

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Official Records



1534th  
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 23 June 1967,  
at 3 p.m.

FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

### Agenda item 5:

Page

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

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

## AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. Mr. FOCK (Chairman of the Hungarian Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government).<sup>1/</sup> The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic has instructed our delegation to co-operate with other delegations in seeking a peaceful solution to the tragic situation in the Middle East, fraught as it is with grave dangers. The letter of the Soviet Government requesting the convocation of this session rightly points to the substance of the problem before us: that the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States should be liquidated and Israeli troops should immediately be withdrawn behind the armistice lines.

2. The debate in the General Assembly thus far has also pointed to this as the main task, from which no marginal question of detail should divert our attention.

3. The fact that Arab territories are now occupied by Israel is in itself proof of a criminal attack. It is the duty of the United Nations and of all peace-loving forces in the world to liquidate the consequences of this act and to strive to create the conditions of a permanent and definitive solution.

4. It cannot be tolerated that the territorial integrity of Arab States that have emerged from a colonial status should be violated in complete disregard of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. It cannot be tolerated that the aggressor should enjoy the results of his aggression and dictate the terms of negotiations while still in possession of areas he has occupied by force.

5. The attitude of Israel and its supporters and the arguments they have advanced in the General Assembly debate make it clear that Israel is planning to start from the position of strength it holds by reason of its occupation of those territories. It is in this context that

we must seek a peaceful solution; and in the strained state of international relations existing today, still more strained as a result of the Israeli aggression, this search is, of course, no easy task. Dangerous manifestations observed elsewhere in international relations also have made it possible for Israel to commit its aggression.

6. Since the summer of 1963 when the last successful step towards disarmament was taken, various regions of the world have become scenes of the intensification of the aggressive activities of Western Powers, above all of the United States. In South-East Asia, the United States has for years been perpetrating an overt and shameless aggression against the heroic people of Viet-Nam and their defence of their country. Its cruel attacks are intensified daily, in contempt of every norm of international law and threatening the peace of the entire world. Almost every day, too, the United States commits some act of provocation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The United States has also claimed the right of unilateral intervention in Latin America, and has so intervened. In Africa, in addition to its notorious direct intervention in the Congo in 1964, it openly supports the reactionary régimes in power in the southern part of the continent.

7. The atmosphere created by these activities also prevents the settlement of pending issues in Europe. Proposals made by the socialist countries for a Europe free from military blocs, for denuclearized zones in Europe and for peaceful co-operation between the two German States have met with a favourable response among the peoples living in the western part of the continent. At the same time, the official policy which the United States and the United Kingdom enforce both inside and outside the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is aimed at further strengthening that aggressive military organization. Both Powers support the revanchist, expansionist policy of the militaristic circles of the Federal Republic of Germany which are more and more openly drifting towards fascism and which claim the right to have access to atomic weapons.

8. Israel has thus committed its aggression in an international setting characterized by the activities of its principal allies, activities hindering the improvement of the international situation and even contributing to its deterioration. There is no doubt that the policy of the United States in general and the atmosphere created by its war against Viet-Nam in particular have had a considerable influence on the determination and on the wanton criminal acts of Israel.

9. Another direct cause underlying the Israeli aggression is to be found in the political aims of the colonial-

<sup>1/</sup> Mr. Fock spoke in Hungarian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

ist Powers in the Middle East. I do not wish to enter into the details of the recent events, which are known to all of us. But one cannot overlook the direct connexion between the interests of certain Powers in the oil of the Middle East and the policy of Israel towards its neighbours. As is well known, for the last six months the Government of Syria, aided by other Arab States, has been engaged in a severe struggle to defend the national interests of the Syrian people against the oil monopolies. It was thus completely logical that from the beginning of this year Israel should put pressure first of all upon Syria. The Arab States responded to this provocative attitude of threats of open attack by cementing further their alliance with Syria. The Israeli threats were at every stage backed up by Israel's allies, and first of all by the United States. Economic and political pressure upon the Arab States, the demonstrative deployment of the United States Sixth Fleet in the eastern Mediterranean and the threats and show of strength against the United Arab Republic were an open encouragement for Israel to make the final preparations for its armed attack.

10. At the height of the tension, on 31 May, in spite of constant threats, the United Arab Republic made another attempt to find a peaceful solution. In its draft resolution submitted to the Security Council<sup>2/</sup> it proposed that the Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission resume its work within two weeks' time. In response to this, on 5 June, the extremist forces, gaining the upper hand in Israel and emboldened by the prospect of United States naval intervention, started their aggression.

11. The third factor of the Israeli aggression lies in the policies that the Governments of the State of Israel have pursued for many years.

12. The General Assembly admitted Israel to membership of the United Nations on 11 May 1949 [res. 273 (III)] during its third session. Progressive world opinion warned the leaders of the new State even then of the dangers they were exposed to by the forces of international reaction. It warned them that they might become exponents of the forces of imperialism and colonialism against the Arab peoples and against the States that had been liberated and were emerging from colonial status. The policy that the Governments of Israel have followed in the past nineteen years regrettably demonstrates that they have not tried to avoid the danger, but that they have knowingly accepted a part in the fight against the forces of progress. The successive acts of aggression of Israel against its neighbours and Israeli expansionism, which have been condemned in numerous resolutions of the Security Council, have envenomed the atmosphere in the Middle East. What should one call the policy which Israel enforces against the former refugees and the populations of the recently occupied Arab territories? Is this the same Israel which was created for the refugees persecuted by fascism?

13. It is very important, and especially so for Israel, to understand clearly and distinctly that the heinous crimes it has repeatedly committed against the Arab countries foster the opinion that Israel is not

a sovereign country but a willing tool of the colonialist Powers.

14. This emergency special session of the General Assembly met after the aggression had been perpetrated, and as a consequence of that aggression. It is taking place under circumstances in which Israel would like to reap the benefits of its aggression and when it holds foreign territories occupied in sharp contradiction of the rules of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It is in this context that we have to formulate properly what we mean by a peaceful solution.

15. The representatives of both Israel and the United States have spoken about lasting peace, harmony and co-operation. Even the title of the United States draft resolution speaks of creating a stable and lasting peace. The facts, however, speak differently.

16. Has the representative of Israel come to this place to help liquidate the consequences of the recent Israeli aggression?

17. The representative of Israel in his speech and in his reply indeed spoke about negotiations, but only on condition that Israeli troops do not first withdraw from the occupied areas. It is a characteristic feature of the adventurist policy of aggressors that they would like to make the issue of unlawfully occupied territories a bargaining point in negotiations. We have heard wanton statements made to the effect that a return to the situation that existed prior to 5 June—that is, before the seizure of foreign territories—is wholly unacceptable to Israel. In the statements by the representative of the State of Israel, ceaselessly repeating himself, we have heard about threats of a "new explosion" should the General Assembly take a stand in favour of the status quo. What is this if not the threat of a new criminal adventure?

18. As has happened so many times in the past, the United States has displayed a two-faced attitude here. On the one hand, in accordance with its policy pursued up until now, it has in fact supported the unlawful aspirations of Israel. On the other hand, however, it claims not to be responsible at all for everything that has happened thus far, as if it were entitled to act as an unprejudiced and neutral arbiter.

