

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

Official Records



1536th
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 26 June 1967,
at 3 p.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 5:</i>	
Letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (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. His Majesty HUSSEIN I (King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan): When I last had the privilege of addressing this distinguished body, the United Nations itself was facing serious problems that seemed to threaten its effective survival. Happily for the world, the United Nations continued to survive and since then it has continued, under the wise and patient guidance of its present Secretary-General, to serve well the cause of peace.

2. Today the United Nations is indeed facing a serious challenge. Whether it can preserve its moral authority will in no small measure depend on what action it takes to meet the most serious crisis it has faced since the attack on the Suez Canal in 1956. Then, the United Nations took a firm stand, and, by its moral power, forced the aggressors to give up their gains and retire to their original positions. We are confronted with the same situation today, and the aggressor is one of the belligerents of 1956. The United Nations must again choose whether it will close its eyes to aggression or force the aggressor to give up his spoils of war.

3. My mission is a serious and a solemn one: to speak to this distinguished group of world citizens on behalf of my Arab nation. I have a simple purpose and a simple objective: to state clearly our case in the present crisis and to urge that the issue be resolved promptly and with justice.

4. I could not explain the Arab position adequately if I did not at the outset express our astonishment at the recent failure of the Security Council to condemn immediately the Israeli aggression and to demand that Israel give up at once the territory it occupies.

5. I can very well imagine the hue and cry that would have arisen had the Arabs attacked first, and how bitter would be the denunciations if we were today in Tel Aviv. Why this double standard on the part of some Powers in considering the rights of the Arabs and the

rights of the Israelis? We know, of course, that world sympathy for the Jews created Israel in the first place. But world sympathy for a tragic past does not permit condoning aggressive acts on the part of those who were once the victims of aggression.

6. I will not speak to you only about peace. For the precondition of peace is justice. When we have achieved justice we will have achieved peace in the Middle East. There has been much talk in these chambers about peace. There has been little talk about justice. Israel has stated that what its people want is peace and security. This has always been the cry of the successful aggressor: peace by the submission of the victim, and security for what he has stolen. What Jordan and the Arabs want, on the other hand, is peace with justice.

7. In order to put today's challenge to the United Nations into proper perspective, it is necessary to go back to the situation that existed before the Israelis made their sudden attack on the morning of 5 June. These were not normal borders that the Israelis crossed to rain down death and destruction on the Arab countries. These were truce lines drawn nineteen years ago. These were the truce lines over which hundreds of thousands of Palestine Arabs had left in panic and fear in 1948 to become the one million three hundred thousand refugees whose existence today is a rebuke to this great body.

8. I need not remind the General Assembly that we would not today have sustained the deaths of thousands of our soldiers and citizens if the Palestine injustice with all its many facets had been prevented. Today's war is not a new war, but part of the old war, which will go on for scores of years if the moral and physical wrong done to the Arabs is not righted.

9. The latest aggression occurred on 5 June when Israel, by its own admission, opened an all-out air and ground attack against the Arab States. In an age of supersonic aircraft and guided missiles, with distances shortened to minutes, aggressors have a unique military advantage. If there is one military lesson to be learned from the recent battle, it is that victory goes to the one who strikes first.

10. This is a particularly ironic and dangerous lesson to establish. But one way of establishing it is to reward the aggressor with the fruits of his aggression. The members of this Assembly should ponder well this point, or they will surely risk setting a precedent which will haunt these halls and the world for decades to come.

11. We have heard the admitted aggression described as self-defence against navigational interests vital to the national security of the enemy. This, although much is made of it, cannot be a serious contention. The Strait

of Tiran was never opened to Israel until the aggression of 1956. No vital interests suffered. There has not been an Israeli ship through this strait for the last two and a half years. This is clearly not a question of vital interest. It provides no justification for armed aggression, the occupation of thousands of square miles of territory, the deaths of thousands of human beings, and the destruction of their cities and homes.

12. We stand today as the victims of that aggression. An attack against one of us is an attack against us all. We have for long known this, and Israel has frequently made ruthless attacks on one country, for an alleged provocation attributed to another. This was true in their destruction of the Jordanian village of Es Samu, so recently condemned in the Security Council.

13. We have always been joined together in regional defence agreements, never knowing where the next strike will be made, never knowing when the ominous bridgehead, which the existence of Israel has constituted in the heart of the Arab world, will break out.

14. Israel, I need not tell you, is a skilled adversary in the joint arts of concealed aggression and propaganda. Thus, it has lived in contempt for United Nations resolutions and has lived in arrogant defiance of the United Nations and its Charter for the past nineteen years. Each year as the General Assembly meets to consider the extension of UNRWA's mission, the General Assembly reaffirms its moral position, namely, that the Arabs of Palestine should be permitted to return to their homes or else be compensated for their losses. And what has Israel done to honour this commitment? I need not answer the question. Nor do I have to remind you that this latest attack by Israel is not an isolated example but part of a deliberate Israeli expansionist policy.

15. Although they have somehow made it appear that they are a tiny, unarmed country surrounded by Arab bullies, the facts are that the Israelis and not the Arabs have been denounced repeatedly in these chambers for their aggressions over the last nineteen years. For many of these years, Israel had been planning the master aggression that began on 5 June. This was no sudden act of violence. It was not even one of Israel's so-called retaliatory acts. It was an act of war as vicious as the blitzkrieg on Poland or as stunning as the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

16. That Jordan, without adequate means, was unable to cope with it is a matter I will deeply regret all the days of my life. Against undreamed-of fire power both in the air and on the land, our men fought heroically and fell in defence of every inch of our beloved homeland.

17. I should like to state here, for the record, that Jordan complied immediately with the United Nations request for a cease-fire. But it was forced to continue the fight because Israel, although it had agreed to the cease-fire, obeyed it only when it had accomplished its pre-determined objectives. As Israel has boasted, it started the war at a time and place of its own choosing, and it ended the war, in violation of the Security Council resolution to stop fighting, in the same way.

18. Although the complete record of the Israeli army's behaviour has not yet been fully assembled,

it is already clear that they were as vicious in their treatment of our soldiers and civilians as any barbarian invaders. Specifically, I charge the Israelis with the widespread use of napalm and fragmentation bombs, with inhuman and indecent treatment of prisoners of war, with looting and destroying Jordanian and other Arab towns and villages and driving the inhabitants from their homes, with adding to the refugee problem by acts of vandalism, terror and confusion, with firing at or over the heads of refugees to prevent them from re-crossing the Jordan and returning to their homes.

19. Each of these is a serious charge, and would be sufficient in itself to earn United Nations condemnation. But what concerns me most, and what should concern you equally, is the fact that unless this great body acts speedily and effectively the plight of refugees will double in size, sorrow, misery and death. Not only are thousands of older refugees fleeing from the camps that have been their lot for nineteen years, but thousands more new refugees are being created. These are the fruits of Israeli victory.

20. We have heard talk from the Israelis themselves, and from the lips of their friendly advisers, about magnanimity in victory. There can be no magnanimity when the victor is in the wrong. There is no magnanimity in disposing of the spoils of war.

21. We come now to the time of decision. What is the United Nations going to do about the serious and explosive situation which confronts it? First, there must be a clear recognition of the fact that the territory of three Members of the United Nations has, deliberately and with premeditation, been violated by one other represented here. Its troops are today on the soil of those three countries. The whole of the West Bank of Jordan, my country, is still occupied. That is a completely unacceptable and intolerable situation.

22. What, then, is the duty of the United Nations? It can be nothing else but the swift condemnation of the aggressor and the enforcing of the return of Israeli troops to the lines held before the attack of 5 June. To permit Israel to retain its gains as a bargaining weapon is to permit the aggressor to use the fruits of his aggression to gain the ends for which he went to war. That is immoral. It will not be borne. An added danger in this form of political blackmail is that while Israel remains in possession of the land, it continues its aggression. The Israelis are engaged in destroying the homes and property of the people. Their aim is clear: to make life so impossible for our people that they will have nothing to return to. That is the policy Israel followed so successfully in 1948 and which it appears determined to repeat again.

23. Jordan is a small country, as you know. What has happened to us is as great a tragedy as could happen to any country moving forward across the threshold into a peaceful, happy and progressive future. Today all that is in ruins. The largest part of our most productive land is occupied by the enemy, inhabited by 800,000 of our people, with about 150,000 so far having fled into refugee status.

24. Jerusalem is in foreign hands for the second time in 1,300 years. So too is Bethlehem, Hebron, Jericho

and much of the growing fertile valley of the Jordan River. All these must be swiftly returned with the support of this body assembled here today.

25. Should this aggression not be condemned, should the return of all our lands be delayed any further and should all traces of the aggression which began on 5 June not be completely erased, Jordan will still survive. Ground down by sorrow for the moment, we will rise again. And with us will arise the Arab Nation.

26. It is apparent that we have not yet learned well enough how to use the weapons of modern warfare. But we shall learn if we have to. The battle which began on 5 June will then become only one battle in what will be a long war. The political state of David and Solomon lasted only seventy years, that of the Crusaders just under a hundred. It might be well for Israel to re-read its history.

27. To this United Nations General Assembly, I wish to address one final word. Jordan obeyed the cease-fire order immediately and in good faith. It did so, confident that the United Nations would never allow aggression to pay. Should the United Nations not live up to the promise of its order, "Cease fire", and should it permit the aggressor to keep even one square foot of his spoils, it will never under any circumstances anywhere in the world be allowed to say the words "Cease fire" again—and be obeyed.

28. To the many nations that have already expressed their support for our position we are truly grateful, and to those who will speak afterwards in endorsement we are also indebted. God grant that out of these discussions the path to a just conclusion will become clear and that the nations assembled here will have the wisdom to take it.

29. The PRESIDENT: It is because the situation of the civilian and refugee population in the Middle East is so clearly a major humanitarian issue, transcending national or ideological boundaries, that I hope this Assembly will allow me to say a few words on the purely humanitarian issues involved.

30. I am certain that no Member of this Assembly can fail to be moved by the plight of so many of our fellow human beings. Indeed, the ultimate purpose of this Assembly and of the United Nations as a whole is a humanitarian one, expressed in the opening words of the Charter:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war..."

The care and relief of the innocent victims of "the scourge of war" must therefore represent a most immediate and direct obligation upon all Members of this Organization.

31. We are all aware of the vital work which has long been sustained by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The resources of UNRWA always have been slender in relation to its task. Today, in the face of a vast new tidal wave of human misery which has broken over the area, the resources both of Governments and of this United Nations agency clearly are overtaxed.

32. Because of the widespread concern expressed about the refugee situation, I felt that I should try to obtain the latest information on the situation. I therefore contacted by telephone in Beirut the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, Mr. Laurence Michelmore, and he has confirmed the information contained in his recent report to the Secretary-General [A/6723], namely, that there are 100,000 or more newly displaced persons in Jordan who are in immediate need of all the essentials of life—food, shelter and adequate sanitary facilities.

33. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency has been engaged recently in arranging temporary camps and meals for as many as possible of these unfortunate people. However, there is a most urgent need for additional foodstuffs, for funds for tents, for blankets and for other equipment, if temporary living facilities are to be provided for at least a major proportion of those who are now homeless and destitute.

34. Nor can we ignore the fate of the many for whom displacement and the refugee camps have long been a way of life. We are told that, as a result of devoted and ceaseless efforts, services have been re-established at existing UNRWA camps in the area, although many of the refugees from these camps who left them still have not returned in the aftermath of war. Their fate must add a further element of concern to the already grim picture of human misery.

