even duty, under the Charter to save succeeding generations in the Middle East from the scourge of another war.

95. It is against the background of this over-all policy that my Government has developed its attitude toward the question of Jerusalem, and I wish to make that attitude very explicit.

96. The views of my Government on Jerusalem have been expressed by the President of the United States and other high-level officials. On 28 June the White House made the following statement:

"The President said on 19 June that in our view there must be adequate recognition of the special interest of three great religions in the Holy Places of Jerusalem."

"On this principle, he assumes that before any unilateral action is taken on the status of Jerusalem, there will be appropriate consultation with religious leaders and others who are deeply concerned.

"Jerusalem is holy to Christians, to Jews, and to Moslems. It is one of the great continuing tragedies

of history that a city which is so much the centre of man's highest values has also been, over and over, a centre of conflict. Repeatedly the passionate beliefs of one element have led to exclusion or unfairness for others. It has been so, unfortunately, in the last twenty years.

"Men of all religions will agree that we must now do better. The world must find an answer that is fair and recognized to be fair."

97. The second statement, released on the same day by the Department of State, read:

"The hasty administrative action taken today cannot be regarded as determining the future of the Holy Places or the status of Jerusalem in relation to them.

"The United States has never recognized such unilateral action by any State in the area as governing the international status of Jerusalem."

98. During my own statement to the General Assembly on 3 July, I said that "the safeguarding of the Holy Places, and freedom of access to them for all, should be internationally guaranteed, and the status of Jerusalem in relation to them should be decided not unilaterally but in consultation with all concerned." [1546th meeting, para. 3.]

99. These statements represent the considered and continuing policy of the United States Government.

100. With regard to the specific measures taken by the Government of Israel on 28 June, I wish to make it clear that the United States does not accept or recognize these measures as altering the status of Jerusalem. My Government does not recognize that the administrative measures taken by the Government of Israel on 28 June can be regarded as the last word on the matter, and we regret that they were taken. We insist that the measures taken cannot be considered as other than interim and provisional, and not as prejudging the final and permanent status of Jerusalem.

101. Unfortunately, and regrettably, the statements of the Government of Israel on this matter have thus far, in our view, not adequately dealt with this situation.

102. Many delegations are aware that we were prepared to vote for a separate resolution on Jerusalem which would declare that the Assembly would not accept any unilateral action as determining the status of Jerusalem, and which would call on the Government of Israel to desist from any action purporting to define permanently the status of Jerusalem. However, the sponsors made clear then, as was their right, that they preferred to proceed with their own text in document A/L.527/Rev.1, and now with their draft resolution in document A/L.528/Rev.2. The latter draft does include changes which we consider represent a marked improvement over the original version, particularly in that it no longer tends to prejudge action in the Security Council. Nevertheless, since the resolution just adopted [2254 (ES-V)] expressly builds on resolution 2253 (ES-V), on which we abstained for reasons which we stated publicly, consistent with that vote we also abstained today. Even as revised, the resolution does not fully correspond to our views,

particularly since it appears to accept, by its call for rescission of measures, that the administrative measures which were taken constitute annexation of Jerusalem by Israel, and because we do not believe that the problem of Jerusalem can realistically be solved apart from the other related aspects of Jerusalem and of the Middle Eastern situation. Therefore, the United States abstained.

103. We have, of course, recently expressed ourselves in a more formal sense by voting for a draft resolution dealing with the question of Jerusalem; this was the Latin-American draft resolution [A/L.523/Rev.1] which dealt with Jerusalem as one of the elements involved in a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

104. It is because of the treatment of one aspect of the problem of Jerusalem as an isolated issue separate from the other elements of Jerusalem and of a peaceful settlement in the Middle East that we were unable to support resolution 2253 (ES-V).

105. Certainly, Jerusalem, as has been pointed out universally, I think by every speaker, is an important issue, and, in our opinion, one which must necessarily be considered in the context of a settlement of all the problems arising out of the recent conflict.

106. In Jerusalem there are transcendent spiritual interests, but there are also other important issues. We believe that the most fruitful approach to a discussion of the future of Jerusalem lies in dealing with the entire problem as one aspect of the broader arrangements that must be made to restore a just and durable peace in the area.