19. Although the attitude of the United States means that it is supporting the aggression, yet at this special session it has gone even beyond this. On the one hand, its draft resolution attaches strings to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied areas, although the restoration of the situation that existed before aggression is not made a consequence but a condition of a general settlement.

20. On the other hand, the fact that the draft resolution fails to condemn the act of aggression obscures the issue of responsibility and even encourages those responsible to enjoy the results of their aggression. Obviously this proposal does not lead to any solution; it is contrary to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

21. We have to draw the conclusion that any peaceful solution is essentially blocked by the attitude of Israel. Both in words and in deeds Israel has clearly demonstrated that it has not given up its aggressive

<sup>2/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7919.

political aims. Not only has Israel not surrendered the territories it has seized, but it also lays claim to part of them by the right of the aggressor.

22. Israel has no right to propose any settlement until it has withdrawn its forces from the areas it has occupied. Only after Israel has complied with this condition can there be any question of negotiations. To negotiate in a state of occupation and terror would be contrary to the very concept of negotiation. A peaceful solution is in the interests of mankind. The entire world is interested in a peaceful solution which would settle the conflict between the State of Israel and its neighbours for a long time to come.

23. What can the General Assembly do to create the conditions of peace in the Middle East region? First of all, in conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, it has to condemn the war of aggression and establish Israel's responsibility. We have to demand as a condition of settlement the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories. All of us who lived through the events leading up to the Second World War and the War itself, know full well where the policy of concessions leads. Israel also should not forget what are the final consequences of the policy of aggression.

24. Those considerations prompt me to declare that the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic supports the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.519]. The adoption and implementation of that draft resolution provide conditions for a long-term solution to be reached and also for the Middle East to avoid becoming the nucleus of a widening conflict.

25. On behalf of my Government, I invite the delegations attending this session, and all those who strive for a peaceful settlement of issues in dispute, to support the draft resolution submitted by the Government of the Soviet Union, and on the basis of that text to combine our efforts to create peace for the peoples who have undergone so much suffering in the Middle East.

26. Mr. BEAVOGUI (Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Guinea) (translated from French): The fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened on the initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order, as stated by Mr. Nikolai Fedorenko, Permanent Representative of the USSR, in his letter, "to consider the question of liquidating the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States and the immediate withdrawal of Israel troops behind the armistice line" [A/6717].

27. As thus defined, the subject with which this session has to deal is clear and unambiguous. My Government agrees that this is in fact the problem we must consider and that any other way of stating it would be prejudicial not only to our work at this session but also to the United Nations as a whole and to peace in the Middle East.

28. My delegation proposes to examine this question—Israel's aggression against the Arab States—as to its causes, its manifestations and its known and unforeseeable consequences, and also the remedies it calls for.

29. It is not our intention to cover in detail the entire history of the Israel-Arab conflict, which comes before us regularly at every session of the General Assembly as the well-known agenda item, "Question of Palestine". Everyone is aware of the manner in which, since the famous Balfour Declaration of 1917, international Zionism has sought to establish in some appropriate part of the world, and preferably in Palestine, a Jewish State which would reconstitute the Biblical nation of Israel. Even some African countries, including Uganda, were thought of as a possible shelter for this famous nation. An area in my own country, Fouta-Djalou, was considered by certain enterprising French circles as a home for a Jewish community. It is common knowledge that, shortly after the Second World War, during which the Jews of Europe paid a heavy price for Hitler's megalomania and schizophrenia, the State of Israel was imposed on the Arabs of Palestine. It must be admitted that the United Nations insisted on sanctioning this act of violence, which knows no precedent in history and whose manifold consequences are the underlying cause of the chronic unrest prevailing in that touchy region of our planet, the Middle East. The fortunes of the Jewish State, which was thus recognized by the United Nations and by the majority of its Members, including the Republic of Guinea, which until recently maintained diplomatic relations with Israel, have fluctuated, depending on whether the Tel-Aviv leaders endeavoured to make their country part of the Middle East or, on the contrary, embraced a policy of dictation and intimidation, a policy which appears to send the more militant circles of international Zionism, which are often all-powerful in the Western world, into transports of joy.

30. My Government cannot possibly approach the Israel-Arab conflict from a religious or racial angle. By nature and by choice, Guinea is firmly opposed to all ideas based on racial or religious discrimination. On the other hand, my Government rests its attitude towards this tragic conflict on political considerations and on the way the States concerned behave both vis-à-vis imperialism and vis-à-vis international peace and security.

31. In its brief twenty years of existence, the State of Israel has been at war with its neighbours three separate times. After the first armistice—that of 1947—when Israel had driven over a million Palestinian Arabs from their lands and usurped their property, after annexing Arab territories in violation of United Nations resolutions on the partition of the territory under the British mandate into two independent States—a Jewish State and an Arab State—there had been some hope that an era of peace and possibly co-operation was about to dawn in the Middle East, a region so long oppressed, subjugated and humiliated by international imperialism, to which it had offered vast natural resources, rapaciously exploited by the foreign monopolies, and a convenient field of action for frustrating the Arab peoples' legitimate desire for freedom, dignity and progress.

32. Those hopes failed to take into account the extremist Zionist groups, both in Tel-Aviv and in other capitals of the Western world, which had never been convinced of the cardinal virtues of pacific settlement of disputes between States—that sacred principle which

is the very foundation of the United Nations Charter. These militant groups corrupted and contaminated by the methods of brute force used by the nazis against the Jewish people, have never been willing to agree that the State of Israel should discharge its sacred obligations towards the hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arab refugees, the many United Nations injunctions to the contrary notwithstanding. Instead, those groups chose, in order to affirm Israel's right to some kind of national existence, to pursue an adventuresome and expansionist policy towards their Arab neighbours, a policy which in July 1956 culminated in the tripartite aggression against an Egypt that had just liberated itself from the grasp of a feudal and reactionary régime and had established a popular revolutionary Government under President Gamal Abdel Nasser, a government resolved to satisfy the aspirations of the Egyptian people and of the entire Arab nation. As we know, because of the determination of certain great Powers and the clear-sightedness of the United Nations the consequences of that aggression were held within bounds and its diabolical objective—the overthrow of Nasser's popular régime—was frustrated.

33. Thus, since 1956, something approaching peace had prevailed in the Middle East, thanks first of all to the United Arab Republic's policy of peaceful co-operation with the United Nations, and, secondly, to the meritorious efforts of the Organization, whose effective presence was ensured by the United Nations Emergency Force and by other institutions. The latter functioned more or less according to the whim of the Jewish State which, as everyone knows, has never had anything but contempt for the United Nations mission of peace in the Middle East and which was oftenguilt of provocations against the blue berets along the demarcation line.

34. The causes of the recent Middle East crisis are known. After the Tel-Aviv authorities had made belligerent statements, threatening to invade Syria, the United Arab Republic invoked Arab solidarity and the Arab joint defence pact and officially asked U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on 18 May 1967, to withdraw the United Nations Emergency Force from Egyptian national territory [A/6730, para. 2]. It is self-evident that in so doing the United Arab Republic was exercising the prerogatives of its national sovereignty to eliminate the last consequences of the tripartite aggression of 1956, both in Sinai and in the Strait of Tiran, which—as all States are aware, although some are not being honest about this—was solely within its sovereign jurisdiction. In accordance with the agreement establishing the United Nations presence, and with the spirit and practice of every peace-keeping operation in any country Member of the United Nations, U Thant honoured the request of the United Arab Republic. My Government wishes to congratulate him warmly on the industrious, intelligent, realistic and dignified way in which he discharged his obligations, thereby reaffirming the impartiality and neutrality of the United Nations.

