



**CONTENTS**

*Agenda item 5:*

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

Page

**President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ  
(Afghanistan).**

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

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

1. The PRESIDENT: Since our last meeting, on Friday afternoon, a matter has arisen on which I should like to give some clarification for the benefit of the Members of the Assembly.

2. Some Members may have read The New York Times of this morning, 3 July. On the first page there is a report concerning a postponement of the meeting scheduled for 11 o'clock this morning. In that report it is stated:

"The President of the Assembly, Abdul Rahman Pazhwak of Afghanistan, whose Government is one of the sponsors of the resolution, extended the deadline for submission of revisions until 8:30 tonight.

"It was also announced that Mr. Pazhwak had granted a request for postponement of the meeting tomorrow until mid-afternoon.

"Representatives of the Western Powers immediately challenged the postponement, asserting that Mr. Pazhwak had no right to override the unanimous decision of the Assembly on Friday to hold its next meeting Monday morning.

"...

"Later Mr. Pazhwak said the whole incident had been a misunderstanding. He explained that he had not intended that the Secretariat should announce officially that the morning session had been cancelled until he had concluded consultations with all groups."

3. I should like to make the following corrections: First, only one representative of the Western group had been in touch with me since Friday afternoon. I had a second contact with the same representative just a few minutes before 11 o'clock this morning—that is, after today's edition of The New York Times had been published. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that representatives of the Western group have challenged anything. Second, I have not made any statement to the Press explaining any situation.

4. I should also like to comment on the statement in the newspaper report that I had "extended the deadline for submission of revisions until 8:30 tonight". Of course, since I am reading from The New York Times of this morning, the word "tonight" means last night.

5. I should only like to say at this stage that my understanding is that time-limits for the submission of proposals and amendments apply to new proposals and amendments and not to revisions by authors of their own texts. I shall raise this point and put it to the Assembly later in my statement.

6. In the circumstances, my silence may be misinterpreted. Therefore, I should like to clarify the situation and give the Assembly a report on what really happened, which I think I owe to Members, in conformity with my practice of keeping them informed on all situations.

7. As Members are aware, at the end of the meeting on Friday afternoon, I made the following statement:

"In the consultations regarding a delay in voting on the various draft resolutions, it was understood that those who favoured such a delay had in mind, among other considerations, the fact that the time would be used in undertaking further consultations designed to achieve some fruitful results. Now that there will in fact be some additional time before the General Assembly comes to the moment of decision"—I repeat—"before the General Assembly comes to the moment of decision, I would appeal to all Members to bear in mind this objective of using that time for further consultations in order to arrive at some fruitful results." [1544th meeting, para. 46.]

8. I am grateful to the countries which responded to my appeal. As Members are aware, and as I was informed, the consultations started immediately on Friday evening, continued through Saturday and Sunday and are continuing this morning. The aim of these consultations, as I have been informed by the parties directly concerned, is reconciliation and the harmonization of the views of the Members of the Assembly.

9. One of the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries [A/L.522/Rev.2] called me and asked whether postponing the meeting scheduled for 11 o'clock this morning until 3 o'clock this afternoon could be considered, in order to give more time for consultations. I had a similar request from one of the sponsors of the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2]. I regarded those requests as coming from the parties directly concerned, because of their sponsorship of the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

10. I told the spokesmen of the non-aligned countries that I personally was willing to accede to their request, if there were no serious objections on the part of any section of the membership, because I myself had made an appeal for consultations to arrive at some fruitful result. I added that since it has always been my conviction that time should be given for consultations, I would make an appeal if any objection were raised.

11. In this connexion, I should like to add that, as Members are aware, the authors of draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.2 wished that draft resolution to be put to the vote not later than Friday. A postponement of the vote was requested by the Western Powers and the Latin American countries. My approach was the same in that case. I appealed to the non-aligned countries. They accepted my appeal and an agreement was reached. That is why I thanked those countries, in my statement at the end of the plenary meeting on Friday afternoon, "for the spirit of co-operation and understanding they have shown" [1544th meeting, para. 45].

12. Then, an objection was raised by a representative who does not consider himself one of the parties directly involved in this matter. My competence as President of the Assembly was challenged. I told that representative that I was acting as I have always acted, and shall always act, strictly within the limits of my competence. I said that if it was felt that my actions were not within my powers as President of the Assembly, any delegation was entitled at any time to challenge my actions, and it would be for the Assembly to decide.