35. Through the United Nations and other humanitarian agencies everything possible is being done, with the assistance of many Governments, to relieve this situation. However, it is evident that the funds and resources available are in no way sufficient to meet the needs, and a much greater effort is called for.

36. We all hear a great deal—a great deal indeed—of the need for vast programmes of economic assistance and the maintenance of the balance of power, which can be of concern only to the conflicting parties. Surely, it is not too much to expect that adequate attention be paid to the humanitarian issues, which are or should be of universal concern.

37. In this painful situation, so difficult for anyone to describe who is not himself a sufferer and a participant in this tragedy, my only wish is to address the most immediate appeal to all Members, both as signatories of the Charter and as morally obligated human beings, to make whatever contribution they can to ease the massive suffering of these men and women and children. For this purpose none of us has resources so slender that his contribution will not be of some significance to those whose plight is so desperate.

38. Mr. SALLAM (Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Yemen Arab Republic): The case which this emergency session has met to study is unlike any international case which this Assembly has discussed before in attempting to safeguard peace and ensure sound international relationships. The case of today not only bears upon the most sacred ideals of international ethics, but also rings a warning alarm, as a dangerous principle is well-nigh imposing itself upon all lofty ideals and human values, and threatens to disfigure such values, obliterate human conscience and bring us back to the age of piracy and the law of the jungle. This principle is the principle of perfidy.

39. Certain big Powers, pretending to safeguard peace and security, called for self-restraint and for a peaceful and lawful solution of the problems, in order that the innocent and law-abiding victim might concentrate all its energies on finding such solutions. Their aim was to divert attention away from the preparations for aggressive acts which were in the offing. Meanwhile, these great Powers mobilized their physical and scientific strength, hiding behind the skirts of the enemy, in order suddenly and heavily to strike the innocent people, whose only sin is that they are marching forward towards freedom, justice and the dignity of man and refuse to surrender to spheres of influence or bow to subjugation.
40. The Yemeni people, in whose name the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic is privileged to speak at this emergency session, while they were fighting backwardness for a better life, thought that they were the only people who were exposed to the anger of the CIA and its venomous consequences, despite their deep interest in befriending the American people. While we thought that we were the only people subjected to the wrath of the CIA, the people of the world awoke, on the fifth of this month, to find that there were others. The news broke out that a hideous Anglo-American Zionist aggression had been inflicted upon our brothers in the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. The imperialist Powers used Israel as a tool and a take-off ground for achieving their ends and sharing the spoils of a shockingly perfidious plot: Israel, to realize its dreams of imposing its existence and conditions on the basis of a fait accompli; the United States, to liquidate the Arab liberation movement and the aspiration of the Arab nation to consolidate its entity, crystalize its personality and determine its future according to its own will and interest; and Britain, to put an end to the nationalist movement in the occupied south of Yemen, as some British papers reported in the wake of the aggression, hoping that such a plot would bring the downfall of anti-imperialist forces in the Arab homeland.
41. That, in a nutshell, is the tragedy that world conscience, represented in the various delegations here, faces today. This conscience calls upon us to formulate the legal and historical terms that describe the crime, accuse the culprit, bring justice to the victim, and issue the fair sentence, in order to deter others from committing such crimes. The international society, which seeks effectively to live under the protection of law and strict adherence to international norms and ethics, is called upon to condemn aggression so that it may not go back to the rule of the jungle and barbaric régimes.
42. World opinion is undoubtedly aware that the conflict between the Arabs and Israel is not one of race or creed. The Jews still live with Arabs, as they always have throughout the centuries, in happiness, peace and security, prospering as ever under the banner of the brotherhood of man. The conflict is one of the legitimate rights of a people—any people—to live on its land and to be buried in it. If colonizers come from various parts of the world to expel an innocent people from its homeland under armed force and usurp its land and homes, they have to expect that people to resist them to death in defence of its life, its rights, its dignity, and its cultural heritage.
43. Let each one of us ask himself quietly, and with all sincerity and objectivity, what he would do if someone broke into his home to loot it and kill his children, and then evicted him, leaving him in desperation to join the homeless and jobless. Would each one of us surrender to the crime? Would each yield to his fate? Or would each defend his right, himself and his children? And if the aggressor, for some reason, overpowered him, would he recognize him and yield to him the fruits of his aggression? Or would each of us fight to regain his usurped home? Is there any fair judge who can clothe aggression in an attire of legitimacy and then compel the victim to accept a peace based on injustice and aggression?
44. This is the essence of the conflict between the Arabs and zionism. The Arabs have always hoped, and still do, that the great Powers, who lend their full support to zionism, would know that the Arabs are peaceful people, who seek the friendship of all nations so that the march of world civilization towards progress and human happiness might proceed in peace, security and stability. Yet the Arabs shall never allow their rights to be violated, or their dignity to be trampled, as long as there is one drop of blood that runs through their veins.
45. The Arabs have always stood against aggression and shared with men and might in the decisive battle against nazism and fascism. The Arabs fought side by side with those who were fighting injustice and the Nazi dictatorship. Tens of thousands of our men were killed in the battles, The Alamein desert and Arab North Africa bear witness to this fact. The Arabs also stood in support of the United States in denouncing the perfidious aggression against Pearl Harbor and condemned those who suddenly struck a fatal blow to the American Navy to paralyse its power and compel the American people to accept the logic of the aggressors, to surrender to their will and yield to the conditions which the victorious dictate from a position of strength. The Arabs, as well as many others, stood with the United States in their refusal to accept the logic of perfidy. The battle went on until the lawful triumphed and the noble human ideals were respected.
46. Therefore, the people of the world were expecting that America would be the first country which the present generation would nominate to stand in the forefront of all those countries which refute the principle of perfidy, condemn aggression, refuse all its consequences and point an accusing finger at the aggressor.
- Mr. Sandoungout (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.*
47. To our dismay, and to the shock of the civilized world, instead of upholding justice and truth, the United States conspired with zionism against us. A quick review of the American and Western Press points out the true nature of the aggression. It does not need much scrutiny in order to untangle all the strings of the plot. Editorials in many American papers will tell you: "Israel fought the battle of America in the Middle East with Israeli blood". A spokesman for the White House told the Press that the United States had decided not to intervene unilaterally, as the top advisers to President Johnson, and the CIA reports, confirmed that Israel would beat all the Arab countries together.

48. In the 19 June issue of Newsweek we read the following:

"The President had received a reassuring assessment from Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who predicted that the Israelis would win the war within three or four days if they brought off the first air strikes."

Of course, the word "predicted" is a misnomer. This, we should remember, took place one week before the aggression. The same article goes on to say:

"So skeptical was U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg of this report, that Wheeler was sent to compare notes with the CIA chief Richard Helms, who ratified the judgment."

49. Analysts in the United States are now assessing and evaluating the performance of those who held the strings of the conspiracy. Some are even reaping the gains from the role they played.

50. In the 23 June issue of Life magazine we read the following:

"There were two men who gained considerably in the eyes of their peers and the President: General Earl Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who provided Johnson with capability estimates which showed the Israeli army gaining victory in three or four days; and the CIA director Richard Helms, who helped supply Wheeler the data on which the estimates were based."

51. The same magazine goes on, almost as literally as Newsweek, to describe the skepticism of the distinguished Ambassador Goldberg. Many papers now congratulate the conspirators, and it is common now to read such statements as: "The United States has emerged with diplomatic gains far outnumbering their losses"; and, "To Washington, the combination of Israeli muscle and United States sweet-talk had produced eminently satisfactory results".

52. Is there any more proof of this perfidious behaviour? This "sweet talk" calls for self-restraint, asking the Arabs for assurances and declarations of non-belligerence while conspiring against the Arabs, as if they were tying the hands and feet of the innocent victim and letting a mad dog loose against him. The fruits are now being reaped on the skulls of the victims and the debris of aggression. Life magazine, says Pollster Louis Harris, "believes that the new data will show L.B.J.'s personal position strengthened considerably because of the way the Middle East crisis came out... the episode will help rally Viet-Nam support for the President and tend to discourage dissent". We may, of course, hear again from the United States representative that these are allegations and not facts. Let the incident of the CIA spying vessel Liberty, a name very much undeserved, always remind the conscience of the world that it was torpedoed by Israelis when it was only fifteen miles from the Egyptian shores, as if poetic justice decided to stamp the conspiracy and the conspirators.

53. It was not astonishing, therefore, nor was it strange to see the American draft resolution as an expression, succinct perhaps, of the desires of the aggressors and of a surrender to Zionist pressures.

54. A review of the speeches of the Zionist leaders at the Lafayette Park rally on Thursday, 8 June 1967, and a comparison with the demands contained in petition they submitted at the White House, prove this fact beyond any doubt. In that rally, the Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of major American Zionist organizations called for—and I quote from The Hebrew Watchman of 15 June 1967—"strong U.S. backing of a settlement based on Arab recognition of Israel's 'permanent presence' in the Middle East". The President of B'nai B'rith demanded that "Israel's borders be adjusted to safeguard security and peace", and on top of everything else, United States House Speaker John McCormack pledged the rallyists, according to the same paper, "to do all in his power to the end that the fruits of Israeli military victory are not defeated in the fields of diplomacy", and asserted that "the national interests of the United States call for strong support of Israel". Senator Fulbright, in a press interview last week, said that the United States cannot stand impartial because of the tremendous American-Zionist pressures. Mr. Richard Nixon, the former United States Vice-President, seeking to bolster his case for the 1968 presidential election, declared in Tel Aviv on Friday, 23 June 1967, that Israel should never give back any territory it gained and that it should use its strong position to compel the Arabs to sit separately with Israelis at the negotiation table.

55. The United States draft resolution [A/L.520] is, therefore, a faithful expression of all these Zionist demands. It is, to say the least, the true mirror of the conspiracy. Thus, the United States recognizes the principle of perfidy and the necessity to accept the consequent fait accompli.

56. You have heard the Israeli representative submit the case of aggression as one of self-defence after the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from the area and the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. He chose, of course, not to mention the threatening statements made on 12 May 1967 by Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol. The Israeli Chief of Staff, Itzhak Rabin, who concentrated thirteen brigades on the Syrian front in preparation for aggression, said on that very day, in a bellicose and arrogant statement, that his forces would carry out military operations against Syria with the aim of occupying Damascus and overthrowing the present Syrian régime.

57. This is the actual beginning in a series of events which culminated in the Israeli aggression. The withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force and the subsequent defensive measures taken by the United Arab Republic were only the inevitable consequences of the Israeli threats and preparation for aggression against Syria. Would proper reason expect the Arabs to lend a deaf ear to these threats and close their eyes to the massive concentration of enemy troops? What would have been the case if the Arab countries had remained silent and left Syria to the hazards of aggression? Would not the turn of each come one after another as long as imperialism, in desperation, had decided to strike a fatal blow at the Arab liberation movement and to cripple its march towards progress and prosperity?

58. It is indeed bewildering that those who decried the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and energetically

roamed the earth to rally support for the formation of a multi-national maritime power to force open the blockade do not deplore the same energy or decry the continuous violation by Israel of the United Nations Charter and Israel's total disregard of all the repeated United Nations resolutions concerning the Arab refugees. The duality in their international behaviour will make the present generation lose faith in international law and order.

59. Let us now ask ourselves, What would have been the position of those big Powers had the situation been the reverse, had the Arabs begun the attack and restored their own land in Palestine? Would the Western fleets near Arab shores have remained where they were? Would they have shown the same sharp teeth which they showed before the Israeli aggression when they repeated their pet phrase of respect for the territorial integrity of all countries in the area? Or would they have amended this declaration as did President Johnson after the aggression on Monday, 19 June, when he added a little "but" which seeks to compel the victim to recognize the aggressor and negotiate directly with him?

