

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**1891st
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 30 October 1970,
at 10.40 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 22:

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*) 1

President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).

AGENDA ITEM 22

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

1. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Once again the General Assembly meets to debate the Middle East crisis. This year, 1970, marks the fourth year of Israel's occupation of territories of three States Members of the United Nations. Many debates and discussions have been held on this problem and many resolutions adopted, only to be shelved later. The debate this year should be particularly significant for a variety of reasons—mainly because it comes at a time when many Member States have the chance to ascertain the facts, assess the situation and acquaint themselves with Israeli intentions.

2. During the last three years, Israeli illegal and arbitrary measures of razing villages and quarters of cities to the ground, confiscation of property, annexation and expulsion of families and inhabitants, and the increase in Jewish immigration and settlements have constituted yet another development, in Israel's traditional policy of creating *faits accomplis* and confronting the world with them.

3. The world today will, we hope, in the spirit of the Charter, exercise its collective responsibility and show Israel that it will never tolerate such policies of *diktat*. During the last three years, Israel has been conducting an experiment to find out how many of its arbitrary actions the world will tolerate. The successive *faits accomplis* created through the use of force are the best and most obvious examples of this policy of *diktat*.

4. Jerusalem stands as the obvious example of such Israeli defiance. In 1967 the Israeli annexation of the Arab city of Jerusalem was carried out under the pretext of administrative unification. Then it became simply unification. Then Jerusalem was called an integral part of Israel, not negotiable, and never to be given up by Israel—contrary to the international will as expressed by the many General Assembly and Security Council resolutions concerning Jerusalem.

5. Israel's continued defiance was reported by George Wilson in *The International Herald Tribune* on 18 October—this month. His article was issued yesterday as an official document of the United Nations

[*see A/8141*]. Only yesterday the Arab Mayor of Jerusalem, now expelled to Amman, cabled his protest to you, Mr. President, and asked for immediate measures against Israel. We shall request the circulation of the cable as a United Nations document.¹ I understand that some members of the Security Council have received similar cables.

6. More drastically, Arab villages have simply disappeared and their people have been rendered homeless. They have been replaced by scores of Jewish settlements established on occupied Arab territories since 1967. Only three days ago, on 26 October, *Le Monde* reported that 80 Israeli families wanted to settle in Sharm El Sheikh and be the "first founders" of an Israeli city to be established in that Arab region.

7. That was the case in Al Khalil (Hebron), in the Syrian heights and along the River Jordan on the west bank. All these and other Israeli acts of lawlessness are in direct contravention of United Nations resolutions. They are in violation of the cease-fire resolutions which were explained on 12 June 1967 in the Security Council, without any objection, to mean "that the guns must be silenced and that the troop movements must be halted wherever they are". It was also emphasized that any attempt to gain legal and geographical advantages from the current situation must be deplored.

8. With these continued Israeli violations in mind, one wonders: does Israel have a divine right to discard decisions of the international community with impunity? Frankly, if we roll back the reel of events in the last 20 years or so, we find that Israel has drawn the conclusion that the use of force pays huge dividends. It seems that Israel, counting on the lack of United Nations action, has found out it has no reason to abandon this policy. The time has come for the nations of the world to stand against such policies. To cover up its aggressive actions, Israel has resorted to political deceit, centred on the themes of "direct negotiations" and "security". On direct negotiations, Bertrand Russell had this to say, only one day before his death:

"For over 20 years Israel has expanded by force of arms. After every stage in this expansion Israel has suggested 'negotiations'. This is the traditional role of the imperial Power, because it wishes to consolidate with the least difficulty what it has taken already by violence. Every new conquest becomes the new basis of the proposed negotiation which ignores the injustices of the previous aggression."

9. Under the pretext of security Israel has gradually expanded to and absorbed Palestinian and other Arab

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/8145.

territories, arrogantly claiming that this expansion and absorption exist only in the minds and fantasies of the Arab individual. However, they are a historical reality. What is ironic is the fact that the successive waves of Israel's military conquest and occupation have not brought the security that Israel keeps talking about—simply because the seeds of conflict are carried and fostered by each successive conquest.

10. Count Bernadotte, in his book *To Jerusalem*,² warned the United Nations that this Israeli expansion would continue. Recently his Israeli assassins revealed that the United Nations mediator was “executed because he favoured the internationalization of Jerusalem and a reduction of Israel's boundaries beyond those laid down in the United Nations partition plan”. That was reported in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 11 September 1970.

11. Mr. Yost, in an article written before his appointment as Ambassador to the United Nations, in the *Atlantic Monthly* of January 1969, asked a very relevant question: “Can strategic boundaries and conventional military strength ensure permanent security for Israel?” One might ask, what and where are these secure boundaries? Or is it true that Israel, in the words of Senator Fulbright addressing the Senate on 23 August 1970, “can have no security at all until it has robbed its neighbours of all semblance of security”?

12. Indeed, it is not only the neighbours' security that is in danger, but the world's security, for Israel has been deliberately polarizing the conflict and drawing super-Powers into its arena. Therefore the challenge we are facing is very grave. Either the General Assembly charts the lawful path for peace or it abdicates its responsibilities. We have enough confidence that it will not choose the latter course, because Member States cannot afford it.

13. We are happy to see in draft resolution A/L.602 a special reference recognizing the rights of the Arab people of Palestine. In our search for peace, justice must be the basis, for we cannot have a final settlement unless it is a just one, and to have a just settlement in our area the rights of the people of Palestine should no longer be ignored.

14. It is in the interest of peace and in the interest of objectivity that we should define the problems and conflicts that are confronting us. The conflict between Israel and the Arab States is one thing, and the Palestine problem is another. Although both are interrelated, the first is a derivative of the second. The Palestinian people must have the right to determine their own destiny—political, economic, social or otherwise. Unless that is recognized, there will never be peace in our part of the world.

15. Jordan, in its efforts for a just peace, has lent its full co-operation to the mission of Mr. Jarring. It has co-operated with the big Powers in their search for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). It has

accepted its international obligations and undertakings, especially those passed by this Assembly and by the Security Council, only to find Israel arrogantly tearing them apart and abrogating them at will when they no longer serve its purposes. Resolutions are called one-sided when they demand that Israel follow the precepts of the Charter and when they seek the safeguarding of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

16. Mr. Eban said the day before yesterday: “In conditions of peace Israel's eastern neighbour would be an Arab State, a majority of whose population would be composed of Palestinian Arabs, and the majority of all the Palestinian Arabs would be citizens of that State.” [1888th meeting, para. 59].

17. A clearer statement, showing the real motives and the future ambitions of Israel, was made by General Weizman, the former Israeli Transport Minister, who said, according to *The Guardian* of 10 September 1970, that, in his opinion, the “time has arrived, as it is now the best time, to liquidate the Kingdom of Jordan”.

18. Those statements are partly intended to divert world attention from the real issue now before the Assembly, namely, the refusal of Israel to withdraw from occupied Arab territories and to resume its contacts with Ambassador Jarring. As part of that campaign, Mr. Eban said before this Assembly that the Arabs are responsible for violations of agreements. That statement is belied by another statement made by the very same Mr. Eban, in his introduction to a book by the first President of Israel, Chaim Weizman. He explained why Israel does not honour international agreements and United Nations obligations. Mr. Eban said openly and with no reservation whatsoever that:

“... the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine were no more than opportunities They, carried with them no inherent certainty of fulfilment. Everything”—that is, every single international instrument or United Nations decision or otherwise—“depended on whether they could be replaced by a geopolitical reality more substantial than themselves”.

19. That kind of respect for international agreements explains why every single United Nations instrument which does not serve Israeli designs has been completely defied by Israel, including the Protocol of Lausanne of 12 May 1949, by virtue of which Israel undertook to abide by the United Nations partition plan as the settlement, and the partition line as the secure border.

20. We all know that Ambassador Jarring has been trying to bring about the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). On the one hand Israel accepted this resolution, while on the other it put every conceivable obstacle in the way of its implementation. Many pretexts were used as a smoke-screen to cover up Israel's sinister designs. For many months the Israelis led Ambassador Jarring into a cruel exercise in futility. Later, this prompted the French delegation, in a sincere attempt to help the mission of Ambassador Jarring,

² Translated by J. Bulman, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.

to suggest convening the Big Four meetings. The meetings continued on different levels at different times and, unfortunately, with different political motivations. Again, for different reasons, obstacles were created, at times by the United States alone and at other times with the help of the United Kingdom. How ironic that this resolution 242 (1967) turned into exactly the opposite of the original equation: "two fo(u)r two" has become "two against two".

21. It does not need much imagination to see who worked hard for peace with justice. The United States asked that withdrawal should be coupled with some rectification or territorial adjustment. This undermines the very principle which the Security Council intended to protect, namely, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. We know very well that military supremacy cannot create new rights where none existed previously. An illegal act can produce no legal results and can lead to the acquisition of no right; there can be no fruits from aggression. Israel cannot dictate its conditions for withdrawal. I need not remind the Assembly of what happened when Hitler also became intoxicated by his victories. Where did his desire for expansion lead him? Not a single country, be it European, Soviet or African, accepted surrender as a solution. Where is Hitler now? Where are nazism and fascism? The Israelis should ponder that.