13. Then I had a contact with another delegation in the Assembly, which I regarded—although it is not an author of any draft resolution—as representing one of the parties directly involved in the question before the Assembly. I should like to name that delegation. It is the delegation of Israel, and I spoke with the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations. He referred to the same matter and wanted to discuss the question with me. He did so in the diplomatic language and manner which are expected of all of us and I thank him for that. I thanked him on that day and I thanked him this morning before I opened this meeting. We ended our conversation in a pleasant manner, on the basis that all matters should be decided by the Assembly when we convened this meeting, as scheduled, in the morning. I see him here, and I hope that he will bear out what I have just said.

14. Since I have mentioned the delegation of Israel by name, I should like to say that I have made no contacts with any Arab delegations which, although directly involved in the question before the Assembly, are not authors of any draft resolution; neither was I approached by any of them. All those delegations with which I had contacts had requested those contacts themselves, and I, for my part, have not taken any initiative with any Member of the Assembly.

15. Now, I should like to repeat the last part of the statement which I made to the Assembly at the plenary meeting on Friday afternoon:

"Now that there will in fact be some additional time before the General Assembly comes to the moment of decision"—I deliberately used those

words, the "moment of decision" being the time when the Assembly takes a vote on any proposal—"I would appeal to all Members to bear in mind this objective of using that time for further consultations in order to arrive at some fruitful results." [*Ibid.*, para. 46.]

16. I would recall that at the 1544th plenary meeting, on Friday afternoon, 30 June, I suggested, and it was so decided, that the time-limit for submitting draft resolutions to the Assembly should be 12 o'clock on Saturday, 1 July, and the time-limit for submitting amendments should be 11 o'clock on Sunday, 2 July. After making that proposal, I made the statement—to which I have already alluded this morning—on the holding of further consultations in order to arrive at fruitful results.

17. It has always been my view—and this has been borne out by consistent practice—that a time-limit for proposals and amendments does not prevent the sponsors of such proposals and amendments from withdrawing them or revising them at any time before they have been put to the vote or have been amended by some other proposal; in that case the proposal itself no longer belongs to the sponsors; it belongs to the House. That this was my intention at the 1544th meeting emerges from the remarks I made about the opportunity being provided for further consultations so that fruitful results might be achieved.

18. If the sponsors of proposals and amendments were to be prevented from introducing revisions by reason of the time-limit for new proposals and amendments, no purpose would have been achieved by consultations. What was the purpose of consultations, if they were not to enable members to meet some point of view of their colleagues?

19. It is therefore, in all good faith, my understanding that it is still open to the sponsors of proposals and amendments already before the Assembly to revise those proposals and amendments if they see fit. The time-limit applies to new draft resolutions and new amendments. Of course, the Assembly can at any time decide otherwise. However, if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly accepts my interpretation.

*It was so agreed.*

20. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of Sweden in order that he may introduce draft resolution A/L.526 and Add.1.

21. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden): In the debate during this emergency special session, many references have been made to the suffering inflicted upon civilians as a result of the hostilities. The responsibility of the international community to bring humanitarian assistance to these unhappy people has been stressed again and again. You yourself, Mr. President, made a strong appeal on 26 June [1536th meeting]. The Secretary-General demonstrated his interest by issuing an appeal on 14 June, followed by his decision on 29 June<sup>1/</sup> to send a personal representative to the area in accordance with Security Council resolution 237 (1967).

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/8021, paragraph 6.

22. The Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East has been able to continue to a very large degree his activities, under difficult circumstances, with respect to persons coming within his mandate. He has also authorized, as far as possible, assistance to be given to other persons in the area who are at present displaced and who are in serious need. This is being done on an emergency basis and as a temporary measure.

23. The United Nations Children's Emergency Fund has allocated funds for assistance for women and children, and Red Cross organizations are also active in bringing relief to the needy. Many Governments have made special contributions to these various activities.

24. The draft resolution which I now have the honour to introduce, and which has been circulated in documents A/L.526 and Add.1, dated 1 July, is designed to put the full authority of the General Assembly behind the efforts to provide humanitarian assistance, without prejudice to any of the political aspects pertaining to the problem of refugees. The draft resolution contains an appeal to all Governments, as well as to organizations and individuals, to make special contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency and to other organizations. It commends the Commissioner-General for what he is doing for the refugees under his mandate, and it endorses his efforts to help other people also. It is designed to encourage co-operation between all the agencies concerned in order to make the total work more efficient.

25. The following Member countries are the original sponsors of the draft resolution: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sweden and Yugoslavia: to these have been added Canada and Singapore.

26. It is the earnest hope of the sponsors that the draft resolution will be adopted unanimously by the General Assembly. Such a vote would give concrete expression to the world-wide compassion that goes out to the innocent victims of the war. We respectfully ask you, Mr. President, to submit the draft resolution for approval to the General Assembly at the time which you find appropriate.

27. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Burundi, who wishes to make a statement.

28. Mr. NSANZE (Burundi) (translated from French): It is my high honour to submit, on behalf of the sponsors, the revised draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.2, which has been revised once again and is now A/L.522/Rev.3.

29. We have requested the floor at this point in the discussion for a number of reasons. In the first place, we could hardly fail to note the way in which the press and the broadcasting media have interpreted certain television interviews by playing up the role—you yourself, Mr. President, seemed to make this mistake originally—of certain countries which are sponsors of the draft resolution of which I speak. The fact is that all the sponsors of this draft resolution played an equal and active part in drafting it. That is why,

before going into the substance of the matter, I should like to call the Assembly's attention, on behalf of the sponsors, to the fact that the draft resolution must be regarded as the "resolution of the non-aligned countries", that is to say, as a draft resolution submitted jointly by eighteen delegations, most of which belong to the Afro-Asian group. In saying this I presume that the delegations whose role has been rather over-emphasized will agree to being placed on the same footing as the other sponsors. The Cambodian delegation has just requested to be included in the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3, which brings their number to eighteen.

30. The reason we decided to amend our draft resolution is that we realize that the United Nations faces a crucial problem and that all the Members of the Organization must resolve to make the largest possible contribution so that we may arrive at a final solution, a positive one we hope and trust, which will not be the outcome of the work of one delegation or group of delegations, but the fruits of the labour and the efforts of all Member States. We have agreed to make many concessions and in this way a number of changes, which I shall now explain, have been made in the draft resolution.

31. We have added a phrase to operative paragraph 4 so that it now runs as follows:

"Calls upon all States to render every assistance to the Secretary-General in the implementation of the present resolution in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

The addition begins with the words "in accordance with".

32. Another change has been made in paragraph 5, so that the paragraph now reads as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General to report urgently to the General Assembly and to the Security Council on compliance with the terms of the present resolution".

33. Lastly, paragraph 6, too, has been altered and now reads:

"Requests that the Security Council consider all aspects of the situation in the Middle East and seek peaceful ways and means for the solution of all problems—legal, political and humanitarian—through appropriate channels, guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular those contained in Articles 2 and 33".

34. We thought it our duty to agree to these concessions in order to arrive at a proper solution and to succeed in establishing that peace which we all desire. We have had many consultations with various delegations and groups of delegations in our search for a compromise which will, we hope, open the way to constructive and positive results.

35. In this connexion, I should like to pay a tribute here to those other groups and delegations which have sought in every way to help us to arrive at a draft resolution which would respond to the demands of the present situation.

36. The problem facing the United Nations, at once so acute and so complex, has of course various as-

pects, some of which are undeniably more urgent than others and thus demand a speedier solution. These aspects should therefore be given priority. We hope that all the Members of this Assembly, bearing in mind the applicability of the proposals made in the draft resolution and its extreme urgency, will give it the support it deserves.

37. The United Nations, which has already lived through a number of crises, will—we hope—be able to overcome this one also and is not, we trust, on the verge of breaking up. Some of the aspects of the problem we are now discussing cannot be completely settled today. We all know that it will take time. We therefore think that some of the questions which arise can be postponed to another time, when we have entered the next phase. On the other hand, the matter referred to in the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries (A/L.522/Rev.3) demands a speedy and appropriate solution. That is why, on behalf of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, I should like here to express the hope that even the delegations which had a hand in drafting other draft resolutions now before this Assembly will be willing, in a spirit of co-operation and in order to make their contribution, to amend their position in order to join with us in adopting an appropriate solution and thus safeguarding peace where it is now tottering and where the peoples with their hands outstretched to us are impatiently awaiting this solution. Our resolution must therefore be adopted by all the nations represented here so that it can be truly regarded as a resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

38. We hope, therefore, that all Member States will give us their support and, if the time-table allows, we are willing to welcome with the greatest pleasure all delegations that might wish to be associated with us as sponsors. We thank them in advance and shall be most grateful to them.

39. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes. May I remind Members that, if they wish to refer to more than one of the proposals, they may do so in one and the same intervention.

40. Mr. PEREZ GUERRERO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): I should like to describe briefly the position of the Venezuelan delegation on the subject before the General Assembly, in the light of the various draft resolutions which have been submitted.