35. Naturally, certain Governments—of course including the Government of Israel—and certain international information media which are notoriously pro-Zionist attacked the Secretary-General and criticized

his action with a view to discrediting the United Nations as a whole. As to certain personalities, such as the well-known counsel for the African States who was to defend the South West African case—which he lost pitifully, by the way, thus showing the paucity of his legal learning—they did not hesitate to compromise their reputation by taking extreme positions which can only harm the one effective international instrument we have for the maintenance of peace, the United Nations. This aberration on the part of the Government of Israel, which is after all a child of the United Nations—an illegitimate child, it is true, but a recognized child just the same—this international conspiracy against the United Nations in pursuit of political ends which cannot bear public scrutiny, must be denounced and condemned. I must emphasize that Israel never agreed to United Nations troops being stationed in its territory, as United Nations resolutions demanded. The Zionist rebellion against the United Nations seems, oddly enough, to escape the notice of the imperialist circles, which are stricken with amnesia whenever a legal or political argument unfavourable to Israel is advanced. The Government of the Republic of Guinea reaffirms its unshakable support of U Thant, who has done honour to the high office whose onerous functions he discharges with distinction, intelligence and impartiality.

36. It is no secret to anyone that the withdrawal of United Nations troops from Egyptian territory created a new and controversial situation, which was of course interpreted by different countries according to where their interests lay, but which everyone knew to be serious. The Secretary-General himself made it plain that the situation was at its most threatening since the 1956 hostilities. That is why he went to Cairo in an effort to overcome the crisis by advocating a cooling-off period during which a solution to the crisis might be found by peaceful means and diplomatic methods. On that occasion, he received every assurance from the United Arab Republic as to its peaceful intentions.

37. At that point, the Security Council met to seek a solution to the mounting crisis. Even as the Council's work progressed towards what everyone hoped would be constructive results, the Israel leaders decided that the international community's efforts were futile, seeing that in its deliberations it appeared to accept an act that was in no way out of the ordinary, namely, the exercise by the United Arab Republic of its sovereign rights in its own territory.

38. Faithful to their policy of the *fait accompli*, athirst for war, carried away by their own propaganda which unfortunately met with a favourable response in the Western world, the Tel-Aviv warmongers, in the early morning of 5 June, launched a lightning attack on the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. It is public knowledge—denials and bare-faced lies notwithstanding—that this aggression had been premeditated and its success assured by Israel's perfidious and deceitful behaviour towards the United Nations, certain Powers, and the Arab countries themselves. For even as Israel was giving formal assurances that it would not use violence to settle the dispute—assurances it had been lavish in extending to the Arab nations, which thus became the victims of a deliberate or unconscious international conspiracy—

Israel used its entire, and oddly enlarged, military arsenal to destroy the military potential of States recognized to be peace-loving, States whose cardinal error it had been to adhere to the fundamental principles of the United Nations and to believe the unequivocal promises that had been made to them, Israel's aggression, recognized as such by all impartial and objective Governments, must be censured, denounced and condemned by the United Nations, whose duty it is to oppose war in all its forms.

39. Sacrificing all the principles of the United Nations, sacrificing peace and security in the Middle East and in the world at large, at the risk of bringing about a third world war—a nuclear war this time—Israel's extremists, under the direction of General Moshe Dayan, whose lack of understanding of politics is well known, chose to settle their dispute with the Arab countries with fire and sword, in a rash move whose many immediate and distant consequences cannot readily be foreseen.

40. In expressing the Guinean people's indignation and reaffirming its faith in the peaceful settlement of disputes and its solidarity with all peoples that fall victim to imperialism and its accomplices, the Government of the Republic of Guinea, as soon as Israel aggression against the Arab nation became known, took an unequivocal stand in the communiqué which it addressed to the President of the Security Council and which I take the liberty to read in its entirety:

"This morning Israel, the tool of the international imperialists against the unity and security of the Arab peoples, launched a large-scale armed aggression by land and air against the national territory of the United Arab Republic. Israel airplanes carried out surprise raids on many Arab military aerodromes in Sinai, in the Suez Canal zone, and in the Cairo military zone. On land, the Israeli aggressors launched a total attack on all fronts. The United Arab Republic, together with all the Arab countries, immediately rose to face and repel the premeditated aggression by the Zionists and imperialists.

"The attack on the territorial sovereignty of the United Arab Republic is a serious threat to the peace of the Middle East, of Africa and of the world. The struggle of the United Arab Republic is a just struggle for the defence of the Arab peoples, which for centuries have suffered the most serious attacks on their dignity, their most sacred liberties, and their legitimate rights as a result of imperialist exploitation, the enemy of all peoples.

"The struggle of the United Arab Republic is our struggle, the struggle of the peoples of the African and Asian continents who have suffered the same persecution and the same imperialist exploitation. In line with the policy of Afro-Asian solidarity and the fraternal links forged in the struggle for African independence and unity which bind us to the people of the United Arab Republic, the Bureau Politique National (national policy bureau) of the Democratic Party of Guinea utterly condemns the barbarous aggression carried out by Israel, tool of the international imperialists. It reaffirms its unconditional support of the cause of the Arab people and invites

all citizens of the Republic of Guinea to redouble their vigilance in the face of this fresh proof of the barbarity and aggressiveness of the imperialists and to hold themselves in readiness to respond to any call to give positive expression to their full support of the struggle against our common enemy.

"In order to show its indignation at this ignoble act, the Bureau Politique National has decided to break off diplomatic relations between Guinea and Israel and it therefore invites the Ambassador of Israel and all Israel nationals residing in Guinea to quit the national territory immediately."<sup>3/</sup>

41. When Israel committed this aggression, some persons felt called upon to praise the warlike qualities of the Jewish people and the technical superiority of its military equipment, neglecting to take into account the element of surprise in the Israel offensive and the help Israel received from its would-be subtle accomplices. If some misguided people think they are thus proving the inadequacy of the Arab countries' military equipment, they could always test its quality by launching a military attack on the Soviet Union. We would not, however, advise them to try anything so foolish. At the same time, we do not believe that the lessons to be drawn from the present tragedy in the Middle East are of a military order. Rather we are convinced that they are political lessons.

42. To begin with, by its ill-considered action, inspired by megalomania and by the assurance that its existence would be protected by the imperialists, Israel, and all those who may have encouraged it, have made the solution of the problems of the Middle East infinitely more difficult than it was.

43. Secondly, as an African country and an active member of the Organization of African Unity, which includes six influential, respectable and respected members that have not been involved in this monstrous war, the Republic of Guinea had no choice but to embrace the cause of its sister Arab nations, which in their approach to the problems of the liberation and development of the African continent had always been for the African people and against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

44. Furthermore, my Government believes that the attacks periodically launched by Israel in reprisal against neighbouring States, which have earned it the unenviable title of repeated offender in aggression, are an extremely dangerous precedent for the security of African States, to the extent that the colonialist and racist circles of Portugal, Rhodesia or South Africa might decide to follow Israel's example and attack their neighbours, whose duty it is to help their African brothers to set themselves free from foreign oppression.