60. If the Arabs had been the first to start a forward movement to regain their usurped land, you would have heard those who condone aggression sing in chorus the song of justice and peace. You would have heard them condemning the Arabs and asking them for pounds of flesh. But since the Arabs, Mr. President, are the victims, you hear them use "sweet talk". Those who condone perfidy now close their eyes to the atrocities inflicted by Israel upon its victims and grow deaf to the moans of the civilians who suffered the inhuman and sadistic torture of the enemy. May I refer you, Mr. President, to the 17 June 1967 issue of the Economist, and the issue of Le Monde of 20 June 1967, to read what the eye-witnesses had to say about the barbaric behaviour of the Israelis. May we call upon world conscience, through you, Mr. President, and through the representatives of all nations, to read those reports and to judge for themselves. The Economist said:

"The main cause of death was napalm bombing. Eyewitness reports from Lebanese doctors speak of continuous napalm bombing of roads where civilians are fleeing from the West Bank. Ambulances and medical units were bombed. Three hospitals were totally destroyed."

61. Of course, you may once more hear the Israeli representative say shamelessly that these facts are totally unfounded and are figments of our imagination. We should not be astonished if he did. If someone has been condemned eighteen times by the United Nations and has not heeded the deterring implications of these condemnations; if a gangster hoists the flag of oppression on one of the holiest places for Muslims in complete disregard and distrust of all human doctrines, one may expect anything from him—suspending the soldiers by their feet for forty-eight hours like slaughtered sheep, using napalm bombs, or anything else. But those who did not learn the lesson of Pearl Harbor do not budge. Now the hawks are turned into doves because the Arabs are the victims, not the Zionists. Those countries now come to give lip-service to peace and security, to impose on us a

fait accompli and to allow the enemy to reap the fruits of his aggression.

62. Therefore, the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic will vote against the United States draft resolution.

63. The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.519] is the minimum demand acceptable to the Yemen Arab Republic.

64. In supporting the Soviet draft resolution, though it does not call for positive punishment, the Yemen Arab Republic delegation believes that the peoples of the countries which participated in the aggression will not allow the aggressors to go unpunished, at least in the annals of history. The Yemen Arab Republic delegation records its gratitude to the Soviet Union and to all peace-loving countries which condemned aggression and stood in defence of right and justice. We also record with admiration and appreciation the honourable and correct decision of our Secretary-General U Thant in responding to the call to withdraw the United Nations Emergency Force. By this action, U Thant refused to put this world Organization under the pressure of any Power, thus preserving its dignity as the true institution to safeguard world peace and security.

65. The Yemen Arab Republic delegation, representing a people whose culture goes back thousands of years, calls upon world conscience to reject the principles of perfidy and aggression. It is only the complete rejection of such principles and all their consequences which can ensure the continued existence of this world Organization. It is only by such rejection that we may restore in the hearts of those who were shocked by the Israeli crime some faith in the United Nations and the fervent hope that it will continue as the guardian of peace and the promoter of world understanding. Let us hope that this Organization will be able to avoid the doom of its predecessor when it hesitated to condemn aggression and thus save the blood of millions of innocent people which has flowed through the years.

66. Mr. President and Members of the General Assembly, you are here recording in a clear and truthful manner the history of this generation which expects you to express its conscience, its aspirations, its ideals, and the true meaning of world peace.

67. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway): The Norwegian Government does not find it constructive or useful at the present time to indulge in recrimination or condemnation in connexion with the situation in the Middle East. Today we are facing a crucial moment in the history of that part of the world, but we must not allow ourselves to be prisoners of that history. It can, however, help us to get the right perspective for the time to come and make us realize that we must profit from the present crisis to construct the future of this unhappy region on lasting foundations.

68. The recent past in the Near East has been one of mounting tensions interrupted by periods of comparative calm. An explosion was always in the realm of the possible, and our task is now to work together with malice towards none and charity towards all in

order to construct a future with peace instead of tension, with confidence instead of suspicion, with collaboration instead of hatred and hostility.

69. We must not forget that what happens in the Near East—what happens anywhere in the world—is of direct and immediate concern to us all and engages our responsibility.

70. The Security Council has dealt with this problem again and again for twenty years. The United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the United Nations Emergency Force have played a great and constructive part. Norway has participated in this work, and I am sure that the General Assembly will permit me, as a Norwegian, to say that we are proud of the role played by UNTSO's Chief of Staff, General Odd Bull, in a very difficult post under dangerous conditions.

71. In a time of crisis and mounting tension in the international community, it was a beacon in the dark when the Security Council agreed unanimously on cease-fire resolutions. But, of course, this is just the beginning. We must now look to the future, and there agreement is not so apparent.

72. In our search for a solution, we will do well to ponder the words of our President that

"it is our duty to think not only of present circumstances but of future consequences. Our ultimate aim is peace, lasting peace, and we should remember that genuine peace is based solely on justice, and therefore just solutions must be sought" [1525th meeting, para. 13].

73. These words echo what our Secretary-General stated on his return from his mission to Cairo at the beginning of the crisis which has brought us together here, when he stressed that we "must continue to seek, and eventually to find, reasonable, peaceful and just solutions".^{1/}

74. My Government whole-heartedly agrees with these words, and hopes and trusts that the present session will be the beginning of a lasting settlement of the difficult problems of this whole region. We shall probably not be able to solve the underlying problems in this session. We may have a long and arduous task before us.

75. The Norwegian Government hopes that it will be possible, through all the avenues at our disposal and with the co-operation of all the parties to the dispute, to reach solutions acceptable to all, even though we realize that this may demand more time and more patience than many people thought it would when the present session was convened.

76. The first consideration which leaps to the mind is that any possible solution must build on the Charter. Article 2, paragraph 1, states in clear and unequivocal terms that "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members". This means that all Members, individually and collectively, are bound to respect the sovereignty of all other Members. According to paragraph 4 of the same Article, "All Members shall refrain ... from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity

or political independence of any state". It is thus clear, clear beyond a doubt, that any future settlement must be based on the continued existence of all the States in the region. But it means also—and this is just as clear—that no territory may be claimed as the fruit of conquest. Conquest is not a valid title under the system of the United Nations and cannot be admitted as such.

77. These two principles are the very essence of a settlement in the Near East. The immediate tasks are the withdrawal of troops and the fixing of lasting boundaries.

78. One of the most important steps towards security in the region is to work for a gradual limitation of armaments. It is the sincere hope of my Government that the great Powers will refrain from supporting one or more States in the region with arms. We must also discuss practical steps in connexion with a lasting settlement. The Norwegian Government is in favour of a United Nations presence, either an enlargement of UNTSO or some other kind of organization, and my Government is willing to contribute to any such operation.

79. International shipping has figured prominently in the debates about the problems of the Near East. Innocent passage through international waterways is of great importance, and we hope that steps will be taken to reach internationally accepted principles in this field.

80. But in terms of human lives, human decency and charity, the fate of the Palestinian refugees is the most serious problem in the Near East. The Norwegian Government feels convinced that no lasting peace can exist before an equitable and generous solution has been found for this burning question, which is of tremendous importance in both the political and the humanitarian spheres. Human misery, suffering and hopelessness cannot be the basis of life. We must not tolerate a situation in which hundreds of thousands of people lead a life which violates human pride and dignity. Norway has in the past made contributions to alleviate the misery of the refugees and will be willing to do so in the future. My Government would also be in favour of a large-scale programme for the economic development of this entire region.

81. The solution of the problem of Jerusalem depends on collaboration not only among nations but also among religions, so that the Holy Places can be protected and administered for the benefit of the faithful of the great religions which meet in that Holy City.

82. It may well be that we cannot, during a short emergency session, reach final agreement on the difficult and complex problems confronting us in this region of the world. Perhaps we can only draw up a catalogue of the conflicts which must be solved. It will take a long time to solve them and we must go step by step, and we must realize that the aftermath of a bitter war does not afford the best climate for constructive efforts. The Security Council has a special responsibility, and no progress can be realized without the concerted effort of the great Powers. This is why we welcomed with particular satisfaction the meetings which took place recently between the President of the United States of America and the Chairman

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7906, para. 19.

of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and we sincerely hope that these meetings will usher in a new era of reasonable compromise which will dispel the danger that this present conflict will settle down into the hopelessness of an East-West struggle of cold-war character. Recriminations and accusations will not bring a solution any closer. Our only hope lies in the realization that we are all co-workers for a peaceful world built on decency and respect for the rights of peoples.

83. We are bound under the Charter "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours". Let us hope to achieve this in common endeavour in the Near East, where our common heritage over the centuries speaks of love, peace and understanding.

84. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel has asked for the floor in order to exercise his right of reply, and I now call upon him.

85. Mr. EBAN (Israel): This debate has revolved around two themes: responsibility for the past, and concern for the future. The views which I expressed on both of these subjects on 19 June [1526th meeting] remain intact. Let me recall that there were two phases in this design: the Egyptian phase and the Jordanian phase. I have shown how, from 14 May to 5 June, the United Arab Republic planned, organized, declared and launched a war for the avowed purpose of destroying Israel. The aggression was unprovoked. It came at a time when Israel had not attacked the territory, the population or any vital interest of the United Arab Republic. Indeed, the Israel-Egyptian frontier had been relatively tranquil for ten whole years. Our policy until the Egyptian aggression unfolded was to maintain that stability and then to advance beyond it towards a durable peace.

86. Now, it is impossible to refute the central fact that during the last weeks of May and early June a drastic change took place in Egyptian policy. A reckless decision was made to disrupt the security balance established by general agreement in March 1957. The first phase in the aggression was the sudden movement of infantry and tank forces into Sinai on 16 May. The second phase began the next day when General Mahmoud Fawzi requested the commander of the United Nations Emergency Force to evacuate his troops from the line of the Egyptian advance and concentrate them in Gaza. On 18 May, the Egyptian Foreign Minister conveyed his Government's decision to remove all United Nations forces from the territory of the United Arab Republic and Gaza.

87. The third stage of the plan began on 20 May with the forcible expulsion of the United Nations forces at Sharm el Sheikh. Egyptian forces now occupied the entrance to international waters in the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Elath. On 22 May, in a visit to Sinai, President Nasser dramatically, fatally, announced his intention to close the Strait and Gulf to Israel commerce and navigation. He then installed coastal guns and put a naval force into the Strait. Since passage in the Suez Canal had also been illegally denied for many years, the blockade of Israel's southern approaches was now complete.

88. The fourth stage in the plan of encirclement and strangulation opened on 23 May when, in a series of swift movements, Egyptian forces in Sinai were increased to seven infantry and armoured divisions amounting to ninety thousand men and nine hundred tanks. No such forces had ever in history been assembled in the Sinai peninsula.

89. The fifth phase of this aggressive design unfolded between 30 May and 5 June with the conclusion of pacts with Jordan and Iraq to ensure the participation of their forces in the imminent assault on Israel. During that period Egyptian aircraft made daily reconnaissance of Israel's southern territory in readiness for a fatal airstrike on Israel's airfields. They were studying the target and preparing for the kill.

90. I hold in my hands the detailed operation orders issued to Egyptian commanders in Sinai in the last weeks of May. They contain a precise definition of all the airfields in Israel which they were to bomb and to destroy. They contain a plan for the conquest of Elath and of the southern Negev. They contain instructions for total readiness to be effective from the morning of 26 May.