41. The Venezuelan delegation has followed with close attention and interest the important general debate at this emergency special session of the General Assembly under your skilful and impartial direction, Mr. President. The topic debated—the crisis in the Middle East—does not yield in significance to any other item which has come before the General Assembly and it is the more significant in that it has come up several times in the past in circumstances critical and dangerous for world peace. Hence, the problem goes beyond the limits of the region of the disturbance, and Venezuela cannot, and does not wish to, any more than the other countries represented here, avoid its responsibility as a member of the international community to seek a solution, a responsibility which weighs particularly on the parties directly concerned.

42. Some countries—I refer to four permanent members of the Security Council—have a primary responsibility, in keeping with their major influence on international problems such as the one we are now discussing. If they could find common ground in their approach to the present situation, they could help towards peaceful developments, with the backing of all the other countries and the goodwill of the parties concerned, leading to a just and lasting peace in the region, where it is sorely needed.

43. The world is distressed and confused by the present situation of war, open or disguised, which is not only causing indescribable suffering for the regions directly involved—that in itself would be sufficient reason for calling for an end to the present state of affairs—but could easily spark off the nuclear holocaust we are trying to stave off—and let us hope to eliminate for ever—through so many other serious and praiseworthy efforts.

*Mr. Liatis (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

44. As far as concerns the problem of the Middle East, once again before the General Assembly in an acute form, the occupation by Israel of territories belonging to the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria—a situation which the Venezuelan delegation believes cannot be justified in any way—has certainly made it more difficult to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the many complex problems besetting that region. Yet we must not become discouraged in our search for a satisfactory solution.

45. Venezuela enjoys cordial relations with both Israel and the Arab States. We are linked to the latter by a long tradition, and share with them the consequences of the critical problem of underdevelopment—a basic factor underlying the situation in the Middle East and a problem which in our own case we are determined to solve, primarily by the efficient utilization of the product of our natural resources in an increasingly equitable manner. As regards Israel, Venezuela has from the outset recognized its right to exist, and therefore we can but hope that it will become a properly integrated part of the region, to whose prosperity it could undoubtedly contribute.

46. We have not the slightest doubt that if the obstacles to fruitful and lasting coexistence among the various countries of the region are to be eliminated thoroughly and realistically, the withdrawal of the Israel forces from the occupied foreign territories must start without further delay. No rights can be conferred by acts of violence; neither can any State be forced to negotiate under coercion.

47. On behalf of my delegation I must insist that there can be no accepting an act which, whatever name is given to it, is in fact nothing more or less than an attempt by Israel to annex the part of Jerusalem and its environs beyond Israel's borders. My country, like many others, would like to see an international régime for the city of Jerusalem, in whose Holy Places the revered tradition of three of the world's great religions converge. The Venezuelan delegation has held this hope ever since the question of Palestine was discussed at the United Nations twenty years ago, at the time when the new State of Israel was created, and it continues to do so.

48. It is equally important, if we wish to break through this vicious circle of recurrent violence in the region, that the Governments of all the States directly involved put aside their attitude of belligerency in so far as it involves the threat or the use of force. It is not for the Venezuelan delegation to pass judgement on the Governments directly affected by the crisis or to assign responsibilities. The causes, both remote and immediate, are many and complex, and they must be examined mainly with a view to solving once and for all each and every one of the problems whose persistence has given rise to the present inflammatory situation.

49. It will be the Security Council's task to help the parties to progress step-wise towards a solution. The effectiveness of the United Nations presence in the area has already been shown and warrants our gratitude and admiration; it should be re-established in the light of the demands imposed by this new and let us hope ultimate stage in the process which began two decades ago.

50. The contribution of Secretary-General U Thant, who has performed so many valuable services for the Organization, will be more indispensable than ever in the present circumstances, which call for the calmness, devotion and impartiality characteristic of him.

51. Another important problem is navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba. We trust that a basis can be established for keeping open the Straits of Tiran for the innocent passage of vessels to and from any of the ports on the Gulf, as a first step towards solving the many outstanding and interrelated problems. Ultimately, it is the coastal States that should deal with this matter, with the help of the United Nations.

52. It is also essential, as has been repeatedly stressed in this Assembly, to find a satisfactory solution for the problem of the refugees, which has become more acute with the recent tragic events. Heed will have to be paid to the resolutions already adopted by the General Assembly concerning this problem, the most distressing feature of which is the human picture it reveals.

53. In view of these various points, the Venezuelan delegation joined with the other Latin American States in preparing a draft resolution. This has many sponsors and is the result of a compromise, and it contains in our view the basic elements required for the initiation of a process which could lead to a final settlement of the issue. We are confident that if it is adopted it will help to eliminate the risk of violating the cease-fire, which was the first highly significant achievement of the Security Council. But it would mean that all Israel troops would have to be withdrawn promptly from the occupied territories, and any further confrontation of forces would have to be prevented by a United Nations presence. Venezuela shares the view that it is indispensable for the General Assembly, at this emergency special session to lay the groundwork and establish procedures which will enable all to work together in order to attain the common goal sought both by the Middle East region and by the rest of the world—a just and lasting peace.

54. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): The General Assembly is now approaching the moment of decision, a decision

which many speakers in the general debate have described as a momentous one that will have far-reaching consequences, not only for the immediate question of war and peace in the area, but also for the future of the United Nations itself.

55. The central issue emerging from this debate is whether the military occupation of territories of Member States is to be permitted. It makes no difference whether that occupation is to be used as a means for bargaining or as a step towards eventual formal annexation.

56. The situation which confronts us today was not brought about by fortuitous circumstances, but resulted inevitably from a well-planned military operation with well-defined political, strategic and territorial objectives. This is no longer a matter of opinion or conjecture. The declarations of the Israeli leaders and, indeed, their action with regard to Jerusalem leave no room for doubt as to their real intentions.

57. A few days ago Mr. Eban, with supreme disregard for the intelligence of his audience, described [1541st meeting] this action in Jerusalem as tantamount to the extension of social and municipal amenities to the Arab population of Jerusalem. Social and municipal amenities indeed. This obfuscation is the kind of propaganda which we thought had disappeared with the late Mr. Goebbels. The annexation of Jerusalem is but the first probing step towards the annexation of the western bank, the Gaza Strip and other Arab territories. No doubt, as the annexation machinery for those territories is completed, Mr. Eban will come here and entertain us with some choice administrative phraseology suitable for that occasion. It is therefore clear that any decision which will allow Israel to maintain its occupation of Arab territories, under any guise and for whatever reason, is—to borrow a phrase often used in this debate—a prescription for war.

58. There can be no settlement, not even the beginning of a rational discussion of the underlying causes, before withdrawal is effected. The road to peace in the Near East lies in the non-partisan study of the merits of the case, in the objective appraisal of the contributing factors, in the rigorous self-examination of former policies, in a removal of the scales from certain eyes when observing Zionist action in the field—no matter how sweet the Zionist words and the intellectual ability to distinguish cause from effect, the symptom from the disease. All this must be done on the basis of a balanced and compassionate sense of justice, and not on the basis of glib explanations which, I am sure, any fair-minded person will repudiate with the scorn they deserve.

59. Therefore, the *sine qua non* of peace is the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories. Subsequent to that, the entire spectrum of underlying problems must be looked into in the light of the provisions of the Charter and of earlier United Nations resolutions. This should not be done on a selective basis whereby priority is given to the symptoms of the conflict instead of its causes. In this broad-based approach all details will fall into perspective and the proper matters will be accorded priority.

60. We have before us several draft resolutions. But let me hasten to say that Israel would like nothing more than to have the Assembly fail to take any decision or at most, adopt a vague and meaningless resolution which will not ensure the prompt withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories. It is clear that the United States Government, which now seems fully committed to the perpetuation of this occupation, is exerting all its considerable influence and effort in this direction. It opposed the convening of this emergency special session and now it wants to ensure the failure of the session so that Israel will be able to pursue without hindrance or interference its expansionist ambitions. For this reason it is necessary to avoid the pitfall of adopting a resolution full of loop-holes, one which will enable Israel to have the excuse it wants to procrastinate on withdrawal and to prolong its occupation. One way to do this is to insist that all outstanding questions have to be resolved and settled before withdrawal is completed. This approach conforms entirely with the policies of Israel and its plans.

61. Since the discussion of all these complex and varied questions is likely to take time and their settlement is not foreseeable in the immediate future, the linking of withdrawal to final and definite settlement of all issues will enable Israel inevitably to maintain its occupation, hoping that with the passage of time that occupation will be transformed into permanent annexation. This is no fanciful excursion into the future. It is solidly based on past experience. Let us not forget that 40 per cent of the territory which Israel controlled before 5 June was first occupied under the terms of a temporary cease-fire.

62. In the light of what I have said, my delegation will cast the following votes.

63. We shall vote in favour of the Albanian draft resolution [A/L.521], which states the case clearly and forcefully.

64. Similarly, we shall vote in favour of the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.519]. The Soviet draft resolution is practical. First things must come first. Withdrawal must be immediate and to behind the armistice lines. This clears the ground of the debris of war. It prevents blackmail and negotiation under duress. The draft resolution supports the existing United Nations presence in the area. It provides for an instrument for supervising compliance with the resolution. It allows for the participation of the world community in the solution of the crisis. Not only does it have a viable short-term perspective, but it also takes a longer view by suggesting modalities for reviewing the underlying causes of the problem on a non-arbitrary, non-discriminatory basis.