45. Lastly, because of its philosophy, its ideology and its political choices, Guinea is a natural ally of the Arab peoples which have chosen revolution as the way to develop their society. We for our part are convinced that for the Arab peoples the road to liberation lies in the qualitative transformation of the established economic and social relations within each Arab nation and in the trust they repose in their democratically elected leaders, who are the embodi-

ment of their sovereign will and their legitimate aspirations. We are also convinced that the security of the Arab nation and of all the nations of the Third World rests essentially on their own potential and their will to defend their interests and their freedom by the means at their own command.

46. Naturally, as a State Member of the United Nations the Republic of Guinea is in duty bound to oppose in all circumstances the argument of force, and to rely on the force of argument in seeking solutions to any and all disputes.

47. It will readily be understood, therefore, what position my delegation takes on the draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly for approval by the Soviet Union on the one hand [A/L.519] and by the United States of America on the other [A/L.520].

48. It goes without saying that, in my delegation's view, all Members of the United Nations must, in defence of the lofty principles of the Charter, vigorously condemn Israel's aggressive activities and the continuing occupation by Israel of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan; demand that Israel should immediately and unconditionally withdraw all its forces from the territory of those States to positions behind the armistice demarcation lines, as stipulated in the general armistice agreements, and should respect the status of the demilitarized zones, as prescribed in the armistice agreements; demand that Israel should make good in full and within the shortest possible period of time all the damage inflicted by its aggression on the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan and on their nationals, and should return to them all seized property and other material assets; and appeal to the Security Council to take for its part immediate effective measures in order to eliminate all consequences of the aggression committed by Israel. These proposals are contained in the USSR draft resolution, to which my delegation gives its unqualified support.

49. We note with regret, on the other hand, that while the United States draft resolution contains some just and legitimate provisions, it refrains from condemning Israel for its aggression and, oddly enough, sets conditions for the withdrawal of Israel's invading troops which, in our view, offer a reward to the aggressor. We are convinced that no peaceful solution can be found which does not provide for a return to the *status quo ante*, as on the eve of the Zionist aggression against the Arab States.

50. It must also be said that if the Israel Government were to arrogate unto itself the right to keep the conquered territories, thus playing the sinister role of a colonial Power, it would thereby create the pre-conditions for permanent hostilities in the Middle East and, in the last analysis, for a systematic destruction of the empire that would be created there, including the pivot of that empire—Israel itself.

51. If for any reason whatever this Assembly should recognize Israel's right of conquest, if it should tolerate Israel appropriating the fruits of its aggression, if owing to the use of force the balance of forces and the geographical configuration of the Middle East were to be altered, then the United Nations would have proclaimed the law of the jungle in interna-

tional relations, and this would be a prelude to its own disappearance and very probably the disappearance of our planet. Perhaps that is what the militarist Government at Tel-Aviv desires. But I have no doubt that the majority in this Assembly have enough common sense not to give it a free hand and to make reason prevail over recklessness, justice over injustice and peace over war.

52. Despite basic and vital reasons, reasons of different orders—humane, political and objective—for stating its position in much more passionate terms, the Guinean delegation deemed it a duty to elevate this debate by refraining from sterile polemics. In so doing, it attempted to make a constructive contribution to our joint effort which must, of course, be bent to the complete elimination of the consequences of aggression and a reasonable, objective and impartial search for means of bringing about an exemplary, lasting and just solution to the chronic and pernicious crisis affecting so many countries and peoples in the Middle East, that cradle of civilization, cradle of three great religions that were to spread throughout the world, cradle of brotherhood and love among men.

53. Mr. CYRANKIEWICZ (Prime Minister of the Polish People's Republic):<sup>4/</sup> The convening of the Emergency Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly testifies to the seriousness of the matter now before us. From the very beginning, the Polish Government had supported the initiative for convening this session. The reason for our presence here is the aggression of one Member State against other Members of our Organization. In violation of the United Nations Charter, contrary to the law of nations, in spite of the tragic experience of mankind and that of its own people, in spite of all political reason contrary to its own *raison d'état*, the State of Israel, harnessed to the policy of imperialism and its political and oil interests, in collusion with imperialists, reached for its well-prepared armoury in order to commit aggression against the Arab States.

54. It was not by accident that this aggression occurred in an international situation poisoned already by the protracted and constantly intensifying United States aggression against North Viet-Nam. Thus a new step in escalation was made through the unleashing of hostilities at a place which was convenient to and needed by imperialism—an escalation which, if allowed to continue, would amount to a further attempt at pushing the world towards war. The very fact of Israeli aggression is clear beyond any doubt, and no one who is in any way familiar with the course of events is questioning that. This is known both to those who say so with all emphasis and demand the drawing of proper consequences therefrom, as well as to those who chose rather to remain silent on this point.

55. Thanks to the intervention by the Security Council, it became possible to bring about a cease-fire. But we recall that, in spite of several interventions by the Security Council, the Israeli army aimed with total ruthlessness at achieving military and political objectives, planned well in advance. There is no doubt but that Israel wants to utilize its momentary military superiority in order to impose damaging, unjust and

<sup>4/</sup> Mr. Cyrankiewicz spoke in Polish. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

inadmissible peace conditions upon its neighbours. The authoritative political spokesmen of Israel, no longer bothering to cover the fact of their aggression, have now begun publicly to formulate their programme of annexations. The steps taken by the Israeli Government and military authorities with respect to the Arab population in the occupied territories prove that what they had in mind was to establish faits accomplis.

56. Were we, as the General Assembly, as the representatives of Member States, to allow the realization of those objectives of the Israeli Government, we would not be true either to our obligations or to the United Nations Charter. As the representative of a country which in the recent past itself fell victim to a brutal aggression and cruel occupation and which considers peace among nations as the supreme value of the contemporary world, I emphatically state that the Polish delegation will under no circumstances reconcile itself to a situation in which military might and aggression become an accepted instrument for solving international conflicts, or where the success of aggression is rewarded with the recognition of the aggressor's claims. We of the United Nations cannot allow under any circumstances the sanctioning of such precedents, the establishment of which is today eagerly awaited by various sinister forces in the world. The acceptance of such a principle would amount to recognition of the law of the jungle in international relations, and would thereby destroy the authority of the United Nations, as was the case during the ill-famed years of the League of Nations.

57. The United Nations, and its ability for effective action, is the hope of humanity in the nuclear age. Our task is to act in such a way as not to allow it to remain just a hope.

58. That is why we should most emphatically reject the cynical declarations by the representative of the Israeli Government that it would not abide by the decisions or recommendations of the United Nations, even if they were adopted by all members with the sole exception of Israel. In the past, justice has caught up, sooner or later, with those who had taken such a stand.

59. The General Assembly has been convened in a situation in which the aggression has been perpetrated, foreign territories occupied, and demands for annexation put forward. In the opinion of the Polish Government it is the task of the General Assembly to fulfil the fundamental duty of the United Nations to point out and to condemn the aggressor, to call upon it to withdraw to its own territory, to ask it to make good the damages and liquidate the consequences of aggression. That is why the Polish Government will support the draft resolution presented to this Assembly by the Government of the Soviet Union [A/L.519].