107. We believe, consistent with the draft resolution we were ready to sponsor, that this Assembly should have dealt with the problem by declaring itself against any unilateral change in the status of Jerusalem.

108. Since we are approaching the end of the session on this important subject, in which remarks were made not relating specifically to Jerusalem but ranging very broadly on other subjects, I cannot let this occasion pass without reference to some of the allegations made regarding my Government's role in the recent conflict in the Middle East.

109. The charges that the United States instigated, encouraged, or in any way participated in this tragic struggle are too unfounded to dignify by individual comment. I dealt explicitly with many of these falsehoods in the Security Council, and will not take the time of the Assembly to go over the same ground here. I reaffirm what I said to the Security Council with respect to each and every one of these charges.

110. I shall merely say that one positive development in this session has been the abandonment of the most vicious falsehood of all, which could have been productive of the most disastrous consequences: that United States planes and military personnel participated in the war on the side of Israel. Before the war broke out, we had sought to prevent it by all means at our command, and once it began we did everything in our power to bring it to an early end. The record of our diplomacy is very clear in this matter, despite comments that have been read from newspapers, which scarcely characterize that diplo-

macy. And the record of the Security Council is plain and clear for everyone to read, as to the actions we took, supported and initiated in the Security Council to bring the conflict to an end.

111. There is one charge about our position to which, I believe, no nation in this hall faithful to the Charter would feel any necessity to plead: that is the charge that we support the right of every sovereign State Member of the United Nations to an independent national existence, its right to live in a spirit of peaceful coexistence and good neighbourliness with all in the area. That is a charge which the Charter of the United Nations places on us all and which we should all readily accept and acknowledge.

112. Our view has remained steadfast, before, during, and now after the conflict: we extend the hand of friendship to all States in the Middle East and express the fervent hope that as time heals the scars of war we can soon again join our common efforts in helping build a better, more enduring order in every State and throughout the area, with peace, justice, security and liberty for all.

113. So much vituperation has taken place in this Assembly, so unseemingly in a great world forum, that I could not help recalling today a statement made by my predecessor, who died two years ago today in the cause of peace, Adlai Stevenson. Adlai Stevenson, speaking about our beloved Eleanor Roosevelt, said: "She would rather light a candle than curse the darkness". And I share that spirit. I do not see that anything is gained in the cause of peace in the Middle East by the vituperation which has taken place—not only against my country, but against other, small countries—vituperation which has no place in this forum.

114. The time has come—indeed, the time is long overdue—for vituperation and bitterness to be tempered by sober realization of the difficulties ahead and the willingness to face them squarely and to do something about them. What is needed is the wisdom and statesmanship of all those directly concerned, and of the Members of the United Nations, so that conditions of hate, too much ventilated in this hall,

can be eventually replaced by conditions of good neighbourliness.

115. What is needed, above all, in the area is a spirit of reconciliation, which will, some day—hopefully soon—make possible a peace of reconciliation. I fervently hope that all in the area, and all in this hall, will approach the days ahead in this spirit.

116. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States was the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting had taken place. However, the representative of Malaysia has asked to speak. Since he was not present at the time of the voting, I think that he may wish to make some point of clarification, rather than an explanation of vote. We are strictly at the stage of explanation of votes. But, if there is no objection, with the consent of the Assembly I now call upon him to speak on a point of clarification.

117. Raja AZNAM (Malaysia): Before I proceed, may I seek clarification from you, Mr. President. The point of my intervention in the proceedings of our meeting this afternoon is merely to explain how my delegation would have voted had I not, unfortunately, been absent at the time of voting. May I proceed?

118. The PRESIDENT: You may proceed on a point of clarification of the situation, but you obviously cannot explain a vote you have not cast.

119. Raja AZNAM (Malaysia): As is known, my delegation voted in favour of the earlier draft resolution [A/L.527/Rev.1] on 4 July, sponsored by Pakistan and various other countries, concerning the attempt by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem. The purpose of my intervention this afternoon is to explain that, had I been present today, my delegation would certainly have voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.528/Rev.2, since, as the document makes clear, my delegation was one of its co-sponsors.

120. The PRESIDENT: The statement just made by the representative of Malaysia will appear in the record of the proceedings of this meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.