22. With all the talk about secure borders, one wonders whose security we should talk about. In all the discussions of the Big Four, neither the United States nor the United Kingdom saw fit to consider or discuss the security of the Palestine people. They wanted to forget that throughout the last 22 years the only security that has been threatened and violated has been that of the Palestinian people and of three Arab States. Moreover, the question of security is not a question of territorial expansion through force. We know very well that no change of border can bring security. Security can come only from peace, and genuine peace can stem only from justice and equity. Today's modern warfare makes geographical boundaries meaningless in terms of security. Even Ben Gurion, the father of Israel, could not help saying clearly, as reported in *The Jerusalem Post* of 5 October 1970, that: "There is no such thing as secure borders Those are empty words."

23. Thus, any attempt by Israel to rewrite resolution 242 (1967) to serve its piecemeal territorial expansion is unacceptable.

24. On this very point the United States, I regret to say, is playing a role not befitting a great Power having special responsibilities under the Charter. Is it not ironic that the United States finds itself standing alone? In separate declarations, all regional groups have emphasized and called for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories. Most recently at the conference held at Lusaka,³ all the non-aligned countries reiterated the impermissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and called for the immediate withdrawal of Israel

from all Arab territories occupied after 5 June 1967. Similar declarations have been made time and again by other groups of States on different occasions.

25. It is indeed unfortunate that the United States has manoeuvred itself into a position that has encouraged Israel to boycott Ambassador Jarring's talks. Now the United States has subjected itself to Israeli blackmail.

26. While, on the one hand, the United States offered what looked like a glimmer of hope in coming up with the so-called American initiative, we find, on the other hand, Israel deliberately and maliciously snuffing out the small candle in the sea of darkness that surrounds the prospects for peace. Now the United States finds itself in the unenviable position of having to bribe Israel with 500 million good United States dollars, together with Phantoms, Skyhawks, electronic and other equipment, so that Israel may return to Jarring's peace talks. At this price, solving every problem now pending before the United Nations can be a very costly proposition. The United States, and indeed the world at large, is not rich enough to be able to afford substituting appeasement for peace. Israel has thus made vacillation in the quest for peace a highly profitable business.

27. In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the United States statement yesterday [*1890th meeting*]. We were told that it would be extremely irresponsible for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution if it even interprets resolution 242 (1967). What does that mean? It means that the United States does not like either the decision taken by this Assembly to discuss the question or the almost unanimous decision to give it top priority. It means that the United States wants the Assembly to pass no judgement on Israel's continued aggression, occupation and violation. It means freezing the matter. What, in effect, the United States is telling us is: do what I want, or else your acts, whether under-taken by majority or unanimity, are irresponsible.

28. The question arises: where does the irresponsibility lie? Does it lie with the General Assembly, or with one Member, one single Member State that wants to impose its will on the Assembly?

29. I submit that the United States should stop and think of the consequences. Will not such an attitude on the part of the United States undermine all efforts for peace, including the mission of Ambassador Jarring itself? The mission of Ambassador Jarring was never intended to be a permanent sub-organ of the United Nations. If it has to continue, it has to make progress; and when the United States fails to help the mission of Ambassador Jarring and uses its moral, political and diplomatic weight—moral, political and diplomatic weight; I think those were the words of Mr. Justice Goldberg, who spoke before the Security Council when that very resolution 242 (1967) was adopted [*1382nd meeting*]. He promised the whole world that the United States would be using its moral, political and diplomatic weight to see to it that the resolution was implemented—when, I say, the United States fails to help the

³ Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 8 to 10 September 1970.

mission of Ambassador Jarring, it makes it even more imperative that the Assembly face up to its responsibility and take a stand befitting the prestige and dignity of this great body.

30. Mr. KUZAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): The twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly has as its motto "Peace, justice and progress", and as its principal theme, the strengthening of international security. Therefore, it is natural to emphasize the necessity of quelling existing conflicts, and of eliminating the crises and sources of tension that endanger world peace.

31. The conflict in the Middle East is from all standpoints an extremely dangerous one. It is dangerous because of the extent of the injustice and tribulations it imposes on the Arab peoples. It is dangerous because of the challenge it hurls at the fundamental principles governing international relations. It is dangerous because of its repercussions on the world situation. It is dangerous, finally, because of its particular acuteness at the present moment.

32. The examination of this question undertaken this year by the General Assembly should help, must help, to hasten a peaceful settlement of the conflict on the basis of the principles laid down by the Security Council in its resolution 242 (1967), of 22 November 1967.

33. From whichever angle we consider the conflict in the Middle East, independently of the rhetoric that may be used at one or another stage of the conflict, certain objective facts emerge.

34. There is, first of all, the territorial expansionism that has constantly characterized the policy of Israel towards its Arab neighbours. Nothing is more eloquent in this regard than to compare the map of Israel at the time of its creation with the map of the territories it occupies at present. And since we are speaking only of facts, we shall not mention the even more ambitious and dangerous plans of certain Israeli leaders, plans that have been recalled to us in the course of this debate.

35. Secondly, there is the continuing denial of the rights of the people of Palestine, the continuing tendency to dispossess them, and the 'Israelization' of non-Israeli territories. Suffice it to cite the great number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this matter and rejected by Israel.

36. Thirdly, there is the political decision to maintain the military superiority of Israel over the Arab countries—according to Israel, to ensure its defence. But the facts themselves indicate that the only reason behind it is to allow territorial expansion and the holding of successively conquered areas.

37. Fourthly, there is the unceasing propaganda seeking to depict Israel as a modern crusader of Western civilization in the Middle East, a kind of propaganda which, carried on on a world-wide scale, has long succeeded in sowing confusion but has finally been smashed by the evidence of facts.

38. Fifthly, there is the close integration of Israeli policy and its subordination to the traditional objectives of imperialism in the Middle East. In keeping with those objectives, Israel has sought to become, and in time has become, to a certain extent, a factor determining the policy of its protectors; a role which Israel would like to strengthen even further.

39. The aggression of 5 June 1967 intoxicated the Israeli leaders with feelings of strength and power. But in many countries, in many parts of the world, that aggression brought about an awakening; it called for a revision of opinion regarding the fundamental elements and responsibilities in the situation in the Middle East. At the same time, it led to a broadening awareness of the dangers of conflict. For the conflict in the Middle East bears not only on the situation of the countries directly involved but it affects the situation in other areas as well. The growing tension in the Mediterranean region is one of its consequences. The particular strategic and economic importance of that region is such that the conflict has increased the tension between East and West and in the world as a whole. That conflict continues to exercise a decidedly negative influence on the atmosphere within the United Nations and on the activities of our Organization. It still remains the most acute and pressing problem our Organization must face. The impotence of our Organization in solving this conflict—an impotence due to the stubborn arrogance of Israel—diminishes the prestige of this Organization.

40. The Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Riad, in his speech [*1884th meeting*] rightly stressed the threat to the fundamental principles of the Charter resulting, for the United Nations and its Member States, from Israel's attempt to legalize aggression as an instrument of policy, and its vain hope to force the world to accept, and to become accustomed to, the occupation of territories by force in violation of the United Nations Charter.

41. When we consider the situation in the Middle East, we concentrate on the political and humanitarian implications. This is only natural, since we speak of the future and the destiny of the despoiled Arab people, and because we speak of a conflict that endangers international peace and security.

42. A series of consequences of the conflict in the Middle East, however, escapes us—the effects of the conflicts on the economy of the Middle East and of the world itself, for one. May I dwell on this aspect of the problem for a moment as the representative of Uganda did yesterday [*1890th meeting*]. I shall take the same example: that of the closing of the Suez Canal—such an important means of communication for trade and transport between Europe and the western hemisphere and eastern Africa, Asia and Australia. Twenty more days are required now to deliver shipments from Europe to India. The cost of freight has also increased—a 15 to 20 per cent surcharge having been imposed by the regular shipping lines between Europe and South-East Asia. For certain countries this average freight increase has been 30 per cent. The

cost of the transport of oil, itself has also risen because of the closure of the Suez Canal and that alone has cost many countries up to \$500 million a year.

43. One of the countries suffering the consequences of this state of affairs is Poland and the other developing countries are also the first to face these difficulties. The increase in freight has also provoked a rise in the cost of many articles imported by these countries. Obviously, that must also affect the standard of living of many levels of society in those countries, with serious social consequences.

44. The closing of the Suez Canal has increased awareness that tonnage of merchant ships is wanting. To the problem of increased freights must also be added that of structural changes required in the building of new ships. The greatest shipbuilding yards are now building high tonnage ships and this phenomenon must have long-term consequences on the developing countries whose ports are not ready to receive such high-tonnage ships.