60. It should be recalled that it is not for the first time since the establishment of Israel that its Government has attempted to settle conflicts with its neighbours by the use of force. The Israeli aggression has created a permanent inflammatory situation which is being aggravated with every successive war. The essence of the problem of the Middle East consists above all in the fact that the Arab nations inhabiting that region are fighting against the most rapacious forces of imperialism and colonialism for their right to na-

tional independence and progress, for the right to dispose of their national riches and resources, and to use them for the development of their countries. The policy of the imperialist Powers defending the interests of the oil monopolies, and at the same time mindful of the strategic importance of that region, has been for years to combat the national movement of the Arabs.

61. In accordance with the principles of our foreign policy, together with other socialist countries and many other Members of the United Nations, we of Poland have recognized the fact of the establishment of the State of Israel; and this position of ours has not changed. All the more justified, therefore, have been our frequent warnings—and we repeat them once again—that the line of policy chosen by the ruling Israeli circles was, in the long run, suicidal for that State.

62. Israel finds itself in a very special geo-political situation. It is a country with a population of 2.5 million, having as its neighbours on all its frontiers tens of millions of Arab people. It would seem that in such a situation the basic premise of the Israeli policy should be to find a *modus vivendi* with the Arab world. The historical experience of the Israeli people should have made their leaders conscious of the bitter taste of oppression and persecution; it should have shown them also how ineffective an instrument was force in the solution of aggravated national and international problems. What dangerous consequences can ensue from attempts at resisting the just aspirations of other nations which have recently cast off the yoke of colonialism and are now looking for means of self-defence against imperialist pressures, and which, through hard toil, are building their political and economic independence. And yet the ruling circles of Israel have rallied precisely to the forces of imperialism against the Arab world. Not to mention the preceding years, in 1956, Israel, in collusion with those very forces, perpetrated aggression against its Arab neighbours.

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

63. I do not think that I have to quote here at length from authoritative sources showing beyond any doubt that the aggression against Egypt in 1956 was planned in advance with the aim of overthrowing the national Government of Egypt. Another delegation present in this Hall is, I think, more competent to refer here to the memoirs of Mr. Anthony Nutting.<sup>5/</sup> This would be both correct and useful, and it would be even more useful for the Government of that country to draw conclusions from the utter failure of the 1956 Suez adventure.

64. In the consciousness of the Arab countries, which are selflessly struggling to cast off the vestiges of the American and British imperialist rule—for the policy of President de Gaulle has excluded France from their ranks—Israel is an instrument of alien and hostile interests in the Middle East. It is a sad role and the Israeli leaders shall bear full responsibility for it. Immediately before the outbreak of the military conflict President Nasser uttered these significant words: "We are facing not Israel but imperialism".

<sup>5/</sup> Harold Anthony Nutting, *No End of a Lesson*, London, Constable, 1967.

These words have been either by-passed in silence or distorted in the flood of anti-Arab propaganda.

65. And now at this session we see time and again the representative of Israel coming to this rostrum to invoke excerpts from some articles in the Arab press and also some specially selected quotations from statements by Arab politicians and to repeat constantly "they wanted to destroy us". And yet, obvious facts deny this contention, as it is denied by authoritative statements made, *inter alia*, by President Nasser. Besides, it was very well known to the Government of Israel from other sources which it considers authoritative that Israel was not threatened by any aggression on the part of the United Arab Republic, just as it was well known to it that the problem of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba could be solved within a short period of time.

66. In the course of this debate and also before the present session was convened, we heard remarks on the withdrawal of the United Nations Forces which were stationed on Arab territory with the consent of Egypt. This force was likened to a fire brigade being withdrawn at the time of a fire. These were pin-pricks aimed at the Secretary-General, to which he replied in a dignified and well-documented statement. But, after all, nothing prevented the Israeli Government from calling this fire brigade to the Israeli territory which, however, that Government has repeatedly refused to do. Or, in other words, this fear of the destruction of Israel was imaginary and served only to incite public opinion in many countries with a view to creating a political smoke-screen for aggression and, at the same time, served as a mobilizing factor of the Israeli population for war. Precisely because it knew that the Arab States would not start war, Israel could use in its onslaught the methods of blitzkrieg which had already been tried in the past by other aggressors. No one has found a better analogy for the Israeli action than its statesmen who compared the action of 5 June to a "blitzkrieg". For us in Poland, a blitzkrieg is tantamount to the Hitler aggression against Poland, to the terrible Nazi occupation, to the annihilation of 6 million people exterminated by Hitler, among whom so many were Polish citizens of Jewish origin. As the representative of Poland, I think that the one who is crowing over the Israeli "blitzkrieg" in the Middle East and comparing it to the Luftwaffe onslaught against the Polish soil, should not at the same time abuse the memory of Jews murdered in the Nazi concentration camps.

67. Therefore, nothing but revulsion and distaste can be evoked by the line of the Israeli politicians who try to take advantage of the feelings of world public opinion, feelings which have been born out of noble sentiments of solidarity and compassion for the Jewish martyrology.

68. The sweet voices of the apologists of aggression attempt to mollify world public opinion by pointing out that Israel is a small country compared with the Arab world. They invoke comparisons with the Bible: they refer to the fight between David and Goliath. But in this case the small David was very well armed and prepared for aggression. I think it would be more correct to refer here to the not so distant history of colonialism. For it is with the history of colonialism

and not with the Bible that the imperialist aggressions against Arab countries of 1956 and 1967 ought to be linked. The joint responsibility of Anglo-American imperialists for this last aggression also leaves no doubt whatsoever.

69. It is common knowledge today how many hopes were linked in the influential quarters of Washington and London with the aggressive acts of Israel, hopes for destroying Arab unity, for setting the Arab States against each other, for isolating and subjugating them one by one, and also for eliminating those Governments which were not to the British and American liking.

70. The Israeli leaders maintain that they are striving to assure the independence and security of their country. No one has ever achieved this in alliance with the forces of imperialism and reaction. The only safeguard for the independence and security of Israel is to find a common language with the Arab countries. One should only ask the representatives of Israel: What have you done during those ten years which have elapsed from the previous aggression in order to improve relations between Israel and the Arab States?

71. The socialist countries, in accordance with the principles of their policy, support the aspirations of the Arab world for complete liberation from colonialist and neo-colonialist subjugation. That is the position emphatically stated by the Polish Government. That attitude with regard to the Israeli aggression against the Arab States also found its recent expression in the Moscow Declaration of the Socialist States adopted after the hostilities started against the Arab States and while they were still in progress. That attitude was also contained in the latest statement by the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

72. We express our full solidarity with the Arab nations, which are painstakingly searching for their own road of social reforms and of building a better society, for uplifting themselves from age-long backwardness and for embarking upon the road of modern development.

73. We have heard repeatedly from this rostrum representatives recalling the basic truth of the contemporary world, namely that peace is indivisible. The events of recent years give to that truth even more convincing testimony, which is pregnant with forebodings.

74. It would be a mistake if we were to approach this problem, which has brought us here, in isolation from the political situation in other parts of the world and consider it as an isolated event. The conflict in the Middle East is conditioned by its own background, but, at the same time, it is born out of the present international atmosphere and, in its turn, is influencing that atmosphere to a considerable extent. It constitutes, no doubt, a link in the long chain of interventions in the internal affairs of other States, of exerting pressure, of supporting aggression, and of organizing coups d'état in places recognized in some way as key points for planned aggressions in the future, aggressions aimed at strangling anti-imperialist tendencies towards independence in specific countries or regions.