65. The United States draft resolution [A/L.520], on the other hand, can be dismissed at once as openly pro-Israel, designed to permit Israel to maintain its occupation of Arab territories with a view to their eventual annexation. It is that draft resolution, and not the others, which provides a "prescription for war", because a resolution such as that of the United States would give Israel the sanction of the General Assembly to keep the spoils of war and to prolong indefinitely its occupation of Arab territories. It would be tantamount to giving Israel all it has asked

for, allowing it to break the cease-fire at will—as it has done during this last weekend—in order to occupy even more Arab territory.

66. The eighteen-Power draft resolution [A/L.522/Rev.3] represents a compromise. Although it does not contain a clear condemnation of Israeli aggression, the draft has many positive and constructive features. The most important of these, of course, is that it calls upon Israel immediately to withdraw all its forces to the positions they occupied before 5 June. In its operative paragraph 6, it also requests the Security Council to consider all aspects of the situation and to seek a peaceful solution, guided by the Charter of the United Nations. This paragraph, with its wide range, should dispose of the objection and doubts expressed by some delegations regarding the situation which would prevail after withdrawal was completed: whether—to use a phrase often used in this debate—we would go back to hostilities or forward to peace. The answer is that we are going forward to a sober and exhaustive consideration of all aspects of the situation by the Security Council, the organ which is primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council, in the words of the draft resolution, would "seek peaceful ways and means for the solution of all problems" on the basis of the Charter, that is to say, on the basis of justice and equity. This is not going back to hostilities, as is alleged by Israel and its supporters; it is going forward to a meaningful effort by the highest body of the United Nations to deal soberly with all the problems in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

67. How can this possibly give offence to anyone, unless the aim is to allow Israel, under one pretext or another, to continue its occupation of Arab territories and to satisfy its oft-proclaimed territorial ambitions? To allow Israel to prolong its occupation is the shortest way back to hostilities; whereas the balanced and sensible approach of the eighteen-Power draft is now, in fact, the only way to ensure that there shall be no going back to hostilities but rather, as I said, that we shall go forward to a profound and meaningful consideration of the problem by this Organization through its highest organ entrusted with peace and security.

68. For all those reasons, we shall vote in favour of the eighteen-Power draft resolution.

69. I come finally to the Latin American draft resolution [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2]. We have confidence in the good faith of the Latin American countries. All Arab countries are proud of the links that we have with Latin America. For this reason we are saddened by our present inability to see eye to eye with the Latin American countries. We hope they will examine their draft resolution in the light of the following remarks.

70. The representative of Trinidad and Tobago, when he introduced the draft resolution on Friday [1544th meeting], gave us no explanation of it; he merely stated that it was an objective and fair draft. While I do not doubt for a minute the Latin American group's desire for objectivity, the fact remains that the draft is slanted on the side of Israel.

71. Why is this so? It is so because the draft resolution calls for withdrawal but implicitly makes with-

drawal contingent upon solution of certain specific, outstanding issues. In other words, it is not clear whether the Latin American draft resolution proposes that withdrawal should precede a settlement or that it should be part of a settlement. This ambiguity gives Israel an enormous advantage, in our opinion. All Israel has to do is make exorbitant demands which it knows beforehand the Arabs will not accept, and then, arming itself with that refusal, continue its occupation of Arab territories, gradually making changes, such as those it has already made in Jerusalem, with a view to the ultimate annexation of those territories.

72. I am sure the Latin American group does not wish to provide Israel with such excuses for prolonging its occupation of Arab lands, or to pave the way for their ultimate absorption. I hope that my Latin American friends will think about the consequences of such actions and whether it is possible for them to tolerate occupation of Arab lands. I ask them to think what havoc would be wrought in their own continent and the world over if the theory of territorial occupation were allowed to be used as a means to obtain political and territorial advantages.

73. Specifically, the Latin American draft resolution has a most striking feature: that is its logical inconsistency, if I may use that phrase. It rejects the validity of acquisition through force, but implicitly permits such a position to be exploited for territorial and other objectives. Moreover, the draft reflects a dangerous disregard for the existing United Nations machinery in the area by its scrupulous silence on the General Armistice Agreements. This compounds the fluidity of the situation, encouraging Israeli irredentist hopes and creating a supervisory vacuum in the area occupied by Israel. It is specific when discussing transit rights in so-called international waters, but becomes vague when discussing the rights of the Arab refugees. It fails to link the independence of States with their responsibilities, particularly Israel's responsibilities with regard to the Arab refugees and the numerous draft resolutions which have been adopted by the General Assembly since 1948.