45. This, in a few words, shows the economic consequences of Israel's aggressive policy and, particularly, of the closing of the Suez Canal as a result of its aggression. Suffice it to show the price paid by all the countries of the world, and particularly by the developing countries whose economic interests are the most seriously undermined by such policies.

46. I agree with the representative of Uganda that only one region in the world derives any advantages from this situation, and that is southern Africa, the racial régime of South Africa and the Portuguese colonial Powers. The closing of the Suez Canal has made the ports of South Africa and of the Portuguese colonies into important ports of call. This strengthens the economic position of the racist régime in South Africa, its *apartheid* policy and the defiance it has hurled in the face of the United Nations and its resolutions.

47. Furthermore, in these last few months both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly we have discussed at great length the danger inherent in the declared intention of the new British Government to renew shipments of arms to South Africa. Is it not characteristic that the main argument adduced by the British Government to try to justify that policy is precisely the so-called need to protect the lines of communication around southern Africa?

48. The elimination of the conflict in the Middle East is, therefore, from the political as well as the economic points of view, not only in the interests of the peoples of the Middle East, but also in the interests of the international community. It is also a key problem for the prestige and authority of the United Nations.

49. It is basic, therefore, for the peoples of the Middle East, for the international community and for the United Nations, that a solution be found as soon as possible to this conflict, that the occupation of the Arab territories by the Israeli armed forces be ended and that peace be restored in the Middle East.

50. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) constitutes an over-all response to the global problem posed by the Middle East conflict. Poland and the great majority of Members of the United Nations are in favour of the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) as a whole. We consider that in that resolution lies the true basis for an over-all solution to the problem of peace and security in the Middle East. We therefore support any measure that will lead to the implementation of that resolution and, particularly, we support the mission of Ambassador Jarring which we would like to see resumed as soon as possible.

51. The statements made by the representative of the United Arab Republic a few days ago and by the representative of Jordan this morning, once again confirm the acceptance of resolution 242 (1967) as a whole by their countries. They are ready to implement that resolution and to co-operate with Ambassador Jarring in the fulfilment of his mission. They have also spoken in favour of the four-Power negotiations concerning a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East. Thus, the Arab countries have given every proof of their will to put an end to the conflict and achieve a peaceful and political solution.

52. Israel, on the other hand, has adopted and maintains a diametrically opposed stand. It maintains its reservations and its specific interpretations of resolution 242 (1967) which are tantamount to a rejection of that resolution. Israel has constantly torpedoed its implementation.

53. Israel is against the talks of the four Powers on Middle East problems. It insists on direct bilateral negotiations with the Arab countries in order to negotiate from a position of force and *diktat*. Israel obstinately opposes the efforts made by this Organization through Ambassador Jarring. For all those who have followed closely the events surrounding the decision of 7 August to renew the Jarring mission, there can be no doubt that what Israel sought, and what it continues to seek, is to nullify that mission before it starts studying the substance. One of the pretexts advanced by Israel concerns the alleged violation of the cease-fire by the United Arab Republic. Mr. Riad showed that that argument was fallacious. Furthermore, he stressed the right of the United Arab Republic to take all steps to ensure its defence, which we consider to be a natural and inalienable right of all peoples.

54. It is Israel that not only has continued its offensive military operations against the three Arab countries which it attacked in 1967, but has extended its operations to other Arab countries. The condemnations of acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon by the Security Council are too recent for us to dwell upon them at length.

55. Finally, it is Israel which carries out a policy that has been constantly denounced in the United Nations—particularly in the Commission on Human Rights—a policy of colonization of the occupied territories as well as exploitation of those territories, of which the representative of the Ukraine reminded us in his statement of 28 October [1888th meeting].

56. Let us not forget that Israel owes its existence as a State to the United Nations. In its application for admission of 29 November 1948,⁴ the provisional Government of Israel declared that the admission of Israel to the United Nations—which it termed to be an act of international justice towards the Jewish people—would contribute to stabilizing the situation in the Middle East and international peace as a whole. It also declared that the State of Israel unreservedly accepted the obligations flowing from the Charter of the United Nations and committed itself to respect them as soon as Israel became a Member of the United Nations.

57. The aggressive policy followed by the successive Governments of Israel, (and 29 October 1956 and 5 June 1967 are only the most strikingly enlightening dates), give proof of the value that Israel attaches to its commitments. It has also shown how Israel understood its obligations flowing from Article 2 of the Charter concerning non-resort to the use or the threat of the use of force either against the territorial integrity or the political independence of any State or to behave in any other way inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. That policy has become a source of tension and danger to international peace and security. In one word, it is a policy whose consequences constitute a threat to the most vital interests of the people and of the State of Israel itself, which are being placed in the position of enemies of all the Arab countries and of fomenters of conflicts on an international scale.

58. The responsibility of the ruling circles of the United States which encourage, aid and arm Israel is a heavy one since they thus give Israel the material basis for a policy of aggression and the diplomatic shield behind which Israel increasingly shelters.

59. The way to solve the conflict peacefully and to restore peace in the Middle East is pointed to by the resolution of the Security Council of 22 November 1967. That solution, first and foremost, calls for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied after the aggression of 1967. That is a basic condition without which the re-establishment of peace is impossible. We understand and fully share the attitude of the Arab countries that turn down any notion of annexation of the territories by Israel. That attitude is furthermore perfectly in keeping with the fundamental principles of the Charter and of international law—principles which we have solemnly reaffirmed in those documents that we adopted in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations.

60. Secondly, that solution calls for a just settlement of the problem of Palestine. The Arab people of Palestine as of all other countries possess the inalienable right to decide upon their own future and to live in their own homes. This includes a guarantee of the inviolability of frontiers, territorial integrity and the security of all countries of this region, including the Arab countries and Israel as well as the solution of all the other problems enumerated in that resolution.

⁴ *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Supplement for December 1948, document S/1093.*

61. Almost three months ago a new effort was started to implement resolution 242 (1967). Naturally the cease-fire provided for in that effort has never been an end in itself and it can in no way be used to consolidate the occupation of Arab territories by Israel nor to strengthen the offensive positions it has taken against the Arab countries. That would be the very negation of the letter of that initiative and of the declared intentions of its sponsors. It would also be a denial of resolution 242 (1967) on which it rests. What has always been at stake here is to do away with the barriers to the Jarring Mission and to undertake conversations in order to find a peaceful and just solution to the conflict.

62. The General Assembly has both the possibility and the duty clearly to indicate its stand on these problems. It must make sure that we do not again miss the chance of a peaceful and just settlement which is so important for international peace and security; it must act in favour of such a settlement, as is proposed by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.602.

63. The Polish delegation appeals to the Assembly to adopt such a position, which is the only one in keeping with its mission and the only one in keeping with the cause of peace, justice and progress.

64. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria): My delegation welcomes this opportunity to discuss the problem of the Middle East in the General Assembly at this time when the whole world is extremely anxious about the escalation of events in that area. We also welcome this debate because it follows so logically on our preoccupations of the past two weeks when, for the twenty-fifth anniversary commemorative session, we focused attention on the capability of this Organization to maintain international peace and security. That capacity is being put to an immediate acid test in the Middle East. I venture to say that all the hopes for the future of the United Nations embodied in the documents we solemnly adopted on 24 October will be put to the test by the result of this debate.

65. The situation in the Middle East encompasses three of the elements which were recognized by all as being vital for the maintenance of the world order for which the United Nations was created: the peaceful settlement of disputes, the non-acquisition of territory by war, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States. When, on 29 November 1947, this Organization, as then constituted, voted to create the State of Israel by partitioning Palestine [*resolution 181 (II)*], it sowed the seed of dissension in the area. That seed has since germinated and the bitter fruit is what the whole world is now reaping in terms of the threat to world peace. It is therefore incumbent on this Organization to find an immediate equitable solution to the problem which it has, inadvertently or otherwise, helped to create.

66. If the world has come to accept the State of Israel as a reality, Israel itself still has to find a way of peaceful coexistence with its neighbours. A country can live without friends but it cannot live without neighbours.

It is in this context that my delegation has often asserted that in the interests of Israel itself and in the interests of its neighbours as well a way of coexistence, based not on military might but on peace, has to be found.

67. As the leader of my delegation put it during his contribution to the debate on 16 October 1970: "... a solution based on the humiliation of one side by another cannot last. Statesmanship demands that negotiations between contending parties must aim at peace with honour for all" [*1869th meeting, para. 44*]. As a result of the June 1967 war, Israel occupied territories of some Arab States, Members of this Organization. It has since been impossible to persuade Israel to withdraw from those territories as a prelude to normalization of conditions in the area. Nigeria was a member of the Security Council in those difficult days of 1967 when the Security Council was charged with the task of finding an acceptable formula to secure peace. Nigeria was involved in the delicate and intricate negotiations out of which emerged resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. That resolution has since been considered by all parties as the blue print for the solution of the Middle East problem. Yet the resolution has remained unimplemented. This, in the view of my delegation, is a situation which should not be allowed to continue. The June 1967 war also increased the number of refugees who have become homeless and sometimes hopeless. The bitterness that this problem has engendered among the parties concerned has increased. The United Nations must accept the responsibility of rehabilitating those unfortunate people if peace is to return to that area.