75. Of course, the most flagrant manifestation of that United States policy which is diametrically opposed to

the principles of peaceful coexistence is the United States aggression in Viet-Nam, which has become a blueprint and an encouragement for the aggression in the Middle East.

76. These are successive steps in escalating tensions which are pushing the world to the brink of war.

77. When we say that world peace is indivisible, it does not mean that because of this or that local war a world conflict is about to descend upon us. Of course, there are places in the world where this could be the case; but, generally speaking, the number of potential points of conflagration and of open, although local, armed conflicts already assumes proportions of an entirely different order. This situation can be termed either as sliding into war or as pushing the world into a new holocaust.

78. It is obvious that today, more than ever before, every conflict wherever it may arise increases tension in other regions, aggravates new problems, becomes the nucleus of new conflicts. All this is taking place in the shadow of the gravest threat which hangs over the world: the threat of nuclear war. Unfortunately, it is not clear to everyone that a series of small wars leads to a big war. There are such primitive strategists of blackmail who proclaim that the very stockpiling of nuclear weapons excludes the possibility of their being used. Those gentlemen think that precisely in the shadow of nuclear armaments it is possible in a carefree manner to engage in conventional local wars. Unfortunately, this primitive strategy of blackmail has become in recent years the doctrine guiding the policy of a great Power. Interference in the internal affairs of other States, armed interventions, local wars, escalation, all this begins to be patterned into one big chain.

79. For years we have warned against those who do everything in their power to surmount the crisis caused by that policy from the position of strength by methods drawn from the arsenal of that policy. Unfortunately, it is precisely those circles which have gained preponderant influence on the decisions taken in Washington. We are faced with the policy from the position of strength in a new, and by no means improved, edition. Its aims are the same as those in the time of the late Mr. Dulles: American domination of the world. This policy, now as in the time of the late Secretary of State, is directed against the socialist States, against the aspirations of the nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America to gain true independence and to enter upon the road of unfettered economic and social progress, against the aspirations of the nations of Western Europe to free themselves from American tutelage.

80. These are methods reminiscent of the Dulles years although, in spite of the wide application of computers, they are even less exact in their calculations. I am afraid that the present leaders of United States policy, the more convinced they become of their ability to control the course of events, the more they become slaves of the chain reaction which they themselves have set in motion. In this connexion, Viet-Nam serves as an ever more ominous example.

81. And now the Middle East, with its oil deposits, with the Suez Canal, is also a strategic area from which

pressure can be exerted and threats mounted against Africa and the Middle East, against Eastern and Western Europe. But, I ask, what comes next? What comes next in Africa, in Asia, in Europe?

82. Those representatives of European States who, speaking from this rostrum, could not bring themselves to express a clear condemnation of aggression and an emphatic demand for the aggressor to withdraw to his own territory should not cherish illusions that a Europe surrounded by angry seas could remain an island of tranquillity.

83. My country is second to none in its desire for a détente, for normalization of relations, for security and co-operation in Europe. We have given ample proof of that. This is well known to representatives of European States with whom for years we have been conducting frank and constructive dialogue. But today, as in the past, we have stressed our desire for a true détente. We want a true and lasting normalization of relations; we want real security; we want true co-operation based upon authentic goodwill.

84. We know that there exist in Western Europe important and constantly increasing forces whose interests and aspirations concur with ours on that point. But we have been warning—and we do so today with even greater emphasis—against illusions of apparent relaxation of tension, illusory normalization and security upon which no broad and lasting European co-operation could be built. Illusions are futile, but they can also be dangerous if they are used for tactical aims by those who wish to have the freedom of choice of time and place as well as the opportunity to prepare for action from the position of strength. If Europe does not wish to allow the test of strength on the continent to be imposed from outside, the test which, independently of these or other calculations or illusions, would lead to a world catastrophe, then Europe must eliminate the hotbeds of conflict and begin the real normalization of relations.

85. I do not wish to enter into all the problems of détente, normalization, security and co-operation in Europe. There are, however, some fundamental truths which should be repeated here, since peace is indivisible.

86. There cannot be any true détente on our continent as long as in a country such as the German Federal Republic territorial claims against other States are being advanced, as long as these claims meet with encouraging silence and diplomatic evasion on the part of certain great Powers. There can be no real normalization of relations in Europe without normal relations between the two States situated in the heart of Europe on two sides of a frontier where the gravest threat may arise. What certainly cannot be reconciled with the requirements of the normalization of relations in Europe is the unrealistic but very dangerous claim of one State—the German Federal Republic—to represent the other State—the German Democratic Republic—and to interfere in its internal affairs.

87. And finally, there can be no real security in Europe as long as that State which, alone on our continent, advances territorial claims against other States, aspires to represent another State and to

interfere in its internal affairs, and refuses to renounce its drive to gain access to nuclear weapons.

88. I do not believe that I have ventured beyond the scope of the question on our agenda. The thoughts which I have expressed here emphasize, in my opinion, still more the importance of what is taking place in the Middle East.

89. If we approach this problem from a broader angle, if we perceive in time all its implications, it becomes evident that not only in the interests of the nations of that region and of peace in that area, but also in the interests of world peace and of all of us, it is urgent and necessary that we should raise our voice in an effort to stop the chain reaction of events and that we should declare on behalf of the United Nations that we will not reconcile ourselves, either now or in the future, to aggression and territorial annexations; that neither this nor any other aggressor will ever be rewarded; that the aggressor must be compelled to give up the gains of his aggression. Only under such conditions will peaceful coexistence among nations become possible.

90. Mr. MALIK (Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia): Indonesia was one of the first countries to support the initiative of the Soviet Union in calling this emergency special session to deal with a situation which threatens world peace and security. We did so because we felt that the Security Council had so far failed to produce an adequate solution. Moreover, it is our considered opinion that to cope with such a dangerous and explosive situation as that which the world is confronted with today, we must have the benefit of the wisdom of all the Members of the United Nations, pooled together in a joint search for a just and lasting solution. We are gratified, therefore, that this feeling is shared by the majority of the Member Nations present. We sincerely hope that this session will come to grips with the roots of the problem and will thus enable us to arrive at an honourable and durable peace in the Middle East.

91. The United Nations has been seized with the problem of perennial instability in the Middle East since 1947, when the Government of the United Kingdom asked that a special session of the General Assembly be called to examine the question of Palestine. Since then the world has witnessed a long and sad history of regrettable incidents and bitter crises which have kept this unfortunate region in constant turmoil and agony. To mention but a few, we are still struggling with the unsolved problem of the Palestine Arab refugees, whose plight continues to burden the conscience of mankind; we have witnessed constant violations of the Armistice Agreements, and the human misery and material damage caused by these violations; we were horrified by naked aggression during the Suez Canal crisis; and now, again, we are confronted with the ravages of open war, which up to this moment continues to threaten to erupt again and engulf the world in an even wider conflagration.