91. As he advanced from stage to stage in this aggressive design, President Nasser accompanied his movements by a frank explanation of their intent. Between 14 May and 4 June, more than fifty declarations were made by President Nasser, his Ministers, his army chiefs and his officially controlled radio stations, explaining that the aim was to fight a war for Israel's annihilation. Thus, on 26 May President Nasser set out his policy in detail to the Council of Trade Unions in Cairo. He said:

"Our basic goal will be the destruction of Israel. The world is very different from what it was ten days ago. Israel is different today from what it was ten days ago. Lately we have felt that our force is sufficient and that entering into a campaign against Israel now we will be able, with the help of God, to be victorious. I could not say things like this five years ago or three years ago."

92. President Nasser was fully aware that his naval blockade had special significance. It was both a declaration and an act of war. He said:

"What I have done today involves confrontation with Israel. The taking of this step necessitates that we enter into all-out war with Israel."

93. Indeed, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as he has reported to us, informed President Nasser that the imposition of that blockade would have the gravest consequences. Nasser incurred the consequences. On 29 May he assured the members of the National Council that the steps taken so far were part of a deliberate and calculated plan of which further stages were to come. He said:

"We have restored the situation to what it was before 1956. There is no doubt that God will help us and enable us to return the situation to what it was before 1948"—that is to say, before Israel was born."

He added:

"The Soviet Union is a faithful friend that never wanted anything and supplied us with everything

we asked from wheat to armaments. Chairman Kosygin sent a message with Badran—the Egyptian Minister of Defence—"and promised that he would not let any Power intervene until things got to the situation as they were before 1956."

94. This last statement is particularly ominous. It shows that Nasser believed himself to be assured of Soviet support for undermining the arrangements which had been decided in 1957 to make Gaza, Sinai and the Gulf of Aqaba immune from belligerent acts. The Soviet Union had stimulated—and is now renewing—an arms race in the Middle East. It had prevented—and can still be counted on to prevent—effective attempts at pacific settlement in the Security Council. It had refused—and still refuses—to make any statement specifically calling on Israel's neighbours to respect its statehood and sovereignty. It was now giving encouragement and support to a Government which had, three days before, imposed a blockade and announced its intention to wage a war of annihilation.

95. Thus, the Soviet Union has not been an impartial Power working for peace and security, but the ally of Governments in Damascus and Cairo which were at the same time planning the liquidation of a neighbouring State. It is in that light that Soviet proposals before this Assembly should be appraised, criticized and rejected.

96. My Government, accordingly, rejects with indignation any statement, from whatever source, asserting that Israel is responsible for the hostilities which broke out this month. I invite every State here represented to ask itself how it would have acted in the following conditions: a group of neighbouring States encircle you with infantry and armoured divisions; issue detailed orders to their commanders on how to bomb your airfields and capture your territory; announce their intention to wage a war of annihilation against you; proclaim and establish a blockade of your coasts; announce that the object of the blockade is to precipitate a war; and then, with the Security Council ignoring your peril, send their aircraft moving towards you and shell your frontier villages. How would you react? What would you do?

97. If there is anything unusual in Israel's action it lies in the patience shown during those two weeks of suspense and agony that passed between the Egyptian blockade and the movement of forces against us on 5 June. Every honest man in this room and outside it knows in the depths of his heart that what we are discussing is how an attempt to bring about Israel's encirclement and strangulation failed. The world community should regret, not that the attempt failed, but that it was made at all.

98. I now turn to the subject of the hostilities launched by Jordan on the morning of 5 June. Vigorous statements had been made by King Hussein and his Ministers in previous months about President Nasser's attempts to bring about the violent downfall of the Jordanian Kingdom. Yet on 30 May he pledged full military co-operation with Egypt against Israel, and Jordan opened intensive and destructive war upon Israel on 5 June, without Israel having fired a single shot against any Jordanian citizens, without Israel having touched an inch of Jordan territory. Indeed,

that the Jordan front was opened by Jordan is not even a subject of controversy with Jordan itself.

99. At 8 o'clock that morning, Jordanian forces opened fire on Jerusalem with heavy mortars. Three hours later, Jordanian troops attacked and captured Government House, considered as an "area between the lines". By early afternoon, Jordanian forces had shelled Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and dozens of villages and farms along the entire front. Thirty-six civilians were killed and more than 500 wounded in that first assault. Jordanian heavy guns later shelled Lod, Ikron, Kefar Sirkin, Sdeh Dov, 'En Shemer and Megiddo. Jordanian Hunter jet aircraft attacked Kefar Sirkin and Ramat Dawid. Iraqi Tupolev-16 bombers overflying Jordan attacked Natanya and 'Afula. Twenty-four civilians were killed and scores of others wounded. Damage was caused to residential areas and industrial plants. Radio Amman accurately announced: "We have opened fire along the whole front". That was true.

100. Even after several Jordanian bombardments and bombing sorties had taken place, with loss of Israeli life and damage to our towns and cities, we offered Jordan the opportunity to disengage, not to plunge further into a war provoked by Egypt. There had as yet been no Israel riposte. At noon, I sent a message to the Jordanian monarch through General Bull. The message was plain: Israel will not attack any State which refrains from attacking Israel. The message was duly conveyed and received. It was answered by the crash of shells falling on Jerusalem's streets and buildings. For the second time in twenty years, that city, whose name stirs the deepest historic memories, was wantonly converted by Jordanian forces into a battlefield.

101. Jordan had squandered an opportunity for peace. It had gambled with destiny and incurred the full responsibility of unprovoked war. The tragic sequel is well known.

102. The point is that it was not until six hours after the first Jordanian bombardments that Israel forces crossed into the area between the lines to recapture Government House. Enormous efforts at restraint were invested in the hope of avoiding a full Jordanian engagement. It was not until ten hours after the opening of Jordanian fire that Israel forces went into Jordan-held territory to recapture the strategic height opposite the village of Mevasseret Yerushalayim from which fierce shelling had been directed. It was not until eighteen full hours after Jordan shelled Jerusalem that Israel forces engaged the sector of Jerusalem then in Jordan's hands. It was not until two full days after the Jordanian bombardment had begun that Israel forces entered the Old City, from where guns installed amongst the Holy Places had rained a most unholy death upon the city outside the walls. If ever any State had forced a war upon a reluctant neighbour, this was the war that Jordan forced on Israel.

103. That Israel had no designs on Jordan lies beyond honest doubt. Vivid proof can be found in the fact, for example, that no hostilities took place at any time between Israel and Lebanon. If Jordan, like Lebanon, had refrained from war, fighting would never have spread at all to Israel's eastern border. There is neither reason nor justice in losing sight of Jordan's

heavy and unique responsibility when we come to survey the unexpected expansion of the conflict on 5 June. More young men have died and more civilians have perished, more men are blinded and maimed today as a result of Jordan's decision that day, than as a result of any other decision or any other action. Clearly, anyone who has taken such a decision with such poignant results is surrounded by a tragic air—but the tragedy lies in the error of the decision, not in the failure of the design.

104. Once the decision had been taken, there were only two possibilities—success or failure. Had the design succeeded, there would today be no Israel refugees, only Israel corpses. There would be no Security Council cease-fire, for it is a principle of Security Council history in the past decade and a half that no resolution uncongenial to the Arab States can be adopted. Nobody would have intervened. The six million martyrs would have become eight million. Everybody knew this by the end of May, and that is why a shudder of horror spread swiftly round the civilized and the humane world.

105. It is in that light that we now look back and read the interview given by the Jordanian King to a Beirut newspaper on 2 June. Discussing the significance of the Egyptian-Jordanian pact, he said:

"Our renewed co-operation with Egypt and with other Arab countries in the East and in the West will enable us to take a step forward towards wiping out the shame and liberating the whole of Palestine. This is the cornerstone of our policy."

106. Those are historical facts which are available in every record and engraved deeply in the heart and conscience of our region. They must be set against the exotic and one-sided description of the facts that we heard this afternoon.

107. I turn from a review of the past to a consideration of the future. The cease-fire ordained by the Security Council is now in force. Many exaggerated and false reports have been uttered and written about Israel's policy in the West Bank, which, by the decision of the Jordan Government was plunged into the area of conflict. There was, of course, much dislocation at first, but it is being overcome. The return to normal life continues. Since Thursday last, free movement of population and vehicles has been authorized. Vehicles have been handed back to their owners. Commerce between cities and country areas is active again. In the southern areas of the West Bank near Bethlehem and Hebron, where there was less fighting, commerce thrives. The market places are crowded. Any visitor can testify to the normal rhythm of life.

108. All municipalities are functioning. The telephone network was damaged in the fighting; it is now restored. Electricity and water supplies improve from day to day. For the first time since 1947, the whole City of Jerusalem is receiving water supplies. All hospitals are functioning normally. Christian and Muslim religious life in Jerusalem is active and serene. The heads of three denominations in charge of the Holy Sepulchre have written officially informing us that repair work interrupted by the outbreak of hostilities has been resumed.

109. Last Friday nearly 5,000 people came to worship at the Mosque of Omar, amongst them 2,000 Moslem citizens of Israel to whom access to that shrine had been denied since 1947. Similar facilities are being made available for Israel Arab citizens of the Christian faith.

110. During the fighting in Jerusalem, fortunately one church alone sustained damage. A newspaper story published in Britain on heavy damage allegedly sustained by the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem is, happily, untrue. Thousands of pilgrims visit the shrine every week. However, all but one of the thirty-five ancient synagogues in the Jewish quarter of the Old City in Jerusalem were found desecrated and destroyed. This is not a result of the recent fighting. It is the consequence of the policy adopted by the authorities of the Jordan Kingdom during past years. That Kingdom has a sorry and shameful record in its treatment of Jewish sanctuaries. Not only has it denied access to the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest shrine, but it has razed all synagogues to the ground, refused access to Rachel's Tomb and destroyed every Jewish settlement in the land. Therefore, with all respect, the Head of the Jordan State is no authority on the humane treatment of minority communities or on religious tolerance.

111. There is a traffic of people from the West Bank eastward. The numbers vary from day to day. My Government has reiterated that there are no expulsions. There is no pressure inducing anyone to leave. In many instances it may be necessary to resort to forcible means to prevent individuals from leaving. Apart from those associated with Ahmad Shukairy and his organization, whose departure, I confess, is unregretted, those leaving do so mainly for financial reasons. Tens of thousands of Arabs living and working in Kuwait, as well as in other Arab and non-Arab countries, used to send monthly remittances to their families. These amounted to over \$50 million each year. Those sums are now transferred to branches east of the Jordan, no longer to the areas of the West Bank.

112. There is thus a strong economic pull drawing people across the river. The heads of Arab population centres have pointed out that comparatively few residents of Jericho have crossed into eastern territory. Refugees who lived in the camps fled because they wished to receive their rations in Jordan and feared to lose the financial support of their relatives in Kuwait.

113. Amongst those crossing eastward are many Jordan Government officials and their families. There are soldiers who have discarded their uniforms. Amongst those leaving are refugees previously supported in camps by UNRWA. They are now moving to the large camps in Jordan. The Mayors and Heads of local authorities in the West Bank have acknowledged that there were no attacks on civilians. In Qalqilya the Mayor has called for assistance to resettle the city. We will respond to that request on Thursday.

114. UNRWA has promised its assistance for the rehabilitation of the inhabitants. The refugees in Gaza under Egyptian rule had been in what one can only call concentration camps. They have now been permitted for the first time to move and visit their rela-

tives on the West Bank. All the heads of towns and cities have agreed to continue to perform their functions. No one has been deposed. Free movement is available in Jerusalem and Bethlehem. There are far fewer families who wish to migrate from east Jordan to the West Bank, but in the cases where this need arises permission will be granted.