68. My delegation's primary interest in this debate is to contribute towards the attainment of peace with honour. That is why it is my privilege formally to submit on behalf of the co-sponsors the draft resolution contained in document A/L.602. We believe that the draft resolution contains the vital ingredients for a solution to the problem. We also believe that the draft has been formulated in such a way as to make it acceptable to all those who genuinely—I emphasize genuinely—want peace to return to the Middle East. I dare say that all delegations in this Assembly are dedicated to the return of peace. I believe that I speak for the co-sponsors when I say that we desire to recall the now famous Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 as the basis of peaceful negotiation.

69. What are the ingredients which this draft resolution contains? First, it emphasizes the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes and non-acquisition of the territories of other States by force or war. Those territories which have been acquired by force should, in accordance with this principle, be returned. This is to us a necessary first step, if we are to make a beginning towards a solution.

70. Secondly, we have made reference to the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. This, in my view, does not require much elaboration. It is obvious that no settlement in the Middle East can last as long as the Palestinians continue to be reminded of the wrong that was done them in 1947.

71. Thirdly, the draft resolution has urged the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 in all its parts. I do not need to elaborate much on this either. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) has become perhaps the most quoted document of this Organization apart from the Charter. It made adequate provision in its operative paragraphs for a just and honourable solution, including the withdrawal of Israeli troops from territories occupied in 1967 and the guarantee of the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area.

72. Fourthly, the draft resolution also expresses full support for the efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative. In fact, the reactivation of Ambassador Jarring's mission just before the current session of the General Assembly raised hopes for the solution of this problem. Coupled with the cease-fire agreements, the preliminary steps which were taken to commence talks were greeted with relief throughout the world. Unfortunately, hopes have again been dashed and frustration has replaced optimism. The state of military preparedness in the Middle East of all sides in the conflict is so advanced that one shudders to contemplate the result of another round of fighting. That is why any attempt to stall peace efforts imposes a very great responsibility on those concerned. That is also why this Assembly, fully aware of the implications, cannot but insist that all sides should immediately resume their contact with Ambassador Jarring.

73. Finally, the draft resolution calls upon the Security Council to consider, if necessary—mark my emphasis on the phrase "if necessary"—taking steps under the relevant Articles of the Charter to ensure the implementation of its resolution. If we all agree that implementation of resolution 242 (1967) would bring peace to the Middle East, we cannot quarrel with the Security Council if it finds it necessary to take additional steps to implement that resolution. Permit me to repeat that my delegation upholds the right of all States in the Middle East to exist within recognized boundaries. We insist, however, that those boundaries should not be unilaterally extended at the expense of other countries. Otherwise insecurity and instability will be the order of the day. On attaining independence, my country established diplomatic and economic relations both with the Arab countries, to which Nigeria is attached by bonds of history and culture, and with Israel, whose existence we recognized as a fact. This continues to be our stand and we make no apologies for it. It should therefore be quite clear to all concerned that whatever effort we make, whatever advice we give, is just as sincere now as it was in 1967 when we played a role in the negotiations which led to the now famous Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

74. On behalf of all the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.602, I express the hope that the draft resolution will receive the unanimous support of the General Assembly. It is my submission that, contrary to the erroneous impression that has been created, the draft resolution neither adds to nor subtracts from the spirit and essence of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), but is consistent with it.

75. Mr. BITSIOS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Over three years have elapsed since, in this room, during the fifth emergency special session, my delegation had an opportunity of expressing the views of the Greek Government concerning the situation resulting from the Israeli-Arab war in the Middle East [1542nd meeting]. As a country which is near the zone of the conflict, we expressed our deep concern about the events of 1967 and our conviction that a speedy solution was required, based on the principles of the Charter which all the Members of the United Nations must respect and promote. This hope was dashed, and it is with ever greater apprehension that we have seen the perpetuation of a state of affairs created by war and the worsening of the situation. The resort to force in a climate of increasing emotion has led to ever greater dangers for peace and our security. Without an improvement in the situation resulting from the war, a lasting peace will never be possible.

76. This fact was well known to members of the Security Council when on 22 November 1967 they adopted resolution 242 (1967). This resolution laid the foundations of a just and equitable solution, as can be seen from the fact that none of the parties directly concerned opposed it formally. It continues to be the beacon guiding the United Nations in this question. It contains what all of us consider to be the main lines of the settlement, because two fundamental Principles of the Charter which guide our philosophy and our actions are contained in it: first, that the use of force neither can nor should bring about any advantages, nor legitimize any territorial acquisition; and, secondly, that every State has a right to live in conditions of peace within its boundaries, and is entitled to the recognition of its sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. A third factor must not be ignored: the future of the Palestinian people and their rehabilitation. For many years, my delegation was among those which consistently stated that a settlement of the question of the Palestine refugees was of fundamental importance for the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. Events have demonstrated the correctness of our position. Since we were not able to prevent, we must now cure. It is clear that the fate of the Palestinians cannot be forgotten in any settlement.

77. Those are the elements in which we placed our hope for some time, especially after the American proposals. We hope that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, in a new phase of his mission, would have been able to lead the parties, stage by stage and step by step, towards the agreement which will put an end to this tragedy which has lasted far too long.

78. Unfortunately, with every passing day and week, new elements appear in the problem, which obscure the basic facts of the case, making us forget the obviously important issues which must underlie any solution, and further delays and complications ensue. Speaking here on 14 October Mr. Palamas, Under-Secretary of State, said that factual situations resting on violence were precarious and that they constituted a danger for all [1865th meeting, para. 84].

79. Must I enumerate all the inconveniences and dangers of delays and hesitations? The time is no longer for oratorical jousts or recriminations. Our duty in this Assembly is to encourage the parties concerned to abandon any secondary considerations and to invite them to resume contact with the Secretary-General's Special Representative, who has already proved his impartiality, in order to seek with him the modalities of a solution in keeping with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). A prolongation of the cease-fire would contribute to the creation of a climate propitious for Ambassador Jarring's task.

80. The framework in which the parties to the conflict are invited to work out agreements that would lead to peace has been the subject of debate during long and patient deliberations, especially among the permanent members of the Security Council, as regards both the procedure and the substance of the question. All subsequent efforts by the Powers have led to nothing essentially new and they have had, each time, to come back to the machinery offered by the Secretary-General's Special Representative and Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

81. Agreement can always be reached within the United Nations around those two factors. This can be seen in the fact that quite recently, on 23 October, the Secretary-General conferred with the four Ministers for Foreign Affairs and apprised us of the fact that they had decided to deploy every effort to enable Ambassador Jarring to resume his mission as soon as possible, to seek formulas for continuing the cease-fire and to find a peaceful solution on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We do not think that a new formula can appear miraculously. We would be failing in our most fundamental obligation, therefore, as Members of the United Nations, if we abandoned this way, the only way open, for the conclusion of a just and lasting peace.

82. Those few considerations which my delegation wanted to present to this Assembly are inspired by our wish to see tranquillity and peace established in that sensitive area of the Eastern Mediterranean which is closely linked to our past and our future. In addition, they were formulated in the spirit which inspires our work and our aspirations during this anniversary session of the United Nations. A few days ago, by unanimous vote, we renewed our devotion to the principles which must govern relations among States in a community juridically organized, such as ours must be if we wish to survive. We recognized that in their relations States must accept the primacy of law and that only sustained and constructive efforts to reach a peaceful settlement of disputes can preserve the invaluable treasure of peace in law and justice.

83. Mr. MASMOUDI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): It was time that the General Assembly show renewed concern over the problems of the Middle East and to conduct this debate at Assembly level during the present session. My Government is very glad of this and I should like, from this rostrum and with your leave, Mr. President, to express Tunisia's thanks to

those who have promoted the debate and to those who are taking part in it.

84. The hopes, anxieties and attention of all are directed towards our work, our proposals, our plans, our resolutions and our amendments, we would not have earned this commemorative session, we would not have been worthy of the martyrs who have fallen in the Middle East in the service of the United Nations, from the late Count Bernadotte in 1948 to the ordinary soldiers recently entrusted with ensuring observance of the cease-fire if we did not study today the problems that beset that part of the world and expose it to endless confrontations and to war.