74. My delegation will also vote in favour of the two proposed amendments to the eighteen-Power draft resolution, one submitted by Albania [A/L.524] and the other by Cuba [A/L.525].

75. We shall also vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan [A/L.527], regarding the illegal actions undertaken by Israel in its attempt to annex Jerusalem.

76. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): The present crisis in the Middle East is one which has given rise to the gravest concern on the part of all Member States of the United Nations. It is also one which, if not resolved satisfactorily and equitably to all parties directly concerned, could further heighten the tension and result in an explosion which might spread to other parts of the world. Such dire prospects surely should be sufficient to induce all nations, large or small, not to add fuel to the present inflammatory situation.

77. In this connexion, my delegation would like to pay special tribute to the Secretary-General for his untir-

ing and dedicated efforts in the cause of peace and stability in the region.

78. The Thai Government, as is known to all, strives to maintain close and cordial relations with all the countries directly involved. It is therefore a matter of great regret to us that those nations have become so entwined in the struggle. We, of course, recognize that under existing circumstances direct contacts between the contending parties are difficult. None the less, it is incumbent upon all of us, the disinterested parties, to help create conditions which may prove to be more conducive to long-standing peace and stability in the Middle East. This is our aim and objective, which I am sure is shared by all peace-loving nations.

79. On that basis, my delegation does not believe that mutual accusations, recriminations and condemnation would lead to a concrete and constructive solution of the problem, nor would they contribute to any reduction of tension in the area. Indeed, that practice would aggravate further the deep emotions and resentments which unhappily exist in the minds of the people in that part of the world. If any indictment had to be made, it should more appropriately be directed at those who, for ulterior motives and in a search for national gains, have allowed themselves to indulge in the exploitation of the ill feelings of the inhabitants in the region. These are devices used by some to inflame the passions of the people, and are indeed the main causes of the tension in the Middle East.

80. The Thai delegation has followed the general debate with close attention and feels obliged, in view of the approach I have just outlined, to state the following position:

(1) Troops should be withdrawn from occupied territories.

(2) In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the territorial integrity and political independence of any State must be respected.

(3) Every State has a right to exist as a free and secure national entity—free and secure from the threat or use of force, in whatever manner or form.

(4) The principle of the prohibition of war as a means of settling disputes should be scrupulously observed.

(5) Every effort must be made to arrive at a negotiated peace settlement which would be just, durable and acceptable to all parties directly concerned. This might be obtained by means of direct negotiations between the disputing parties or through mediation, conciliation or the good offices of a third party, or by any other peaceful means. As an interim measure, my delegation would be in favour of some kind of United Nations presence, either by the enlargement of existing machinery or by the establishment of new machinery.

(6) Arms shipments and supplies of military hardware to the countries in the region should be reduced to the minimum requirement of self-defence.

(7) The plight and misery of the refugees are matters of concern to all of us, and every assistance should be given to them.

(8) The suggested international status of the City of Jerusalem should be fully considered with a view to providing full and free access to the Holy Places.

81. Let me repeat that the principal objective of the Thai Government is to see long-lasting peace and stability prevail in the Middle East. In determining its position on various draft resolutions and amendments before the General Assembly, my delegation will be guided strictly by that objective, together with the eight points I have just stated.

82. Mr. BUDO (Albania) (translated from French): The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania expressed its views on the draft resolutions in documents A/L.519 and A/L.520 in its statement of 26 June (1535th meeting). We should like today to indicate briefly our position on certain other proposals submitted to the General Assembly since that time.

83. First and foremost, we find draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 completely unsatisfactory and we think that we have good reason for doubting the source and the true objectives of this resolution, despite the goodwill and the good intentions of many of its sponsors.

84. We believe that it is highly dangerous for the legitimate rights and vital interests of the Arab countries and those of all peace-loving and freedom-loving countries and peoples, as also for international peace and security and for the United Nations itself, for the General Assembly to bow to the will of the Governments of the two great Powers and to endorse what Johnson and Kosygin, in accordance with their own sinister purposes, decided together in their meeting at Glassboro.

85. It should be recalled in fact, that in essence, draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3 was announced to the public before the General Assembly even took note of it, at the press conference held by Kosygin on 25 June, immediately after his secret negotiations with Johnson. Such ways of going on, such plots concocted outside and without the knowledge of the General Assembly, are not only prejudicial to the cause defended by most of the Member States here but constitute a barefaced attempt to impugn the dignity of these States and one of the basic principles of the Charter, that of the sovereign equality of all Member States, great and small.