115. Israelis are not being allowed to settle in the West Bank areas. Moslems and Christians are allowed to enter the West Bank in order to pray at holy sites. Arab inhabitants have not been moved from their homes, with the exception of those families who lived in the synagogues of the Old City, which are being pliously and movingly rebuilt. For those, alternative housing has been proposed. Every effort will of course be made to ensure normal and humane conditions throughout the cease-fire area.

116. Let us ask ourselves one question: How did the position of Jordan in the West Bank and of Egypt in Gaza arise? Why was Jordan in the West Bank and Egypt in Gaza?: by conquest, the right of conquest, the fact of conquest. Conquest was the origin of those positions. I do not say this now in order to analyse the consequences but in order to hint at a certain selectivity in the way that facts and rights of conquest are sometimes discussed. The London Times three days ago brought the following message under the heading "Israel tackles tasks of feeding refugees". Mr. Brogan wrote:

"UNRWA stores have been reopened in the camps and the army is distributing bread and milk. The inhabitants of West Bank who fled but did not cross the Jordan are now returning home. Army lorries are being sent down to fetch back the people of Jordanian Jerusalem. The transport was doubtless welcome. When I was in Jericho with some Israeli officers, they were beset by those demanding to know when they would be taken home. The Israeli authorities expect no great trouble in settling those who moved or in feeding them. It is probable that the Jordan authorities are in greater need of help. Relations between the army and the civil population seem excellent."

117. This third-party evidence is of importance because the General Assembly has been bombarded with talk about napalm brutalities. Certainly those who hold telephone conversations with President Nasser on the open wire on how to embroil two foreign Powers in alleged participation in the fighting must expect a certain "credibility gap" in this Hall.

118. I come now finally to discuss, in the main part of my reply, what the future should be. The cease-fire régime is now in operation. Our aim is to replace it by a negotiated peace. And the question how we proceed and what we should avoid from this point onwards is of crucial importance.

119. There is a Soviet proposal for withdrawal to the same situation out of which the conflict arose: the same situation, the same frontiers, the same insecurity, the same blockade of waterways, the same belligerent doctrine, the same divided city, the same choked access on vital roads, the same confrontation of un-separated armies, the same guns on Syrian hills threatening settlements in the valley, the same arms

race and, above all, the same absence of peace treaties requiring a mutual recognition of sovereignty. This is what is now suggested. This is the consequence of every proposal or resolution, however worded, which recommends an unnegotiated withdrawal without a prior mutual and effective commitment to peace.

120. Such proposals, whether submitted by the Soviet Union or by any other State or group of States, are prescriptions for a renewal of the conflict. We should be bankrupt in statesmanship if we were merely to reconstruct the conditions of the recent outbreak and therefore set the stage for the war to come.

121. There is no hope in patchwork settlements resting on doubt and hedged in by ambiguity. The need is for the establishment of those relations between Middle Eastern States, all of which are committed by the Charter to conclude and maintain such relations.

122. An impressive weight of opinion has developed in this week's debate against merely restoring the explosive conditions of the past. Let me summarize those opinions. The President of the United States has said that an immediate return to the situation as it was on 4 June would be "not a prescription for peace but for renewed hostilities".

123. The Security Council, as you have heard, declined to endorse the solution now advocated here by the Arab States and the Soviet Union; declined to endorse their condemnation; declined to establish this fiction of Israeli aggression; declined to accept the doctrine of an unconditional and unnegotiated withdrawal, back to belligerency.

124. The Prime Minister of Denmark said at this rostrum [1529th meeting] that the aim should be not to re-establish the unstable conditions existing before the outbreak of hostilities. The arrangements obtained until then clearly were ineffective and insufficient; they were never meant to be permanent, and they could not, without being amended, form the basis of a genuine settlement.

125. The Prime Minister of Italy reminded us of the principal Articles of the Charter as, in his words:

"... the framework in which we must deal with the problem of disengagement and withdrawal of troops and that of an equitable territorial settlement in the region, which ought to be freely accepted by the parties and be permanent in nature.

"The withdrawal of troops ... is not sufficient. If the United Nations confined itself to this, it would share the blame for a return to the situation which has been the cause of two wars in two decades. It should instead give thought to creating the necessary conditions for a settlement which will at the same time protect the Middle East and the world from the danger of a new regional conflagration which might even expand into a general war. If the United Nations should shirk this responsibility, it would be compromising its very reason for existence." [1530th meeting, para. 131-2.]

Prime Minister Moro went on to advocate a settlement freely negotiated and accepted by the parties.

126. The Foreign Minister of Belgium, endorsing the Italian view, said [1531st meeting] that if a peace-

ful and over-all settlement is not seriously sought and subsequently obtained, the law of the Near East will remain the law of force and insecurity.

127. The Foreign Minister of Canada emphasized [1533rd meeting] that there must be no return to the conditions which helped to provoke the initial military action and expressed categorical opposition to all parts of the withdrawal resolution of the Soviet Union. He also declared that the solution must rest with the parties to the dispute. Mr. Martin stated that withdrawal of Israel forces must be related to other basic issues involved.

128. The representative of Sweden pointed out [1533rd meeting] that a settlement must be based on the consent and co-operation of the parties. The United Nations, he said, cannot dictate any solution, nor can anybody else.

129. The Foreign Minister of Brazil stated that the problem of withdrawal cannot be envisaged as an isolated step. The Prime Minister of Romania reminded us [1533rd meeting] that no outside effort can take the place of a true settlement adopted by the countries of the region themselves in dealing with their common problems. The only lasting solutions, he said, are those which derive from the deep knowledge and the direct experience of the parties concerned.

130. Thus, there is a central viewpoint in this General Assembly which is opposed to a withdrawal of troops unaccompanied by a withdrawal from belligerency to non-recognition. This same central viewpoint insists on an effort to achieve the negotiation of a settlement by the parties themselves. I have called this "a central viewpoint" because those who express it are in every case States which have sought and still seek to maintain a balanced and equal friendship with all Middle Eastern States.

131. On the other hand, the call for an unconditional withdrawal, unaccompanied by peace, comes mainly from those who in the United Nations over the years have felt themselves compelled to give exclusive support to whatever the Arab Governments propose and uncritical indulgence to whatever they do.

132. The Foreign Minister of France reminded us [1531st meeting] that Arabs and Israelis are committed to live together in the Middle East and that they must finally reach a mutual understanding. In endorsing this principle, I venture to express a lesser pessimism than did our eminent French colleague on the chance of an early dialogue, provided that everything is done to promote it. For both parties have an objective need for peace.

133. In Israel the pride of successful resistance is tempered by heavy bereavement and by the sober realization that only a month ago the national security was under grave threat and that in a moment of ordeal we fought alone. Hence, Israel is conscious of the dangers through which it passed, as well as of its success in surmounting them. The national mood, therefore, is sober and thoughtful. We believe that a mutual need for a new era in Arab-Israel relations may lead us to a mutual understanding of reality. It may therefore be unwise to deter a dialogue by showing excessive scepticism of its feasibility.

134. After all, we had experience behind us. In November 1948, there had been a year of fighting, more prolonged, more savage and more costly in life than the recent outbreak. The Arab armies which had invaded Israel had failed to destroy it. There was a proposal to return to the previous truce lines, but the Security Council—which then was in a position to adopt resolutions—on Canadian, French and Belgian initiative, took a bolder course. It adopted resolution 62 (1948), on 16 November 1948, calling not for a return to the old truce, but for the negotiation of new and more stable arrangements.

135. The Arab representatives voted and spoke against this course. Mr. Fawzi, then the Permanent Representative of Egypt, said: "We should not be forced to negotiate with people with whom we do not want to negotiate."^{2/} But the Security Council held to the principle that the parties alone could change the situation caused by their military confrontation. Three months later, in January 1949, Egypt agreed to negotiate, and we reached new agreements which, though now obsolete, stood the test of many years.

136. It is certain today that new currents of thought are destined to sweep across our region, even if they find little open expression here. A short time ago we should not have expected to find a leading article in the Egyptian weekly *Al Musawwar* pouring scorn on the slogan about annihilating Israel. The history of our times is replete with examples of peace settlements achieved on the morrow of war; of ancient enmities giving way to new friendships. We have a strong feeling that such an opportunity now exists. Surely the General Assembly will not wish to interpose itself between the parties and this prospect, but rather to promote the new possibilities.

137. There are, after all, only three possibilities: war, peace and some intermediate, ambiguous position between the two. Of these three courses two have been tried and failed. Peace has not yet been tried.

138. That war is sterile and destructive needs no further proof. It is astounding to find one of the great Powers reopening the arms race by sending scores of aircraft and other weapons to Arab countries in these very days, while its Prime Minister refuses to commit himself to an agreed slow-down of the arms race. But war is sterile and destructive and must be abandoned.

139. Nor will it be contested that intermediate armistice arrangements have had their day. A twenty-year armistice is an absurd anachronism. I doubt whether there is any parallel for this in international history. In this case the paradox arose from the impossibility of reconciling the Charter obligations of Arab States with their doctrine of a state of war and non-recognition of the sovereignty of another Member. These things cannot be reconciled. Henceforth, surely, we must all insist on reciprocity in Middle Eastern relationships. For example, if Egypt claims that there is a state of war between Egypt and Israel, then there is a state of war between Israel and Egypt, and Egypt cannot complain of the consequences of its own doctrine.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Third year, 381st meeting, p. 21.

140. But if there is a treaty establishing peace between Egypt and Israel, then the entire situation becomes transformed and it takes on a completely different aspect. Therefore, the problem of troop dispositions is integrally linked to the manner in which our political and juridical relations are defined.

141. Some Members may feel that the defects of an intermediate and ambiguous situation can be removed by what is called an international presence. Well, we had our experience last month, on which I shall not enlarge again. But what we should do is give attention to what our own Secretary-General wrote in his annual report to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly. He wrote:

"In such cases as the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan and the United Nations Force in Cyprus, the crux of the matter from the standpoint of the United Nations is the continuing absence of any earnest resolve on the part of the parties directly involved in the dispute to seek a reasonable way out of it. Indeed, at times it seems"—said the Secretary-General—"and it may actually be the case, that they tend to take the attitude that the very United Nations presence frees them from any pressing obligation to exert a really serious effort towards a settlement of their differences."

I repeat: He wrote that "the very United Nations presence frees the parties from any pressing obligation to exert a really serious effort towards a settlement of their differences".

"It may well be true"—the Secretary-General went on to say—"that the existence of the United Nations peace-keeping operation and the feeling of security that grows with its effectiveness, reduce the sense of danger and urgency about the continuing dispute, thus relieving the pressure on the parties to seek a settlement."^{3/}

142. Those are wise and thoughtful words. With all else tried, with all else found wanting, only peace remains. It is not peace, but all the other alternatives, that are now unrealistic. Israel's objectives in a negotiation will be security and peace. This is not a dialogue of victors and vanquished; there are only peoples, in equal and profound need of a peaceful agreement. In the peace settlement that we seek, and which others have here advocated, we shall establish all the conditions of a stable and secure peace by mutual agreement. Peace itself contains and unlocks the solution of other issues. If there is a doctrine of peace contractually expressed, then freedom of navigation follows spontaneously. If there is peace, then there is a common interest in avoiding topographical and tactical situations congenial to border disputes. If there is peace, then there is no incentive to perpetuate a refugee problem. We shall then all strive to ensure that there are no refugees, and that those who are now refugees become the productive citizens of sovereign States.