92. It is not our intention to go once again over all those bitter experiences of the past. Throughout that period, the Indonesian position has been quite clear in its full support of the Arab people's struggle against

Israel. With regard to the events which took place just prior to and immediately after the recent outbreak of hostilities, there can be no ambiguity also as to our attitude. We supported the request of the President of the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force. Likewise, we approved the prompt response of Secretary-General U Thant in compliance with this request. Consequently, we were in full accord with the measures taken by the Government of the United Arab Republic with regard to the Strait of Tiran. Our positive stand in these instances was dictated by our conviction of the sovereign right of the Government of the United Arab Republic to take these and other measures in the defence of their legitimate national interests.

93. In this connexion, I should like to stress my Government's view that there are no grounds whatsoever for the doubt voiced by certain quarters as to the legality and appropriateness of the conduct of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in complying with the request of the Government of the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from its territory. We wish, therefore, to reiterate the full confidence of the Indonesian Government in the ability, judgement, and impartiality of Secretary-General U Thant.

94. At the outbreak of armed conflict, we strongly denounced the aggressive actions of Israel perpetrated against the Arab States and joined with other nations in efforts to effect an immediate cease-fire. We also appealed to all States to refrain from any actions detrimental to the peaceful solution of the conflict and continued to press for an integral solution through the United Nations.

95. In the three weeks of strenuous debate prior to this session the Security Council succeeded in bringing about a cease-fire, although a precarious one. The most urgent task the Assembly is now facing is to transform this precarious cease-fire into lasting peace and stability. And this is, in the opinion of my delegation, the very reason for which we have all gathered here now. This Assembly must strive to find a common basis upon which to build that just peace and lasting stability in the Middle East.

96. Our first task, then, is to ensure that the cease-fire is scrupulously observed by all parties concerned. It is clear that without the fulfilment of this very basic prerequisite, no further steps can be contemplated. A cease-fire, however, cannot be but a preliminary step which ceases to have any meaning unless it is coupled with the withdrawal of all combatants to positions prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

97. Neither the norms of established international law nor the precepts of international justice and morality will ever condone territorial expansion through acts of aggression and conquest. This is an axiom governing relationships among all States which brooks no compromise or clever constructions in interpretation. The immutable fact which we face today is that Israeli troops, by force of arms, have occupied and continue to occupy certain parts of Arab soil.

98. It is, therefore, the firm policy of my Government to insist upon the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli troops from parts of the terri-

tories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, to positions they held before 5 June 1967.

99. But a cease-fire and withdrawal alone do not constitute a solution. If we honestly want a real peace for the peoples of the Middle East, we cannot stop there. We should not stop there. It is my Government's considered view that an effective cease-fire coupled with complete withdrawal should serve only as a basis, in fact the only sound and equitable basis, on which to develop further efforts to achieve an integral and permanent solution for the whole problem, taking into full consideration the legitimate aspirations of the peoples concerned.

100. One of the primary causes of perennial conflict between the Arab States and Israel is undeniably the up-till-now unsolved problem of the Palestine Arab refugees. As far back as December 1948 the General Assembly, in no uncertain terms, resolved, in resolution 194 (III), operative paragraph 11:

"that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible".

101. That basic provision, although reiterated each year from 1949 onward, has never been implemented. The recent developments have made this problem even more acute. As a result of the shooting war, the number of Arab refugees has considerably increased. The injustice and the inhuman suffering of innocent people have been even further aggravated. Unless a just and satisfactory redress of this immense tragedy is incorporated in the efforts towards a permanent solution, no durable stability and peace for all the peoples of the region can ever be hoped for.

102. In the course of the general debate, a number of proposals have been submitted in the form of draft resolutions as well as oral suggestions. At this stage, it is not the intention of my delegation to go into the substance of those proposals. In this connexion, however, I should like to make one basic point: any form of solution, to be effective and practicable should, in the view of my delegation, be based on a peaceful settlement with the active participation of the United Nations and in accordance with the principles and purposes of its Charter. My delegation firmly believes that the United Nations should continue to serve as the most appropriate instrument to bring about a meaningful and lasting settlement.

103. May I recall that in the past Indonesia has always responded positively to appeals to contribute its share to the discharge of its international responsibilities. Now again, Indonesia will not hesitate to participate in arrangements which the General Assembly might agree upon in our common search to achieve lasting peace.

104. The present Middle East crisis, apart from threatening world peace, poses a direct challenge to the very existence of the United Nations. We, as Members of this world body, have a common responsibility to

defend its *raison d'être* as an effective instrument for safeguarding international peace and security.

105. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba): On the subject of the Middle East, my delegation wishes to say that the people and the Revolutionary Government of Cuba are, as a matter of principle, opposed to any manifestation of religious, national or racial prejudice, whatever its source, and likewise considered that any advocacy of the annihilation of any people or State is to be condemned. This principle is applicable to both the people of Palestine, which has been crassly, unjustly and brutally despoiled of its territory, and to the Hebrew people, which for 2,000 years has undergone persecution, racial prejudice and, in the Nazi period and so long ago, one of the most inhuman attempts at mass extermination recorded in history.

106. Our attitude to the State of Israel in the Middle Eastern crisis is based on the aggressive behaviour of that State as a tool of imperialism against the Arab world; for the State of Israel has not only resorted to armed aggression against the Arab peoples in order to solve existing problems; it has also done so in the most treacherous and outrageous way, by means of a Nazi-type surprise attack, carefully prepared in advance. I do not think anyone here can deny that that was how the armed attack was launched against the Arab peoples.

107. Acting altogether in keeping with this behaviour, the State of Israel has announced its intention of annexing territories occupied by force from the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. In other words, Israel both proclaims and practises the brutal right of conquest against other States. Needless to say, it would not attempt such a course if it could not count on the full military and political support of imperialism.

108. The Security Council agreement calling for an unconditional cease-fire without condemning the aggressor, without calling to account imperialism which incited and abetted it, and without demanding the withdrawal of the invading troops, is tantamount to endorsing the right of conquest, as proclaimed and practised by the aggressor. To all intents and purposes, that agreement amounted to imposing surrender in the face of imperialist aggression, as the Revolutionary Government of Cuba stated on 7 June 1967.

109. Obviously encouraged by that agreement, the armed forces of the State of Israel in due course possessed themselves of the Sinai Peninsula, wrested a considerable portion of its territory from Jordan and set out to invade Syria.

110. The unconditional cease-fire agreement was a political and moral body blow for the Arab peoples.

111. The people and the Revolutionary Government of Cuba consider that, on the ground of elementary self-respect and patriotism, there can be no cease-fire while a single inch of national territory is in the hands of aggressive troops. It is better that the citizens of a country should die to a man rather than accept such a shameful spoliation of their rights.

112. It is naive to believe that such an agreement can contribute to peace. On the contrary, it helps to

aggravate the situation by encouraging the aggressor, consolidating his conquest and holding out the promise of impunity to imperialism in further wars of aggression in that or any other part of the world. The only alternative for the Arab peoples in the face of this situation is to accept the fait accompli or else carry on the fight.

113. Not only has the State of Israel taken full advantage of the unconditional cease-fire agreement; it has even declared that it will retain the occupied territory and has, in advance, scoffed at the merely theoretical likely to be discussed here. It acts and behaves as an occupying Power with the backing of imperialism, and more particularly of the United States Sixth Fleet.