86. The peoples know full well that the leaders of these two great Powers follow an imperialist policy of world hegemony and of stifling revolutionary movements for national liberation and the safeguarding of sovereignty and independence. A final proof in this respect, as though one were necessary, is given to us by the statements of the leaders of these two great Powers immediately after their recent negotiations, in which they made it quite clear that they are determined to strengthen their relations and their recent understanding at the expense of peace-loving countries.

87. In particular they agreed not to allow this collusion to be impaired by events in the Middle East and other "local" wars, to use their term, such as the war in Viet-Nam and others. They have bargained together and agreed upon the methods and procedures to which they will have recourse in connexion with Israel's imperialist aggression against the Arab

countries, including the employment of the Security Council and provisions of the kind in draft resolution A/L.522/Rev.3, all at the expense of the legitimate rights and vital interests of the Arab countries and peoples and in favour of the Israel aggressors.

88. In the opinion of the Albanian delegation, the draft resolution submitted by the representative of "non-aligned" Yugoslavia (A/L.522/Rev.3) has a number of defects and some deplorable references. We may mention as an example the provisions of paragraph 6 designed to transfer the problem which we are examining to the Security Council, and the references to Article 2 and 33 of the Charter. Such provisions inevitably raise doubts concerning the true motives of their sponsors, bearing in mind the attempts of certain Powers to permit Israel to realize its ambitions by creating for it favourable conditions which would allow it to impose its will on the Arab countries which are the victims of its aggression.

89. In a desire to include in the draft resolution at least some condemnation of Israel's aggression, the Albanian delegation proposed an amendment (A/L.524). Indeed, it seems to us inconceivable and contrary to all logic and to the principles of justice to separate the request for the withdrawal of the attacking forces which is in the draft resolution, from the condemnation of the aggression itself. We cannot pass over in silence the treacherous attack on the Arab countries, and it should at least be demonstrated to present and future attackers that aggression cannot be tolerated in any way. The Albanian delegation hopes, therefore, that a great majority of Member States will support its amendment.

90. Draft resolution A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2 is unacceptable to us, chiefly because not only does it not condemn the aggression but it tends to place the aggressor and the victims of the aggression on the same footing and to acknowledge the advantages which Israel has acquired through armed aggression, in violation of the sovereign rights of the Arab countries.

91. In its statement of 26 June, the Albanian delegation made its views clear on Israel's imperialist aggression against the Arab countries and at the same time submitted a draft resolution (A/L.521) on the provision that the General Assembly should adopt in the face of the grave situation created in the Middle East by this aggression. Our views, as regards both the aggression and the steps which the United Nations should take to restore the status quo ante, are unchanged. We therefore wish the General Assembly to vote on our draft resolution and we express the hope that Member States attached to the fundamental principles of the Charter will support this draft resolution, which provides the indispensable minimum of measures which the General Assembly must adopt at this point.

92. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): The position of Uruguay was made absolutely clear during the general debate by our Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Héctor Luisi [A/PV.1543]. In the view of my Government, the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American group [A/L.523 and Add.1 and 2] is the one that most closely, and with the greatest sense of justice and balance, reflects the various aspects of this difficult, complex and overwhelming



problem of the Middle East. We shall therefore vote in favour of the solution put forward by twenty Latin American countries.

93. The Government of Uruguay feels, however, that while this draft resolution contains the idea that the legal existence of all the States involved in the conflict should be recognized—I refer to operative paragraph 1 (b) and the end of operative paragraph 3—an express provision to that effect should have been included. On the understanding that the Uruguayan vote reaffirms that inference from the text of the draft resolution, my delegation will vote in favour of it.

94. My Government would have preferred the text we put before the Latin American group, couched as follows: it provided that in operative paragraph 1 (b), after the words "to end the state of belligerency", the rest of the sentence would be replaced by the following:

"... and to recognize the irrevocability of their existence as sovereign States and the right of all nations, large or small, to survive free from aggression, whether overt or covert, and free from

intimidation, whether real or potential, and of the principle that territorial conquest by force never confers rights or establishes better bargaining positions."

95. But because of the short time available before the Latin American draft resolution had to be introduced, my Government decided to support the version submitted by the Latin American countries to the General Assembly. The reasons given for Uruguay's intention to vote in favour of this draft resolution explain its opposition to any other draft resolutions which might stand in the way of the solution we believe to be the most viable and constructive in present circumstances. Nor could my delegation support, in the event of separate voting, paragraphs containing principles embodying dogmatic views, since to admit them in isolation and piecemeal would not be in keeping with the interpretation which my Government wishes to emphasize within the general juridical and political context of the Middle East.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*