143. In this spirit we have already established a settlement authority to plan and work for the integration of refugees into economic life. Similarly, we are taking steps to ensure that the interest of the world's religions in the peace and sanctity of the Holy Places, and free access thereto, is expressed in agreed form; the formulation used by the eminent representative of Norway is of great interest here.

144. Let me point out that, for the first time in twenty years, Jerusalem is not divided. For the first time in twenty years, it is not a military frontier. For the first time in twenty years, it offers access to the shrines of all three great religions. Conditions are thus ripe for the fulfilment of spiritual yearnings and ideals.

145. Nobody who studies the major problems of the Middle East in their deeper human context can fail to see how integrally they are linked together. The greatest error would be to separate them in a backward-looking movement towards the belligerency and turmoil from which we have emerged. This should be firmly opposed.

146. The greatest wisdom would be to bring about an urgent and comprehensive discussion on all the conditions of a stable and agreed peace. We advocate this because we desire to go beyond the present situation, towards the next and final stage: peace, to be achieved by sincere and urgent dialogue, is now our destination.

147. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call now on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

148. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Some of my colleagues might wonder why I have asked to speak in exercise of my right of reply when Mr. Eban did not whisper a word about Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian people considers that any attack on any Arab territory is an attack against Saudi Arabia itself; for the country I represent is part and parcel—indivisible—of the Arab homeland.

149. Having said that, I must state that the purpose of this special emergency session was to discuss the letter submitted on 13 June by the representative of the Soviet Union, the substance of which is perfectly clear: it was to consider the question of the liquidation of the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States and the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops behind the armistice lines. That was the purpose of this special emergency session.

150. However, some Western Powers—which I do not have to name, for everybody knows them and they know themselves—from the first day we met here, broadened the horizon of the item before us. The representative of a super Power said that a general settlement should be arrived at, and he tried to make sure that every other Western Power, with few exceptions, would sing the same tune.

151. Here before me is the provisional agenda which we adopted on Saturday, 17 June 1967 [1525th meeting], and the letter written by Mr. Gromyko is mentioned as the fifth point, which is the core of the agenda, namely the letter dated 13 June 1967 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/6717]. What do we find here today? A

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1A (A/6301/Add.1), sect. IV.

general debate on the whys and wherefores of the struggle in the Middle East covered by a long speech under the guise of a reply to His Majesty King Hussein by none other than Mr. Eban. This strategy and these tactics of some Western Powers to confuse this Assembly will not confuse world public opinion. We say in Arabic: "Thou shalt be judged by what thou sayest."^{4/}

152. Mr. Eban and his Chief of State, I believe, and other Israeli leaders, made it explicit that even if there were 121 States Members voting for the immediate evacuation of the additional Arab territories which Israeli armies have usurped, they will not heed them. They will not heed them. I believe we are wasting our time continuing to discuss Israeli aggression in this Assembly. All that this Assembly can do is to recommend. But the grindstones grind very slowly in the Arab East, and, unfortunately, there shall be no peace in our part of the world, no matter how eloquent the Western Powers are or seem to be in trying to opt for peace and security and stability in that part of the world.

153. I wish to ask them, Why all this concern about the Arab world and the Middle East? Gentlemen, I will be frank with you—and I have never minced words, and why should I do so today?—this is a question of West against East, of the Western Powers against the peoples of Asia and Africa. Have Asia and Africa regimented their armies in order to hurt Europe? Where are the armies? Do you see them? Even if they wanted to, they have no capacity to do that.

154. As I have said time and again during the last twenty years, the poor Jewish victims of none other than a Western Power—the Nazis—were imposed on Asia presumably to find a humanitarian solution for their suffering. In all honesty, why did not those Western Powers find another place for those victims of Nazism? They picked on the Arab world, on Western Asia. To be generous with other people's land was easy, because the Arabs had emerged as weak States after the First World War, and through the perfidy of Balfour—the perfidy of Balfour—it was promised by the Zionists that they would contribute all they could towards pushing the United States of America into the First World War in 1917, which was the price of the Balfour Declaration. The British Government of those days had forgotten that when the Arabs fought on the side of the Allies in the First World War they were promised in 1915 that they would emerge as independent States. Let us go to the root of the matter and not talk only of links in the long chain of incidents of which the last aggression is only one. I said from this rostrum and in other councils of the United Nations and committees of the United Nations that they—and by "they" I mean the Western Powers, the Allies—also partitioned amongst themselves the Arab world and placed many of its territories under their mandate, which is nothing but colonialism in disguise. One of those mandates was Palestine. And the Charter is explicit, the Charter of the United Nations, and also the Treaty of Versailles, which was patently clear, that the mandatory Power was duty bound to prepare the indigenous people for self-determination and independence.

^{4/} Quoted in Arabic by the speaker.

155. Lord Caradon will bear me out. The indigenous people of Palestine constituted 86 per cent of the entire population of Palestine after the Versailles Treaty. By what yardstick, by what justice, would they allow this stream of European Jewish immigrants to flow into the land whilst they, the British, were the Mandatory Power which was supposed to prepare the indigenous people of Palestine for ultimate independence?

156. That was the era between the two World Wars—1920 to 1939. Then Hitler came on the scene in the 1930s. We deplored his atrocities and what he did not only to the Jews, but to the Germans too, to Ukrainians, to Russians, to Czechs. Whom did this Hitler spare? I checked with various colleagues a few years ago as to the number of civilians who were killed as a result of Nazi aggression and I was told that there were about 15 to 20 million or so. Our hearts go out to those, including the Jews, who were sacrificed by the whirlwind of Nazism that swept over the populations regardless of their religion. The rich among the Zionists had left Germany—I happened to be in Western Europe at that time—and they encircled Germany: one day in Amsterdam, another day in Geneva, a third day in Rotterdam. And they held conferences: "We should strangle Hitler; buy no German goods"—when the Germans were living on ersatz. Of course their skins were safe, those wealthy Zionists. But who suffered inside Germany? The poor Jew, who had a small delicatessen, who was a cobbler, who was an artisan.

157. A friend of mine, an Ottoman prince, knew Hitler personally. And I am not talking from books; I can produce him here; he is now in Geneva, a refugee. He spoke German fluently—many of those Ottoman princes learned their German in Potsdam—and he said: that there were emissaries sent by none other than Hitler to the leaders of Zionism who were trying to bring him down. And he said: "I have a pawn in Germany, so many million Jews; they will suffer if you continue your campaign against Germany." Did they heed the warnings of Hitler? They should have known he was a tyrant, a monster. No, no; those whom Hitler asphyxiated in the ovens were equally the victims of those Zionist fanatics who did not counsel themselves with wisdom but who were frenzied by a dream of carving for themselves a home in the Holy Land.

158. This is the root of the matter. Ask me; I lived in that era. I happened to be in Western Europe. I am not talking from books.

159. Our hearts go out to all those who were sacrificed by Hitler, whether they were Jews or Gentiles. After all, the Jews are human beings and should have been treated like human beings. Throughout the ages, in some of the Western countries of Europe, the Jew was persecuted systematically. Has the Jew been persecuted in Arab lands throughout history? I challenge anyone from the Israeli delegation to produce historical documents about the systematic persecution of Jews by Arabs. As I have always said, we considered the Jews of our area as our brothers. How could we persecute our brothers? Who were the famous physicians of Spain, the scholars who carved a name for Arab culture and literature? Many of them were Jews. They spoke and wrote in Arabic.

160. And now who comes forth to defend zionism? A Western State; an incursion on our homeland by the erstwhile colonial Powers, and by new Powers drunk with power. Who are they? Who are they that are defending zionism today? Those selfsame Powers that persecuted the Jews.

161. Now, you might say that this is past history; we are living today. As we have been told time and again, Israel is here to stay. I ask those Western Powers which are promoting the welfare of Israel—and I will name the countries which were defeated at the hands of Hitler and nazism, neighbours to begin with; Denmark, France, Norway, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Holland. I do not have to tell you, look at the map; you know how Hitler forked his phalanxes all over Europe. There were Governments in exile; there were underground movements all over Europe. Did they give in? Did they say: "This is a fait accompli"? No, sir; it took a great Power, two great Powers such as Russia and the United States, to join all those invaded States of Europe to beat Hitler. If those two Powers had not joined in the war—and this reminds me of something very significant—would Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, France, Belgium have accepted the fait accompli? No; they would have been fighting until today, a guerrilla warfare, any kind of resistance.

162. Why should the Arabs—I am addressing you Western Powers who are abetting Israel aggression—accept a fait accompli? By what yardstick? I think that it was His Majesty King Hussein who asked today: Why the double standard? Why? Just because we are Asians? This is a war between West and East, and because nowadays the Asians and the Africans are weak, the wanton behaviour of the erstwhile colonial Powers is using the argument of the fait accompli.

163. The Arabs have been Arabs for 6,000 years. This is not what I desire, or what you, Mr. President, or any one of us desires; it is what the peoples of Asia and Africa aspire to; that they not be encroached upon is the thing that finally counts. And I am afraid of one thing. I am afraid that one day Africa and Asia will think that this is a racial war. Although I have reached an advanced age, I put it here on the record: that if the Western imperialist Powers do not mend their ways, it will not be safe for any Westerner, from Europe or from the Western Hemisphere, to set foot in either Asia or Africa—not because our respective Governments would want it so, but because the people will erupt like a volcano, and the lava of that volcano will burn up everyone in its path.

164. Do not fool with the peoples of Asia and Africa. They are like a dormant giant today. But if those peoples wake up, if the giant wakes up, they will tread down everything in front of them—and I hope I shall be dead by then. It may take some time, but it will come to pass. The psychology of the masses—la psychologie de la foule—this is what will solve the problem for the Asians and the Africans when their Governments have not the equipment to defend themselves.

165. This is an incursion of the West into Asia and Africa, and the politicians dress it up with humanitarianism. What business have the Western Zionists to establish a state in our midst? Just because they suffered at the hands of the Nazis? Believe me, I

know many Jews who are non-Zionists and who have wiped away their tears. They have found opportunity all over Europe, all over America and they are prospering. But those who keep up the crying, keep up the weeping, are the organized Zionists. They take as their motto: we shall continue to weep; we have wept for two thousand years; we shall go on weeping at the Wailing Wall.

166. Jews are human. They need opportunities, they need to live in peace. But how can there be peace, when the Arab peoples will not reconcile themselves to a colonial incursion into their midst?

167. I have said this before, but it bears repetition. The reason why the Zionists wanted to be in the Holy Land goes back to various factors, various arguments. First there is the historical argument, that at one time they were in the Holy Land. But those were not the Khazars, the Jews of Europe. The Oriental Jews, our brothers, were there. But it is on this premise, the historical argument, that Zionists say that because their alleged ancestors were there at one time, the land which they once conquered should be restored to them. Therefore, we have to remap the whole world of today: the Italians will claim Gaul as a province; the Red Indians on the reservations should claim Manhattan and other parts of the United States; and the Arabs should claim Spain, where they stayed for a few centuries. This would be a mad world if everybody used the historical argument, that because he was there at one time he should be there now too.

168. Then they accost us with the religious argument—and when I say "they" I mean the Zionists—and their sponsors use the same argument too. They tell us that this is a Holy Land for the Jews. Of course it is the Holy Land for the Jews. Likewise it is holy for the Christians and the Muslims. Furthermore, if we want to use the democratic yardstick in order to determine who should be there, I believe it would be the Christians, because they number a billion—although most of the Christians nowadays are Christians in name only; they go and worship the Prince of Peace on Sunday and, besides cutting other people's throats—Asians and Africans—they cut each other's throats on Monday. They have been doing it for years. They have retained the rituals and forgotten the spirit of their religion. I am afraid if the Muslims do not watch out, they will be the same, especially in the urban regions, where nationalism is replacing religion. But this is another argument.