114. On the appropriate occasion, the Revolutionary Government of Cuba expressed its condemnation of the cease-fire agreement adopted by the Security Council, with neither condemnation of the aggressor nor absolute insistence on the withdrawal of its troops from the occupied territories. The Cuban delegation pays a tribute to the revolutionary attitude of the Algerian Government, which has not only openly rejected the cease-fire agreement but has proclaimed that it will fight imperialism until the rule of law has been restored, the abnormal situation has been rectified and the aftermath of aggression eliminated.

115. The behaviour of the United Nations and its Security Council in the face of the aggression comes as a surprise to no one, since this body, set up originally in the hope that it would strengthen law and justice in international relations, has increasingly degenerated into the despised and mediocre tool or imperialist policy.

116. I speak for a people which, more than any other small country, knows from bitter experience that no protection whatever can be expected from this Organization if its rights are violated. The criminal and more and more savage war unleashed with complete impunity against the people of Viet-Nam by the imperialist Government of the United States proves this if the experiences of Korea, the Congo, and Santo Domingo, and the latest example of the Middle East, were not enough.

117. The only policy imperialism believes in, and consequently practises, is unconditional subjection to its rule, which it tries to obtain by force. It deceives no one. Anywhere and at any time it acts as the demonstrable and self-confessed sponsor of world counter-revolution, and the only answer to such a policy is the heroic and inexorable struggle of the peoples of the world.

118. It is in the context of the over-all strategy of imperialism that the treacherous and pitiless aggression against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic takes on its true significance and importance. It is not an isolated case of aggression, any more than the acts of aggression carried out in the Congo were isolated, or those still being committed in the Dominican Republic, Cuba and Viet-Nam. Each and every one of those aggressive acts forms part of the same over-all policy of aggression conceived and unleashed by Yankee imperialism in its desperate and futile endeavours to crush and bring to

heel the peoples struggling to free themselves from the imperialist yoke or to consolidate their independence and sovereignty. In formulating its plans and pursuing the objectives set, Yankee imperialism relies solely on its military forces and on its conventional and strategic weapons. The revolutionary peoples are well aware of this from their own experience and hence are fully convinced that the revolutionary struggle is the only way to defeat the counter-revolutionary violence of imperialism at its own game.

119. The armed forces of the State of Israel must withdraw from the occupied territories and, unless they do so forthwith, the Arab peoples will be perfectly justified in resuming the fight, for they must be aware that the restoration of their rights will depend basically on their willingness to resist and to fight and not on any action taken by the international Organization, the slave of imperialism, which is the true instigator of the aggression.

120. The only alternative open to the Arab peoples at this decisive moment of their destiny is that open to all peoples facing imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America: to resist and to fight. The homeland or death! We shall conquer!

121. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

122. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): From the opening of this session, the Arab spokesmen have followed one another to this rostrum to launch a marathon verbal assault against my country and my people. They are transferring their warfare, which they have been conducting against Israel for the last twenty years in the Middle East, to this Hall which, in the words of our Charter, is "to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations". They are piling distortion upon distortion and defamation upon defamation with no respect whatsoever for truth. Allegations and charges are recklessly flung about and presented as established facts, no matter how far-fetched they are and how flimsy the evidence.

123. Not content with their statements in the debate, Arab representatives have devised a new technique to widen the front of their propaganda barrage. For the last two or three days, they have been opening the day's proceedings with special announcements. They are using this platform as an amplifier for the diffusion of letters already circulated as official documents and containing false and malicious charges.

124. Yesterday, the representative of Jordan brought up his charges about Qalquiliyah. Today, the representative of the United Arab Republic stepped in with his unfounded allegations about the expulsion of civilians through the line at Qantarrah on the Suez Canal.

125. I want first to give the facts on Qalquiliyah. The damage and destruction which occurred to buildings in that village were all incurred in the course of the actual fighting. The inhabitants of Qalquiliyah had left before the arrival of the Israel forces. That village was a Jordanian front-line position from which the Jordanian army launched attacks on Israel. In Qalquiliyah heavy and long-range artillery was positioned, which shelled Tel Aviv and other towns and villages, causing serious casualties and damage. No civilians

were removed by Israel authorities because, as I have already said, they had left the village before our troops arrived there. I should like to point out that close by Qalquiliyah is the town of Tul Karm. In that town there were no military installations or gun emplacements, and no fighting took place there. The town is undamaged and its population has remained there unharmed. This should serve as an illustration of the baselessness of the charges presented here by the representative of Jordan. Had Qalquiliyah not been directly involved in the attack on Israel, it too would have remained unharmed.

126. In this connexion, I want to say a word about the constantly repeated allegations concerning the situation of the civilian population in the areas under Israel control. All objective observers who have visited those areas have confirmed the extreme care of the Israel army while the fighting was in progress to spare the civilian population from all undue harm and suffering. Rarely have military operations in heavily populated areas been conducted with such concern for non-belligerents, and rarely has such limited damage and harm been caused them.

127. As soon as the fighting was over, every effort was made by the Israel authorities to restore conditions of normal civilian life. A civilian administration in the west bank is operating, all hospitals are functioning in good order, all charitable institutions have resumed their work, the telephone service is functioning in the major cities in the west bank, the local police force is back on duty, factories and other industries are beginning to resume production, farm work is being carried out normally at this harvest time, and food supplies are moving. On the initiative of the Government of Israel, an agreement was signed between that Government and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for the continuation of the work of that Agency in refugee camps. I can assure the General Assembly that the Government of Israel will continue its efforts to provide the Arab population with the necessary conditions for an orderly, peaceful and normal life.

128. I come now to the statement which the United Arab Republic representative made this morning about the alleged expulsion of Palestinians at Qantarrah. This is indeed a puzzling charge. It comes in the wake of previous fanciful allegations from the same source about the stripping of prisoners of war of their uniforms and shoes. In my letter of yesterday to the

President of the Security Council, which has been circulated, I furnished the explanation given to us by Egyptian prisoners of war: that the uniforms were discarded by Egyptian army personnel to conceal their military rank and status and that the shoes were taken off to facilitate escape.

129. To come back to the Qantarrah charge: This town is situated on the bank of the Suez Canal. Prisoners of war are held in a camp at the outskirts of Qantarrah. As part of Israel's policy to return the prisoners of war to Egypt, arrangements have been made with the Egyptian authorities on the opposite bank of the Canal for them to ferry groups of released prisoners from the Israel line to the west bank of the Canal.

130. These prisoners of war are freely accepted by the competent Egyptian authorities and transferred by them to Egyptian territory. No complaints have been received on the spot that persons other than prisoners of war have been sent to Egypt through Qantarrah.

131. If there were Palestinians among the prisoners of war, they apparently belonged to the military units of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army, which was controlled by the Egyptian army and participated in the hostilities against Israel.

132. Be that as it may, the transfer of prisoners of war at Qantarrah is being carried out with the free co-operation of the Egyptian authorities. The representatives of the International Red Cross have publicly expressed their satisfaction and appreciation at the manner in which Egyptian prisoners of war have been cared for and repatriated by Israel.

133. In recent days, Arab spokesmen have filled this Hall with stories of atrocities alleged to have been committed by Israel. I completely reject those stories as figments of their imagination. They can be explained only as a reflection of what the Arabs would have done in Israel if their avowed aim to destroy it and its people had been achieved. Knowing that this was the fate in store for us—massacre and destruction—the people of Israel mustered all their strength to smash that threat once and for all.

134. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to remind the members of the Assembly that the list of speakers was closed today.

*The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.*