85. Until a short time ago the events of the Middle East were considered as some of the most important in the world. It would have been insensate for the General Assembly to have passed over them in silence; it would be even more unthinkable were it not to clarify those situations with its wisdom and its recommendations, recommendations which can only strengthen the authority of the Security Council and restore to its resolutions even greater weight, deeper understanding and a renewed interpretation, a just and true one, in keeping with the spirit and the letter of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

86. In a region where for more than one reason care must be exercised, we should advance slowly, walking with measured tread, rigorous in our analysis, with calm common sense, and unshakable serenity but mainly with a joint political will for peace, which must of necessity impel us to carry out a constant reassessment of the situation, highlight new facts and abstain from polemical debates or facile bids that only render futile our efforts, that feed the false quarrels that bog us down in procedure and make it more difficult to unravel the interests and straighten out the complications of the situation.

87. Unfortunately, the example does not come from above, from those who claim the monopoly of knowledge, ability and power. It is not healthy for the great Powers to make of the Middle East and of the Mediterranean a private field for their murderous competition. For some time their opposing interventions have aggravated the Middle East troubles to the point where they appear almost incurable.

88. If in our debates here our judgements were to be polarized by the rival Powers, it would mean that we were allowing ourselves to become resigned, forbidding ourselves all criticism, all judgement, all initiative; in other words, we would be allowing the giants of this world to lead us in future, for better or for worse, and we would be letting ourselves be taken over, as regards our actions both great and small, within the Organization and outside.

89. We recognize that the United States and the Soviet Union have particular responsibility for the affairs of the world, particularly when peace is threatened. It is because we admire those two Powers, it is because we have a healthy and just understanding

of their role and their international responsibilities, and it is because, without any doubt, we in Tunisia have been trained along the lines of the United Nations on the need for solidarity among peoples and men that we consider it extremely dangerous for the peace of the world that this tendency gained ground whereby the two great Powers tried to set up a kind of planetary council outside the United Nations.

90. If, after having lasted for 20 years, the League of Nations is today merely a dim memory, it was because the great Powers began to lose interest in it and started to meet outside its confines in order to deal with the problems of the world at the time. We believe that the United States and the Soviet Union better informed, better enlightened and ennobled by those directly concerned—great or small—and particularly by the countries of the third world, where there are still fresh reserves of spontaneity, of ardour and of creative imagination, would be better able to carry out their responsibilities and consolidate for their salvation and ours, the peaceful coexistence and the creative competitiveness of security and stability in progress and development.

91. But we know that in the Middle East there are many small States that are sometimes shattered, the prey of misery and sometimes of war, that there is at times disorder, and at times despair, hatred, bitterness: that very often feelings are heightened, but the Soviet Union and the United States should note all this and help us the better to solve our problems and to leave them behind and not contribute to making them more acute and, finally, find pretexts in them for their own confrontations and quarrels. But, unfortunately, the Middle East in its present state has become the battleground for selfish struggles of prestige and influence between the great Powers.

92. To feel that the Soviet Union derives advantages, if matters remain as they are in the Middle East so as better to establish its influence in the region, the better to justify its presence in the Mediterranean and the better to sell its weapons, would be a simplistic reduction of the matter, and only very partially in keeping with reality. In the conduct of the Soviet Union there are understanding and assistance, the significance of which we fully appreciate.

93. To feel, furthermore, that after having been the architect of the cease-fire, the United States is pleased now to reject it and is playing with war and fire for domestic reasons in order, we are told, to satisfy a hypothetical voting public would also be a simplistic assessment which would be only partially in keeping with reality. In the United States initiative there is a will and a generosity whose scope and significance we appreciate, but a summary logic, like the logic of those who work only with statistics, tends to make such will and generosity despotic.

94. We must warn everyone that this, perhaps, is the moment of mistaken pride, and the faults that the great may commit will be great in accordance with their own measure, colossal and murderous, and we, we would be the victims.

95. Let our methods and procedures not be scorned. Let nobody believe we are incapable of reason in the Middle East that we are deaf to solutions which seem logical, and let no one have the pride to feel that the solutions which appear logical can always succeed.

96. It is true that the approach to problems in the Middle East is often derailed and that plans seem disordered or impassioned, but the problems of this part of the world, as in the majority of the developing countries, tend to be matters of a deep-seated, impassioned nature, in which questions of dignity, pride and also generosity sometimes crowd one another and sometimes occur with what we might term pure spontaneity. Let us be humble enough to believe that many of the problems of the planet are passionate problems, but that, fortunately, the heart is still in the centre of man. Let us not believe that everything is organized and harmonized in accordance with the dictates of reason and the modern formulas and requirements of the computer.

97. It is true that in the state in which the Middle East finds itself today, the small countries may feel it safe and healthy to seek protectors to uphold them in their quarrels. It is true that the powerful countries today, the most powerful countries, always believe that they can extend their power even further by having protégés or clients. It is today obvious that when there are the slightest conflicts, the great Powers confront one another, bitterly assail one another, and threaten to make war through the small countries that stand between them.

98. We might say that some diabolical spirit, some occult enterprise, some omnipotent spectre is threatening the Middle East and is trying to pave the way to a horrible war between America and Russia, in which not only the Middle East but the Mediterranean area and Europe and part of Asia would be involved. I believe that this sort of diabolical organization has been given further life by Israel's refusal to apply reason and applies a dialectic of despair that drives some to the madness of hijacking civil planes and others to mortgage their efforts of development by devoting their budgets to arms, and yet others to use, or rather misuse, their weapons so that force will become the law and thus risk the disorganization of States in the legitimate desire to defend them and make them respected.

99. What the world knows now is that the problem of the Middle East is less one of coexistence between Jewish nationalists and Palestine nationalists under conditions to be defined than the tendencies of the Zionists to impose by weapons a new type of colonialism based upon religious and racial fanaticism desirous of exercising and ensuring their right to occupation and armed expansion. What the world has also noted in the light of the recent events that have just shaken the Middle East is the existence of the Palestinian people; is their collective will to exist as a nation in a homeland that will be its homeland, with secure and recognized frontiers. This fact has now become obvious to all. It is important because objectively it is a determining fact. It dictates any process that might lead to a just and durable solution of the problems of the Middle East.

100. To deny it would be to close one's eyes to the evidence and would lead to very grave errors of assessment. It is time for the United Nations to take note of it. It is just and fair to do so. I wish to pay a tribute to the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/L.602] submitted by the 18 African and Asian nations as well as Yugoslavia for having mentioned this in the draft resolution they have proposed to us. That the representative of the United States recognizes that fact here publicly is in keeping with the traditional realism of the great American leaders. What is less so is the embarrassment which he seems to show—and which appears to me to be exaggerated—in understanding the peaceful aims of the Palestinians. With respect to the questions which the representative of the United States asked concerning a valid spokesman, it is rather encouraging. History has taught us that one always begins by putting this type of question, which has become a classical question in the history of decolonization. May I merely say that those who wish to find a valid spokesman will find one. It is sufficient to create the objective conditions which will reassure the spokesman. In conditions of war, there are only warlike spokesmen, and in conditions of peace, the Palestinian spokesman—the one who, during the conflict, stood as the most intransigent, the most violent—will stand out for his maturity, lucidity, responsibility and realism. However, let us say that with respect to Tunisia, as our President Habib Bourguiba stated from this high rostrum on 20 May 1968 [1658th meeting], regardless of the solution to be sought and found for the Middle East, it cannot be conceived nor carried out except with the participation and the adherence of the most interested party, the Palestinian people.

101. In fact, we are confronted by two problems which superimposed add to the gravity of the situation in the Middle East and further reveal in a much more evident manner the unreasonable obstinacy of Israel in its desire for aggression and challenge.

102. On the one hand it is a question of the evacuation by Israel of all the territories belonging to the Arab countries Members of the United Nations which the Israeli troops conquered by the use of arms. This problem has grafted itself on and further complicated the main problem, which is the conflict between two nationalisms—the Jewish nationalism, which the United Nations imposed and implanted against the will of the Arabs, and the Palestinian nationalism on the soil of Palestine. It would be illusory to believe that the problems of the Middle East can be solved with the evacuation by Israel of all the territories which it conquered and occupied in 1967. To solve the substantive problem, the Palestinians must be taken out of the ghettos where they have been penned and condemned to the condition of refugees. They must be involved in a process of political responsibility and considered as full participants in this national conflict in which they are the most directly concerned.

103. Furthermore, it is high time for the Israelis so to behave as to allow of coexistence between Jews and Arabs, as it was and still is between Jews and

Arabs in Arab and Moslem States. They can only claim to have earned the right to that coexistence by "dezionizing" themselves, just as Germany made itself deserving of coexistence between the Germans and the European countries and the rest of the world by "denazifying" itself. We believe that those who helped the Germans to exorcise the demon of nazism could do the same service by helping the Jews to exorcise the demons of zionism. They would greatly contribute, enormously contribute, to assuring peace in the Middle East perhaps for generations to come. On the other hand, they would not contribute to a just and lasting solution of the problems of that region by applying that sacrosanct and dangerous principle of the balance of armed forces between the belligerent States. The best way gradually to organize an escalation of armaments is precisely by scrupulously respecting that rule which tends to make of the balance of armed forces a type of reward for armaments, which finally creates in the region a new type of cold war, all the more dangerous since it is nourished by the state of war among the small nations and threatens at any moment to explode and push the great Powers into a confrontation, after having gradually led them to the escalation of armaments.