169. So the religious argument does not hold water. There are a billion Christians and 600 million Muslims. But even the Christian nations are not saying they should have Jerusalem or the Holy Land because their number is greater than the number of any other religion which considers Palestine its Holy Land. Therefore why should the Jews do so—not 16 million Jews, but only a couple of million Zionists who happen to be a well-organized, well-knit, Western Jewish community, the Western Zionists—why should the Jews claim that they should have Palestine? "Oh," they say, "look—it is in the Bible. That is the prophecy, that this land will one day be a Jewish land". I asked in the Security Council, and I repeat the question before you here, since when has God given the power of attorney to any people in this fashion, to any people

like the erstwhile colonial Powers, to dispose of the land and issue a title deed to the Zionists?

170. This is a hoax. Nobody is fooled by this argument nowadays, not even the Jews. I know there are many wise Jews, and I thank God for the friendship I have with them and they have with me, non-Zionist Jews. The *Sunday Times* of London in a light manner yesterday quoted me as saying that I have many friends among the Jews. They forgot what I said about Western Zionism, I think they forgot on purpose to show that Baroody might be changing his mind or his tactics. We know this trick. They made me a millionaire, also, in print.

171. As His Majesty King Hussein mentioned today, the Zionists seem to have a genius for distorting the truth. Of course, being a Chief of State and a King, he carefully weighs his words. He stated what is tantamount to saying that propaganda is the art of distorting the truth either by dramatization or exaggeration, or even by the conspiracy of silence. This is what the Zionists have engaged in. From whom did they learn about the blitzkrieg? They learned it from those who victimized them, from none other than the Nazis. From whom did they learn about propaganda? From none other than the Nazis and Goebbels. Repeat, repeat and re-repeat. Mr. Eban comes here and repeats the same untenable arguments and thinks that by repetition world opinion will be swept off its feet to come to the rescue of that poor child, the pet child of the West, Israel.

172. The Arab people, fortunately or unfortunately, I do not know what to say, are there. Their land extends from Morocco to the confines of Iran. It is not what Baroody wants, not what King Faisal wants, not what King Hussein wants nor what any of the Chiefs of State want. It is what the people aspire for, and, unfortunately for the Zionists, they cannot accept a colonial incursion in their midst, a Western colonial incursion, just as the Western Powers themselves would not accept Nazi aggression.

173. Mr. Eban talks of co-existence. I do not have a prepared speech, as he does. Unlike his, my speeches are not made to order; the Zionists prepare their reply before they know what a person is going to say and they come and recite it to us. We know them by heart.

174. Why did not the Western Powers accept co-existence with the Nazis? Why should the Arabs accept co-existence with the Western colonial incursion in their midst. Does anyone of the Western Powers dare answer this question? No, they confuse the issue by all kinds of legal quibblings, dressing the whole issue in confusion to obscure the truth.

175. Mr. Eban and his Government stretch out their hands towards us and they want the Arabs to meet them by stretching out their hands towards them. Why did not Mr. Churchill stretch out his hands to Hitler, who sent Mr. Hess to the Hamilton estate during the war? Why did the late Franklin Roosevelt, when the Germans sent feelers for peace, demand the unconditional surrender of the German people, and why did Mr. Morgenthau even want to turn Germany into an agricultural country? But finally some wise American statesmen thought that would be too much to humour

Mr. Morgenthau, in spite of the Zionists in their midst, to turn Germany into an agricultural land. The German people had had that sad episode in their lives under Hitler, and it was a reaction to what they had suffered after Versailles. And, may God rest his soul in peace, Mr. Morgenthau's father, who was Ambassador to Turkey in 1917, remonstrated with his son, and this was a Jew, not to espouse Zionism but to be a good American, this self-same Mr. Morgenthau Jr. who proposed to Mr. Roosevelt—may God rest his soul in peace—that Germany should be turned into an agricultural land.

176. In this very same Assembly in 1956, when Israel was an aggressor, none other than my good friend Henry Cabot Lodge submitted a draft resolution, the purpose of which was to work out a settlement for the Palestine question. That was unexpected, of course. Mr. Cabot Lodge received instructions from his Government, and I, amongst others, reasoned with him. I said that it would mean that the Zionists would be reaping the fruit of their aggression if he meant that there should be a settlement, and when the United States felt at that time that it would be unwise to push such a draft resolution, they withdrew it.

177. Eleven years later, now in 1967, they want Israel to reap the fruit of aggression. They are proposing a general settlement. Suppose that Mr. Goldberg and I opt for peace. It is not what Mr. Goldberg wants, or what Baroody wants, it is not what our heads of State want, and we know that they are at one with the Arab people. It is what the Arab people want that counts.

178. I know that the Western Powers, conniving with Israel, think that they can plant in the midst of the Arab people a Government of their own persuasion—they do not call them puppets or marionettes—but it would not last.

179. Luckily for the Arab people, the Zionists will not last because the Western Powers will use them as puppets to protect foreign interests. I feel sorry for the innocent Jews upon whose sentiments the Zionists have played and I am afraid that one day they will be the victims of Zionism; I really feel sorry for them. Do not think that I am putting on an act because somebody thinks that Baroody tries to use rhetorical tricks. I give you my word that I am sorry and I will tell you why. I am sorry for even the Jews who are innocent—90 per cent of the Jews outside of Israel are non-Zionists and they are also the victims of Western communities because, after all, the attitude toward the Jew in the West has not changed. A friend of mine who used to be Deputy High Commissioner of India before there was an India and a Pakistan told me in 1935: "You know, my dear Baroody, there is nothing that wounds a person more than when powerful people strike at his dignity". There were clubs in India for the white man, for the British, but Europeans were permitted to enter. There were signs on the walls which the British have removed but which we will never forget. The signs said: "No Indians and dogs allowed". It does not pay to engage in such terminology but the attitude is still the same: "Who are those Asians, who are those Africans?" They do not dare to put it in that way because their economic interests would suffer. So let us keep our tongues to ourselves.

180. But the attitude has not changed very much. How do I know this? From the behaviour of the Western colonial Powers in our midst. They rationalize and they find excuses. Let them beware. If they want to have economic development and cultural exchanges with the East in the future, then sooner or later their commission agents behind all their enterprises will be prevented from setting foot in those countries—not by the Governments of those countries but by the people—if they fool with the dignity of the people; they cannot get away with it, no matter how smooth their tongues may be. Their attitude should change and there should be a change of heart.

181. I am talking to my friends, the people of Africa, just as I am talking to my fellow Asians. You know how much you have suffered. They want it that way, they want a Western incursion in our midst. That is my answer: Asia and Africa will rise as one and see to it that their dignity will not be wounded any longer.

182. Why should I take exception to that behaviour? They wound each other's dignity, and I will show you how far the Zionists can go, although they come from the West. I know, Mr. President, that you use French as your language. I should like you, Sir, to look at this cartoon from the New York Post. The correspondent of that newspaper told me that originally this cartoon was from the Washington Post. I should like you to look at it and to give it back to me. It is called "The New Grandeur". Look at the arrogance and the effrontery of the Zionists. Here we see pictured in this cartoon the illustrious Chief of State of a Western country, none other than de Gaulle, who liberated Algeria from the colonialists of his own country, the great man, de Gaulle, whom we all, regardless of whether we are Arabs or non-Arabs, respect for his courage, for his perspicacity and for his analysis of world affairs. He is pictured naked on his knees before an Arab dressed in Bedouin garb, to represent the Arab countries. That Arab has his hands on the faucet of an oil well and the General is on his knees drinking the Arab oil. The implication is simple and you do not have to stretch your imagination. That is how far the cohorts of the Zionists go. They do not know where to stop. There is an Arab proverb which states: "God has mercy only on those who know where to stop and who stop there". This does not apply to the Jews but to the Zionists. Mind you, there is always that distinction. This proverb does not apply to the Jews who are not Zionists.

183. So, lest you say, "Baroody might be imagining"—you all know that I do not fabricate anything, thank God. I am known for being outspoken. But lest you think that I am rambling with my imagination, with your permission I should like to refer my colleagues to the Sunday magazine of The New York Times of 25 June, which has an article entitled "Does R.F. Mean République Française or Rothschild Frères?" It concerns one Rothschild—the arch-Zionist—and his brother who flew to Israel. They make their money in France and have palaces in France, but they finance the Western Zionists against the Arab world. Both brothers took \$10 million with them to help the State of Israel. But that is nothing. If you wait, and indulge me, you will see the effrontery and the arrogance of those Western Zionists. That same article about the Rothschilds shows you what the designs of Zionism are

in our homeland. It is here in print. If I were in the Security Council I would have passed it around, but there are so many of you here in the Assembly that I cannot do it. You can take my word for it. Ask for that magazine if you wish to be assured, word for word, what this article states.

184. I quote:

"As soon as war broke out in the Middle East, Alain and his cousin Edmond boarded a plane for Tel Aviv as representatives of French Jewry, bearing with them a gift of \$4 million, part of a French fund-raising campaign with a \$10 million goal. The Rothschilds also sponsored a poll—you see, they are good French citizens, but they are sponsoring a poll—which showed that only 4 per cent of Frenchmen supported General de Gaulle's attitude of neutrality, and a full-page proclamation by political essayist Raymond Aron on the crisis."

185. No wonder this has been synchronized with the cartoon about de Gaulle. But this is not all; wait and thou shalt see. The article goes on to say:

"Now that Israel is in possession of the entire holy city of Jerusalem, Edmond"—meaning Edmond Rothschild—"foresees a tourist boom and wants to finance a luxury hotel and create sound and light spectacles such as those which have proved their popularity at Versailles, the Coliseum, and the pyramids. He is backing two other programs: One would allow Jews everywhere to adopt double nationality . . ."

Double nationality. You who have Jews amongst you, what would you think if Rothschild had his own way. Would a Dahomeyan Jew, for instance, be a loyal citizen if, at the same time, he declared that he is an Israeli? Would a Lebanese Jew still be a good Israeli? He does not know what he is doing, this Rothschild. He wants to give every Jew a double nationality. Think of that. Some of the Americans here—I know the Americans, I have lived amongst them for twenty-five years; many of them are unreasonable—will say: "Go kikes, go back to Israel; this is not your country", if a Jew opts for dual allegiance.

186. But this is not fair, because many of the American Jews are loyal American citizens and have the welfare of America at heart. But who can stop the hotheads amongst the Americans: "Get out, you Jews, you kikes. You have Israel, this is your homeland. We do not want a split loyalty. We only have the Old Glory, the flag, the Star-Spangled Banner. You cannot be loyal American citizens. Get out of here"—they will say.

187. I would be the saddest man on earth, because those Jews are good citizens of the United States. But whose victims would they be? They would be the victims of none other than the Rothschilds and that Zionist conspiracy. When will you wake up?

188. With your permission, Sir, I shall continue. The article says:

"He (meaning Rothschild) is backing two other programs; one would allow Jews everywhere to adopt double nationality; the other would invite the best Jewish minds to work in Israel for periods

of six months to five years, to lend their knowledge to the country's scientific and industrial development."

189. Many Jewish scientists are great physicists and chemists. They have attained fame, and rightly so, by their contribution to science. But Mr. Rothschild would be exposing them to being called spies, perhaps, for Israel. You see how fanatical those Zionists are. They are blinded. And I pity them.