104. At a time when the United States is taking a new initiative to revive the hope of peace in South-East Asia—an initiative which is worth what it is worth—at a time when the Soviet Union is undertaking a policy of détente and co-operation with Germany, France and the Benelux countries; at a time when a settlement on Berlin can be glimpsed; at a time when the plan for European security is giving rise to certain hopes and taking shape; at a time when all the efforts of the large and small Powers are converging to create understanding, *détente*, co-operation and the necessary solidarity for peace, it is not fair that those efforts are not, by priority, applied to one of the most heated regions, to one of the most sensitive regions of the world, that is, to the Middle East, which has deserved better treatment from mankind—to the Middle East where, in the past, the triple message of the one God called for peace and brotherhood among men.

105. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): In proposing a toast to Marshal Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Mr. Georges Pompidou, President of the French Republic, stated only a few days ago:

"At a time when we are celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the conflicts that still remain might at times cause us to have doubts about an institution which should reflect the world community. On the contrary, we are spurred thereby to greater efforts to see that the United Nations, in accordance with its mission and with due respect to the provisions of its Charter, appears to all as the special instrument to promote understanding among peoples."

Mr. Boyé (Senegal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

106. These words state exactly what our duty is in today's debate. Out of our deliberations must come

a stronger hope for a just and peaceful settlement; out of our deliberations must come the reactivation of negotiations which should triumph over the prospects of renewed fighting. In short, peace must be our sole concern. That is why we shall endeavour not to utter a word which would revive disagreements and resentment, which might hurt anyone's feelings or further deepen the rift between the two sides which it is our duty to seek to fill. That is also why we shall tackle every difficulty with calm, the calm just shown by our friend, Mr. Masmoudi, with calm, but directly. What is at stake in the Middle East demands that every one of us should assume his responsibilities squarely.

107. I should first like to place the debate in context. The Charter confers on the Security Council the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore, there can be no question of the Assembly's assuming the role of the Security Council or of going beyond or weakening a resolution of the Security Council on a matter with which it is still seized. It would undoubtedly have been more in accordance with the Charter, despite numerous precedents, if the Security Council had asked the General Assembly for its views. Although we have not been formally invited by the Council to place this item on our agenda, I do not, however, know of any Council member who opposed its being placed on our agenda at the time, if only because all the Members of our Organization are concerned by the dangers inherent in the Middle East situation. As the Ambassador of Turkey emphasized [*1886th meeting*], the whole moral strength of the General Assembly will have to be brought to bear in the exceptional vote that will be taken at the close of this debate, which is itself exceptional.

108. There is in this problem of the Middle East, so complex in its origins, so difficult because of the interests involved, so burning because of the passions it arouses, an important basic element and, in fact, a comforting one: it is the conviction shared by the very great majority of Members of this Assembly that any just and peaceful settlement must necessarily be based on the resolution adopted on 22 November 1967 by the Security Council [*242 (1967)*]. It is fortunate that three of the main protagonists—the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Israel—have publicly confirmed their acceptance of this resolution. Of course, people have indulged in interpretations of some of its provisions; of course, the Security Council may have too easily accepted, out of weariness, a wording that is not entirely identical in English, on the one hand, and in French, Spanish and Russian on the other. In diplomacy, ambiguities always have to be paid for and this one, unprecedented in the annals of the Council, has seriously impeded the patient search for a way to implement this resolution.

109. Without reopening a discussion with which the Members of this Assembly are familiar, let us merely recall that France's position has always been perfectly clear in this respect. In his explanation of vote, Mr. Bérard, then representative of France in the Security Council, stated:

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

“We were likewise gratified to hear the United Kingdom representative, stress the link between this paragraph of his resolution and the principle of inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force, and quote the words used last September by his Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the General Assembly.”⁵

110. Allow me also, since the English version has been mentioned at this rostrum, to quote from the commentary given in *The Times* of London of Saturday, 3 October 1970, by an eminent Englishman, Sir Harold Beeley:

“The Ambassador”—of Israel to London—“correctly points out that the resolution speaks of withdrawal from ‘territories’ and not from ‘the territories’ occupied by Israel. But I have never been able to understand the degree of satisfaction which the representatives and advocates of Israel seem to derive from this fact. The resolution does not call for withdrawal from ‘part of the territories’ or ‘some of the territories.’ It says, to quote the phrase in full, that there should be ‘withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict’. The intention is perfectly clear.

“Moreover, if the language used in the operative paragraphs of a resolution is ambiguous, the first place to look for an interpretation of its meaning is in the preamble of the resolution itself. And in this case we find the Security Council, in the preamble, ‘emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war’. This can only have been intended to cover all the occupied territories without exception.

“I agree, however, that the omission of the definite article in the operative paragraph was deliberate and that it has some significance. My personal view is that its effect is to leave the way open to some limited and agreed adjustment of the pre-war boundaries. But any such adjustment, if it is to be consistent with the evident intention of the Security Council, must take as its starting point the boundaries of May 1967, and not the situation created by subsequent military action.”⁶

We have never said otherwise. It is, moreover, quite evident that the Charter, signed by all the Members of the United Nations, prohibits the right of conquest.

111. And we are just as adamant on the other basic point, related to the first one, in resolution 242 (1967); that is:

“ . . . respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force”.

112. This means quite clearly, for all the States of the region, and consequently for Israel, the right to existence, recognition and security. This means that Israel’s neighbours should clearly and definitely commit themselves to live in peace with it, in secure and recognized boundaries, but which cannot, of course, be those of occupation or annexation.

113. Not the least of the paradoxes in this Middle East problem is that there is no disagreement on the principles of its settlement. Neither could there be. Every objective mind, every open mind, knows perfectly well that there are not several solutions, that there is only one, whatever the details, and that it will perforce come one day or another. As our friend, Lord Caradon—a man who played an important role in drafting the Security Council resolution—wrote recently:

“Only one question remains, the question whether the settlement can be achieved in peace or whether it will be reached only after terrible bloodshed and ghastly suffering of countless innocent people. In the end the result will be the same.”

114. Yes, no one has any doubt about the solution: peace and evacuation. These are paramount, but also there must be freedom of navigation for all, the setting up of demilitarized zones and, along the borders, the lasting presence of United Nations forces which could not be withdrawn except with the unanimous approval of the Security Council, so as to implement, according to a predetermined schedule, the measures which will mark the end of hostilities and, still more, will make it possible for peace to enter into men’s hearts and minds and become, so to speak, a way of life. Lastly, there must be a just settlement, especially for those whom we can no longer call just Palestinian refugees—who have the right to find homes again, to a stable existence and normal conditions of life and work, who have the right to dignity and the freedom to choose their fate.

115. Everyone realizes that to accomplish the various parts of a settlement much effort, patience, understanding, imagination and financial means are required, particularly as far as the refugees are concerned. But the goal is not out of our reach. We have been working on these problems for months in the four-Power concertation, and I can say that significant progress has been made, that there is among us considerable understanding and that every one of our partners has made very constructive proposals.

116. So what is it that is holding us back, at least temporarily? What is it that prevents us from drafting

⁵ *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Year, 1382nd meeting, paras 111 and 112.

⁶ Quoted in English by the speaker.

joint directives for the Special Representative? The same thing, it appears, that paralyzes Ambassador Jarring in the fulfilment of his mission, the same thing which still prevents resolution 242 (1967), three years after it was adopted, from being applied: the lack of determination to accept or to force acceptance of the recommendations of the Security Council.

117. Nobody wants to put restraints on anybody. Nobody wants to accept frankly, completely and in all its provisions the well-known resolution, with all its implications, and as on their own, the Arabs and Israelis will never, in the present state of affairs, reach a worth-while and lasting understanding; the present stagnation of the procedures for peace inevitably leads to a deterioration of the situation, with all the risks of escalation and new violence.

118. Therefore it is urgent for the United Nations to make its voice heard. It is on this particular point, the application of resolution 242 (1967) in all its provisions, that the moral pressure of our Assembly must be exerted, and, if need be, there must be a new action in the Security Council in the light of the lessons that we learned from the difficulties we met and from the vicissitudes of the recent United States initiative known as the Rogers plan.

119. Let us say right now that anyone who is acquainted with Secretary of State Rogers knows him to be a man of goodwill, sincerely devoted to peace, concerned with justice in the best tradition of great Americans, who are so numerous here and who are a matter of pride for this country.

120. Every initiative for peace deserves encouragement, and as soon as we were informed of the United States initiative, fragile though its bases seemed, we gave it our unreserved support, since it made it possible, in the same vein as the Security Council resolution, for Ambassador Jarring to resume his mission. What happened then? I do not wish to bring up again the history of this question, which has been dealt with at length from this rostrum in rather different lights. However, I think that, in the current impasse, we should, if we want to overcome it, learn the necessary lesson from it.

121. First, in addition to the resumption of the Jarring talks, the United States plan called for a resumption of the cease-fire with "standstill" arrangements, that is, a military status quo, or immobilization of arms, in a predetermined area.

122. Neither the Four nor the Security Council nor the United Nations have ever had to take cognizance of this cease-fire, of these arrangements which, we are told, have been violated, and that is deeply regrettable. Therein lies the basic error. A cease-fire, a halt of military preparations under the guarantee of the Four acting within the framework of the Security Council, would have had a completely different nature. Do not misunderstand me. Like all the delegations of this Assembly, I deplore any failure to fulfil commitments by whatever side. But it was an illusion, and it remains

an illusion, to believe that, in such an explosive situation, one country, or even two, however powerful, could offer a guarantee. What the fate of the United States plan and the cease-fire obviously prove is that, as our Minister for Foreign Affairs stressed before this Assembly [*1879th meeting*], the destiny of peace is not determined by one or two while the Member States of the United Nations are reduced to playing the roles of spectators in decisions in which they essentially would not take part. If one wishes to construct something solid, one must begin with a wider base.

123. Secondly, the same goes for what is called "confidence". We are told: "There were arrangements. They were violated. Confidence is destroyed. It must be re-established. This is an absolute prerequisite to any conversation, to any progress." Of course, it is desirable to re-establish, or rather to create, a minimum of confidence. But confidence is a subjective element. It is not confidence that creates negotiation. It is negotiation that creates confidence when each side is in a position to test the goodwill, the desire for peace, of the other side. How can one conceive of the occupied country having confidence in the occupier, or even of the occupier having confidence in the occupied? By nature, they are condemned to mistrust each other as long as a fair settlement guaranteed by other States is not reached through negotiation. Whence the need for an intermediary whose honesty and objectivity are recognized by all, Ambassador Jarring; whence the need for the Four to act, because of their special responsibilities, within the framework of the Security Council; and whence the need for a solution which, freely accepted by all the parties concerned, would be the guarantee of the United Nations. How can Israel, which owes the founding of its State to this same United Nations, reject a security which the superiority of arms, always transitory, cannot alone ensure?

124. An eminent professor has correctly written that the desire for absolute security is a factor of insecurity, for it represents a threat to all. This thought is perfectly applicable to the Middle East. The desire for absolute security would lead Israel to an unlimited expansion and thus to an endless war; the same desire would lead the Arabs to seek the destruction of Israel; there too, war would be endless with, in both cases, in addition to the anticipated suffering of the peoples, the risk of a general conflict. Both sides, therefore, must accept a peace whose wheels we must start turning today.

125. At the present time, this implies three steps, which our Secretary-General indicated in his statement following the dinner for the Foreign Ministers of the four permanent members of the Security Council: first, the earliest possible resumption of the Jarring mission; second, the extension of the cease-fire for a period to be determined; third the implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

126. It is in the light of those considerations that we shall take our stand on possible draft resolutions or amendments. We are quite prepared to hold talks with

the sponsors of the Afro-Asian draft resolution [A/L.602] in this connexion because what is important is that there be wide agreement to support the work for peace that has to be accomplished. It is in the light of those considerations that we shall measure the desire for peace of all sides. For what we seek is much more than the implementation of a Security Council resolution. What we want is for true peace to be established in the Middle East, in deed but also in spirit, and for all countries of that region to be able to coexist in harmony and devote themselves to the immense tasks of development which await them.

127. We believe that the current crisis—and in this it can be beneficial—offers Israel the unique opportunity of having its legitimacy recognized by its neighbours, offers the Arabs the unique opportunity of freeing their occupied territories and offers the Palestinians the unique opportunity of affirming their rights to existence and justice.

128. We beseech both sides, above and beyond their trials, to engage with us, with the United Nations, on the path of reconciliation and peace.

129. Mr. BUDO (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is again discussing the grave and tragic situation created in the Middle East by the Israeli imperialist aggression of 5 June 1967 against the Arab countries. This question returns to us after a period of three and a half years, during which nothing has been done to condemn and curb the fascist aggressors and to restore to the Arab peoples and States their sovereign rights over their territories occupied by the invader; we are holding this discussion at a time when the situation has become even more serious and dangerous because of the continued Zionist aggression and the criminal game being played by the two great imperialist Powers, the United States and the revisionist Soviet Union, which are mainly responsible for the present state of affairs in the Middle East.

130. The situation in the Middle East is among the most important and at the same time most characteristic problems of our time. It reflects both the policy of savage force being practised by imperialism and its instruments in many parts of the world and the impetuous spirit of popular resistance, of the revolutionary liberation movement of peoples, of the remarkable awakening of their awareness of their sacred and inalienable rights and their growing conviction concerning what must be done to gain their liberty and independence and to rid themselves once and for all of the scourge of imperialism and colonialism in all their forms. That problem is also one of those that best illustrates the inability of the United Nations, subject as it is to the nefarious influence of American imperialism and American-Soviet collusion, to carry out the essential tasks incumbent upon it under the Charter with regard to imperialism's policy of aggression and plunder, its barbarous aggressions and its monstrous crimes against mankind.

131. Israel—that fascist creation of imperialism and international zionism, supported by the United States

of America and encouraged by the counter-revolutionary policy of the Soviet revisionists and their collusion with the American imperialists, as well as by the fact that its aggressions against the Arab peoples and countries have gone unpunished—pursues with ever-growing temerity and arrogance its policy of aggression and expansion by force. Not only does Israel maintain its occupation of the Arab territories it invaded following the aggression of 5 June 1967, but, defying progressive world public opinion, the generally recognized principles and standards of international law as well the United Nations itself, it openly proclaims, without compunction, its determination to carry out its policy of war and expansion at the expense of the Arab countries.

132. During the time that has elapsed since the aggression of 5 June 1967, Israel, in accordance with its colonialist and racist designs, has used all means and continued without respite to apply its sinister plans. While using all available means to colonize the occupied territories, resorting, in particular, to the most ghastly terrorism and the expulsion of Arab citizens from their own homes, Israel has continued its threats, its provocations and its acts of aggression against the neighbouring Arab countries. With the planes provided it by the United States, it has unceasingly, bombed towns and villages of those countries, including the Palestinian refugee camps, causing loss of life among the civilian populations and considerable material damage, reducing entire towns and regions to rubble and destroying industrial complexes vital to those countries. In its attacks against the civilian populations, Israel, true to the criminal practices of its American masters, did not hesitate to use even napalm bombs.

133. While they are committing those acts of international banditry, the leaders of Tel Aviv take every opportunity to boast of their military power and to make threats against the Arab peoples and countries. In particular, they not only unambiguously state that they have no intention of withdrawing from the occupied Arab territories, but also that they will continue their expansionist policy in the future, aspiring even to invade entire Arab States and wipe them from the face of the map. The Israeli leaders have been very explicit on that point. Representatives of Arab countries have cited authentic excerpts from their statements in that sense, and I do not believe I need revert to that. Moreover, world public opinion is fully aware of it.

134. Thus Israel, through its leaders, has made perfectly clear its intention to consider as a fait accompli and final step, the annexation of the Arab territories invaded by force of arms. It has also arrogantly indicated its determination relentlessly to continue its policy of territorial expansion in complete disregard of those principles that must underlie international relations and of the obligations incumbent upon a Member of the United Nations under the terms of the Charter, not to speak of any international agreements that bear Israel's signature. Its only concern is to do everything, to resort to every possible means, to employ every sort of subterfuge and dilatory tactic, including a

renewal of the cease-fire, in order to gain time to consolidate its position in the occupied regions and prepare for new military adventures.

135. Of course if this takes place, it is because behind Israel there stands the United States of America acting in connivance with the revisionist Soviet Union. These two Powers are only concerned with the maintenance and strengthening of their imperialist positions in the area of the Middle East, a region rich in oil deposits and of great strategic importance to their criminal plans involving the Mediterranean basin, Africa, Asia and other regions.

136. In order to achieve their goals of domination in that region based on their bargaining over the division of spheres of influence, the American and Soviet imperialists, assisted by the Zionists, make every effort to divide the Arab peoples, to disarm them and to force them to surrender. Their immediate aim is to stifle the legitimate struggle of the valiant Palestinians, that are in the forefront of the Arab peoples in their struggle for liberation and which therefore are a redoubtable hurdle on the way of the achievement of the imperialist plans. At the same time, they endeavour to satisfy Israel, the imperialist watchdog in that region, by legalizing its aggression and rewarding it for it. The American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists are extremely frightened by the struggle of the peoples as a result of the experience they have gained up to now, in particular their experience with the heroic struggle of the Viet-Nameese people and of other peoples of Indo-China against the Yankee aggressors. These peoples have shown them that such a struggle can never be put down. Hence their redoubled efforts to stifle as quickly as possible, by all means and at any cost, the armed partisan struggle of the Palestinians, which is constantly spreading and growing stronger, and completely to eliminate the problem of Palestine. It is to those ends that the American-Soviet plan, called the Rogers Plan, is designed, as is also Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, likewise of American-Soviet devising and on which the Rogers Plan is based.