190. Is this all? No. There is more in the same article. Look how fanatical and blind one is, to do things that should never be done. This part deals with another Rothschild, Maurice. Now, I have not read everything, because after all I have other things to cite here. But the article continues further:

"The same Maurice, self-appointed black sheep of the family, would invite titled ladies to dinner and throw diamond clips from Cartier"—and you have all heard of Cartier the jeweler—"on the floor, roaring with laughter as the countesses and duchesses scampered on all fours to retrieve them."

This is how the Zionists operate. They even try to corrupt the duchesses and the countesses of Western Europe. Why should they not do more than that to us? It says "on all fours". I do not know whether they showed their bottoms to retrieve some of the brooches of Rothschild, the champion of Zionism, and his brothers, who fly to Israel in order to see to it that Israel does not want.

191. And Mr. Eban has other cohorts. I have a quotation from The Reporter, an editorial. You will see that these Zionists are not respecters of persons. They can get away with murder; they can get away with countesses scampering to pick up Cartier's brooches. And they also touch our Secretary-General. Anyone who does something that does not harmonize with Mr. Eban or the wishes of Israel, is an arch enemy, even the Secretary-General. I am not going to quote what they wrote about the Secretary-General officially. But here are their cohorts, the people in their pay. Not necessarily only Zionists are in their pay, but gentiles are in their pay too, "l'argent fait tout". You know what Napoleon said: "Avec l'argent, on peut coucher avec une certaine reine. L'argent fait tout." I shall now quote from the editorial: "The United States Absence". All that the United States has done in support of Israel is not enough. They can push the United States into a war, those Zionists. Now I am quoting again from the editorial which appeared in The Reporter published on 5 June 1967, the day of the aggression—I think it is The Reporter:

"As to U Thant, poor man, we feel sorry for him. After so much blabbering about a Soviet-American collision course, he may be the one to bring it about. But let us forget about him. He does not count. He should never have counted. Only the President counts, and we are waiting"—

meaning the President of the United States.

192. They are giving a warning to President Johnson: You count. By implication, they say: If you do not do what we want, God help you. And only yesterday they engaged in manifestations. I am here; I watch things. Against whom were these demonstrations? Against

Mr. Johnson. Now they have forgotten their opposition to the Viet-Nam war, these self-same persons, and they are for involving this country in a global war for the sake of Israel.

193. When will you wake up, my brothers sitting around these tables? And I include amongst you my Western colleagues, because, after all, you are my brothers too. I am saying all this not with relish, but with pain and sadness, because if I see a Zionist in the street being bullied, in Arab tradition I will go and throw myself upon him to save him; it is in our Arab tradition. But that does not mean that we, the Arab people, should stand arms-folded and let the neo-colonialists—this Western Zionism—pounce upon us.

194. But the Zionists do not stop; they become more arrogant. Recent clippings prove what I say. I quote:

"Eye patches to Congress (Washington, June 21, Associated Press),

"Members of Congress are receiving in the mail black eye patches like the one worn by General Moshe Dayan, who led Israel's blitz of Arab nations. Enclosed with each patch is a card with the words 'Win in Viet-Nam'. The patches were made in Japan. The only clue to the unidentified donor is the Santa Ana, California postmark on the plain white envelopes."

195. They want to consider the young American men who are fighting in Viet-Nam, rightly or wrongly, as weaklings; or, if not weaklings, as lacking in the stature and resourcefulness of Mr. Moshe Dayan. This is no joke; this is the letter and spirit of what the Zionists declare. This is only a manifestation of what goes on. As we say in Arabic, God has mercy upon him who knows where to stop and stops thereat.

196. But they do not stop. Herzl's dream has become a nightmare to the Arabs, and a potential nightmare to the whole world if Zionism should unfortunately succeed in plunging this country into a third world war.

197. And Mr. Eban rejects with indignation statements from any source to the effect that Israel was the aggressor. It is a polite way of questioning the veracity of His Majesty King Hussein—whose speech reminds me of the Arabic proverb: The words of kings are the kings of words—King Hussein, who spoke with dignity, who had nothing to put over here in the Assembly, a gentleman—leave aside the fact that he is a king. Mr. Eban has the temerity to question the veracity of his statement.

198. We know what the Zionists from Western Europe have in mind. We do not have to look into a crystal ball; we judge them by their declarations. From the beginning, Herzl's dream was designed to create a national home for the Jews—for the in-gathering of all the Jews into that home. I do not know the number of Jews living in Herzl's time. We do know, however, that there are now between 16 million and 17 million Jews. I bet that 15 million or 13 million are happy citizens of the respective countries in which they live. The Zionists want to bring pressure on many of those Jews to come to Israel, which would mean if they do—and I doubt that they will, in great numbers—that they will flood into the Arab homeland, into that usurping State of Israel. That would mean further expansion—if

not by force of arms, then by economic exploitation if they thought they would be able to achieve their goal by attaining peace with the Arabs. They would economically exploit the gateway of Asia by having it maintain not only 16 million Jews but 32 million or more in the future.

199. I must tell the Zionists that this is like a dream of the devil trying to enter paradise. The Arab people will not allow that to happen. This explains why the Zionists have been bringing pressure on the Soviet Union to release its citizens of the Jewish faith: so that they would replenish Israel with more immigrants, knowing very well that only a trickle of Jews from Western Europe would find their way to Israel. And we Arabs should remain inert, arms-folded, in the face of such a danger. I leave it to you, Sir, and to my colleagues to ponder what is behind the recent aggression in Palestine, because the Zionists know that, in the long run, there may be no future for them if they do not now try by all means to conclude a peace treaty with the Arab countries, as a prelude to further expansion.

200. But it is not you or I, nor Mr. Goldberg or Mr. Johnson, nor anyone else, who decides this issue in the long run. It is the Arab people, who will either submit or resist. But knowing them as I do, they will keep resisting.

201. I wish Mr. Eban was here to listen to what I have to say, but in conclusion I should like to say simply the following: Knowing the West as I do, having lived in Western countries for the last forty years or so on and off, I know that one day, things may go wrong in any Western country, as they do in any other country of the world; and, believe me, I feel deeply concerned for many of the non-Zionist Jews—and they are in the majority—who might become the victims of Western communities which might make scapegoats of the innocent.

202. Do not think that this happened only in Germany. I do not wish to cite the many recurring incidents since the days of the Inquisition in which the Jew in Western Europe was the first victim to be terrorized, to be burned, to be maltreated by the populace just because his religion was different from that of the Western people in the barbaric age—those people who thought that, when God created them he had a special mold in which he formed them, and then the rest of the world had to be created by other means. Believe me, no one would be sorrier than I to know that such a thing might happen, and I hope I will not see the day when it might happen. But I hope that in their wisdom the majority of Jews all over the world will wake up and not allow the Zionists to play with their own destiny. Indeed, for one who has worked in the elaboration of human rights since the inception of human rights in the United Nations, there can be no darker picture than that in which someone should be made the scapegoat because something may have gone wrong, and that the victims should be sacrificed and innocent people massacred because of imaginary considerations.

203. They know no limit, these Western Zionists. It was reported to me here in Arabic that, the moment I began to speak, the national television networks were closed to me, in spite of the fact that when I first spoke in the Security Council I received over a

thousand registered letters, telegrams, long-distance messages, from the United States and Canada, Venezuela, Spain and England, a trickle from far-distant countries but mostly from the United States, approving my humanitarian stand towards the Jews and telling me that they better understood the Arab side of this question after I had spoken. Is it any wonder that those networks that are controlled by Zionists have cut me off the air? And none other than my friend Mr. Goldberg prides himself on this country's respecting dissident views, on this country's standing for freedom of information, on this country's being democratic. Of course, when he reads what I am saying he may say, "We have no influence over these networks, over these broadcasts, because these media are privately owned and we are for free enterprise." But how is it that whenever the representative of the United States speaks, all the radios all over the country carry what he says? These media are privately owned. Where is the sense of fairness? After all, the United States is the host country of the United Nations. We Arab States are underdeveloped in the field of disseminating information. So Zionists go to the extent of trying to shut us off the air so that we may not reach the public here or elsewhere as Western speakers do. Would you not call this discrimination, Mr. President?

204. Another point, we have received a dispatch from my part of the world saying that the Zionists' emblem has been hoisted on minarets of mosques. I spoke enough on this subject in two of my previous interventions, but you see how blinded the Zionists are. They do not know where to stop. "God has mercy upon those who know where to stop and stop there."^{5/} The Moslem world cannot be fooled. Six hundred million people will wake up, and I will be the saddest one should there be a day of reckoning, because it might mean a world war that will engulf all of us, Westerners and Easterners, Asians and Africans, the new hemisphere and other continents; for it seems that the Zionists are capable of pushing the host country into a world war. And what is happening in Jerusalem, the holy city of Christianity, of Islam, and of Judaism? I enumerated the three religions in the order of the number of their adherents. What is happening is that Jerusalem has been invaded by those Western Zionists, and this can be shown from one of those American weekly magazines, I believe it is Newsweek—dated 26 June. In 1925 I visited the Mosque of Omar. There was no British soldier in the court of the Mosque of Omar, no British soldier was allowed, nor did the mandatory Power ever allow soldiers to be garrisoned in the Mosque of Omar, not even if they were Moslems. And here the Mosque of Omar, the third most sacred shrine of Islam, has been desecrated by the military prowess of the usurper. Here is the magazine clipping for you to see.

205. It seems that the Israelis know in their innermost hearts that they are capable of playing the role of Samson by bringing down the edifice of the international community not only upon their heads but also upon the heads of mankind. You had better do what we want or mankind will become extinct, including us. This is the philosophy of intransigence behind Western

^{5/} Quoted in Arabic by the speaker.

zionism. No speeches by Mr. Eban or by Mr. Eshkol or by any other of their leaders can confuse the issue.

206. The peace of the world is at stake. Any peace without justice is a phony peace, an artificial peace. Peace by compulsion is not peace. The peace of the grave is not peace. If the Israelis still have a grain of wisdom in so far as survival is concerned, they will read the Book of Jeremiah—the Lamentations of Jeremiah in the Bible. Jeremiah, a great prophet, a Jewish prophet, warned them not to be arrogant and not to be so sure about winning a struggle against Nebuchadnezzar. This is part of the first Diaspora because the King of those days did not heed Jeremiah's warnings and admonitions. The Book of Jeremiah is one of the most touching episodes in the Bible.

207. When the Romans invaded our part of the world they tried to humour the Jews; they even set up a sort of autonomous Jewish State—of course under Roman suzerainty. But the Jews of those days were asking for more—and when I say Jews I do not mean just the common man, but the leaders. They went to excess in their demands and, unfortunately, the Romans brought down the Temple of Jerusalem. And if you want to know who built it, it was the Canaanites. the

cousins of the Jews, their brothers, ethnologically speaking, the Phoenicians. Canaanites were called Phoenicians by the Greeks. That beautiful Temple of Solomon was wrecked by the Romans because of the excesses and the incessant demands of misguided Jewish leaders of those days. We all have excesses and we all make mistakes, but one would think that by the twentieth century we should have learned a lesson from our past. But, unfortunately, we see the same pattern unfolding before our eyes. I am very solicitous about the fate of many Jews, who are our brothers, because they are being involved in this question, by political zionism, although they are innocent.

208. Who would keep on with that nightmare now—perhaps a dream for them but a nightmare to the Arabs, which might become the nightmare of all mankind?

209. May God the Almighty, the God of humanity, of Jew and Gentile, of Buddhism and Hinduism, the creator even of the atheist, may the God of us all remove the veil from their eyes, so that those Zionists, those Western Zionists, may see the righteous path, with other people, so that peace may prevail.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.