137. The American-Soviet plan and resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council are aimed at eliminating the Palestine question and rewarding Israel by recognizing its right to annex the territories invaded in the aggression of 5 June 1967 and by guaranteeing the existence of that fascist State that extends over Arab territories also conquered by aggression, and by granting to Israel other rights as well.

138. In the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Albania in this Assembly on 28 September, our delegation, in pointing out the objectives of the Rogers plan, specifically drew attention to the proposal of a cease-fire for 90 days, saying:

“ . . . the two ‘super-Powers’ want to use the new cease-fire to continue the manoeuvres and machinations which they have engaged in for the past three years in order once again to apply the tactics used by the imperialist Powers after the Israeli

aggression of 1948, with the aim of putting off forever the fulfilment of the sacred cause of the Arabs and thus making a *fait accompli* out of Israel’s new occupation of their territories.’ [1851st meeting, para. 57.]

139. We believe that the various pretexts recently invoked by Israel to justify its defiant attitude toward the legitimate claims of the Arab countries, the victims of the aggression of 5 June 1967, together with the insistence of the American and Soviet imperialists on a new extension of the cease-fire, fully confirm the validity of our point of view.

140. The aims of these two Powers are obvious and unmistakable. Far from wanting to see a just settlement of the problem, they are interested rather in prolonging as much as possible the grave situation obtaining in the Middle East; for it is in such a situation that they can find the pretexts they need to interfere in the internal affairs of the Arab States, to remain permanently the arbiters of the fate of those peoples, thus consolidating their imperialist interests in that region. To those ends, the two Powers very closely collaborate, even to the extent of sharing the roles. While the United States plays the role of gendarme and openly and by all means at its disposal supports Israel, the Soviet revisionists specialize in the roles of cheat and firemen in the liberation struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. In their demagogic declarations, the social-imperialists of Moscow depict themselves as friends of the Arab peoples, while in fact they hit them from behind and abandon them at the most difficult moments. Their treachery and perfidy know no bounds. Even when they supply various weapons to the Arab countries, they attach all sorts of conditions designed, above all, to keep them under their own control, and they constantly exercise all kinds of pressure on the Arab countries and peoples to get them to give up their legitimate struggle, at the same time hastening to give the appropriate assurances to their American partners in the private talks they have together. It is furthermore a well-known fact that, while the United States is ceaselessly providing all sorts of armaments to Israel and everything necessary for war, the revisionist Soviet Union follows a clear-cut line aimed at preventing the Arab countries from bringing their defensive capacity up to the level they need in facing their Zionist enemies, who are armed to the teeth.

141. To appreciate the ignominious and ferocious nature of the American-Soviet plot and the determination of those two imperialist Powers to stop at nothing in carrying it out, it is sufficient to recall the recent bloody events in Jordan, which were the work, above all, of these two Powers seeking, by fire and sword, to wipe out the heroic Palestinian fighters. The means employed in those days, the canons, tanks and aircraft, to exterminate the Palestinian liberation movement; the Palestinian patriots who fell under those weapons in their legitimate struggle for the liberation of their sacred country and the reconquest of their sovereign rights, trampled underfoot by Israel and its imperialist masters; the savage massacres of the Palestinian civilian population—all these atrocious facts have

revolted human conscience and unleashed a wave of profound indignation and resentment among all the Arab peoples and among all progressive peoples the world over.

142. These bloody events will remain among the most monstrous acts committed by the imperialists and they will be engraved on the memory of the Palestinian people who will never forgive the American imperialists and the Soviet socialist imperialists for those crimes.

143. Indeed, the two imperialist Powers by their very nature also have their contradictions in the Middle East and in the Mediterranean. When at a given time one of them realizes that the other has gained some advantage from these concerted plots, these contradictions become manifest. But, in the present circumstances, their joint interests and their collusion overcome these contradictions and particularly when it is a question of stifling the fight for the liberation of peoples—as is the case in the Middle East—they co-operate closely and act by common agreement.

144. The experience of the last three years has shown the Arabs clearly that Israel will never give up its aggressive policies and its plans for territorial expansion at the expense of the Arab States and that Israel will persevere along these lines in the future still enjoying the support of the United States of America and profiting from the American-Soviet collusion against the peoples. The Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples are by now well acquainted with the two great imperialist Powers. They know particularly that their egotistical and rapacious interests have nothing in common with the just struggle of the patriots to liberate their sacred lands and reconquer their sovereign rights, freedom and independence, which have been flouted by the Zionist aggressors and their imperialist protectors. They will never accept the Rogers Plan, or rather the American-Soviet plan, calling for their surrender. The Palestinian people and the other Arab nations rejected that plot, and the efforts of the American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists are doomed to failure. They are fully aware that so long as the problem of the Middle East is left in the hands of the United States of America and its revisionist Soviet partners, there can be no true and just solution to it. They are, therefore, resolved to take into their own hands the pursuit of their sacred cause and, joined in the struggle, to continue their armed fight until the very end, the final victory, knowing full well that they are not only fighting Israeli aggressors but also the two imperialist Powers which are principally responsible for the situation in the Middle East.

145. The peoples of the Arab countries will doubtless win a resounding victory since they are struggling for a just cause and enjoy the support of the progressive peoples of the entire world. Therefore, it is only a question of time. The people who fight in the ranks on the great anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist front represent the overwhelming majority of mankind, whereas the imperialists and revisionists and their cat-paws are only a handful of moth-eaten aggressors who

will be wiped out by overwhelming blows of the revolutionary liberation movement that is developing and expanding unceasingly all over the world.

146. The peaceful Members of this Organization must contribute effectively and with determination to the just struggle of the Arab peoples and countries, victims of the imperialist Israeli aggression. It is this that the principles of justice and equity dictate as well as the supreme interests of peace and security for peoples and sovereign States. Respect for the principles of territorial integrity and political independence of peoples and nations is an imperative requirement of the moment and meets the interests of peace and the security of each State. To take a stand today in favour of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Arab countries and peoples not only means fulfilling a duty towards them and towards international peace and security, it has also become, for any State adopting such a stand, a contribution to the defence of its own territorial integrity, its own sovereignty and its own independence.

147. Last week, peace-loving States and those which respect international security, in the course of the twenty-fifth commemorative session of the United Nations, reaffirmed their commitments to struggle with determination for the great cause of peoples, of freedom, of independence, of territorial and political integrity and self-determination. The situation in the Middle East is one of the gravest problems of the moment; it is directly linked to the cause of the peace and security of sovereign peoples and nations and it must be a touchstone in the determination of peaceful nations—which constitute a majority in this Organization—to contribute effectively to the victory of the Arab States and peoples in their just struggle and to the condemnation of the aggressors and their protectors and allies, thus making an effective contribution to the cause of justice, freedom and peace. During the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly in a draft resolution of 26 June 1967,⁷ Albania suggested the right ways to achieve these ends. Had the General Assembly at that time adopted our proposals and had a serious endeavour been made to ensure their application, the situation in the Middle East would have been entirely different, and, by the same token, this would have had a favourable effect on the Organization; it would have helped its authority and its commitments to the conduct incumbent upon it in order that it may fulfil the role conferred on it by the Charter and which meet the profound aspirations of peoples desirous of peace, freedom and progress. But, as we know, because of the constantly nefarious influence of the imperialist Powers on this Organization, our proposals were not adopted and the General Assembly proved itself unable to condemn the aggressors or to defend the victims of aggression, thus totally failing to perform its mission.

148. The delegation of Albania is always ready to support any measures to satisfy the needs and requirements of the sacred cause of the Arab people and

⁷ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/L.521.*

countries, the victims of Zionist-imperialist aggression. That is in keeping with the policy of the Leninist-Marxist principles of my Government and also with the sentiments of profound solidarity and friendship of the Albanian people towards the Arab peoples. We have upheld, and will in the future continue unreservedly to uphold, the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people and of other Arab brothers against the Zionist aggressors and against the American and Soviet imperialists who are principally responsible for the present situation in the Middle East.

149. To conclude, I shall limit myself in this matter to citing an extract from the statement made on 18 September 1970 by the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha:

“The Albanian people love the Arab peoples because they are our brothers and we are their friends

in times of joy as in times of troubles. In this period of revolutionary and liberation struggles, we are constantly at their side, we have helped them and will continue to help them by all means. We have confidence in the triumph of the just cause for which they are struggling, but to bring victory as soon as possible over the common enemy, the Arab people's unity must be strong as steel in this armed struggle Our Arab brothers will know how to keep the flag of national liberation flying against imperialists and Zionists; they will know how to bring to nothing the plans of the Soviet revisionists and all the provocations planned by the agencies of the Central Intelligence Agency which conspire against the struggle for liberation of the Palestinian people and of all the Arab peoples”.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.