

S RELEASES OF THE S-G : URGENT
EDS FROM FIFTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION
OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONTAINING REFERENCES TO S-G + SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST, A/PV 1506-1590

PLEASE RETAIN
ORIGINAL ORDER

CLEAR

30/03/2004 wj

UN ARCHIVES

SERIES

0891

BOX

12

FILE

5

ACC. DATE 1/5.3.8

NO DATE

INDEX TO STATEMENTS

	Page(s):				Page(s):		
AFGHANISTAN				KUWAIT	25 - 28		
ALBANIA				LAOS	35		
ALGERIA				LEBANON	20 - 24		
ARGENTINA	6			LESOTHO			
AUSTRALIA				LIBERIA	33 - 34		
AUSTRIA				LIBYA	31		
BARBADOS				LUXEMBOURG			
BELGIUM				MADAGASCAR			
BOLIVIA				MALAWI			
BOTSWANA				MALAYSIA			
BRAZIL				MALDIVE ISLANDS			
BULGARIA				MALI			
BURMA				MALTA			
BURUNDI				MAURITANIA	24		
BYELORUSSIAN SSR				MEXICO			
CAMBODIA				MONGOLIA	19		
CAMEROON				MOROCCO			
CANADA	6 - 7			NEPAL			
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC				NETHERLANDS	14		
CEYLON				NEW ZEALAND			
CHAD				NICARAGUA			
CHILE				NIGER			
CHINA				NIGERIA	32		
COLOMBIA				NORWAY	16		
CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)				PAKISTAN	29		
CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF				PANAMA			
COSTA RICA				PARAGUAY			
CUBA				PERU			
CYPRUS	29 - 30			PHILIPPINES			
CZECHOSLOVAKIA				POLAND			
DAHOMEY				PORTUGAL			
DENMARK	1			ROMANIA			
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC				RWANDA			
ECUADOR				SAUDI ARABIA			
EL SALVADOR				SENEGAL			
ETHIOPIA				SIERRA LEONE	13		
FINLAND	15			SINGAPORE			
FRANCE				SOMALIA			
GABON				SOUTH AFRICA			
GAMBIA				SPAIN			
GHANA				SUDAN			
GREECE				SWEDEN			
GUATEMALA				SYRIA	35		
GUINEA				THAILAND	18		
GUYANA				TOGO			
HAITI				TRINIDAD and TOBAGO			
HONDURAS				TUNISIA	7 - 8		
HUNGARY				TURKEY			
ICELAND				UGANDA			
INDIA	24 - 25			UKRAINIAN SSR			
INDONESIA	10			UNION of SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS			
IRAN				UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC	11 - 12		
IRAQ	15; 32-33			UNITED KINGDOM	3 - 5		
IRELAND	9			UNITED REPUBLIC of TANZANIA			
ISRAEL	2			UNITED STATES			
ITALY	16 - 17			UPPER VOLTA			
IVORY COAST				URUGUAY			
JAMAICA				VENEZUELA			
JAPAN				YEMEN			
JORDAN				YUGOSLAVIA	18 - 19		
KENYA				ZAMBIA			

EXCERPTS FROM THE VERBATIM RECORDS OF THE
TWENTY-SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
CONTAINING REFERENCES TO THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL AND TO THE SITUATION IN THE
MIDDLE EAST

General Debate

Mr. KRAG, Denmark (A/PV.1562 at page 36):

"... The views of the Danish Government are based upon the following principles which we consider equally valid: first, territorial gains should not be based upon military action; second, all Member States have a fundamental right to peaceful existence and, third, the Security Council is the United Nations organ which carries the main responsibility for the preparation and implementation of a comprehensive solution to the outstanding problems. In this respect the Danish Government agrees with the Secretary-General that it would be most helpful if he could receive appropriate authorization for the designation of a special representative to the Middle East. And we certainly also agree that such an appointee could serve as a sifter and harmonizer of ideas in the area..."

Mr. EBAN, Israel (A/PV.1566 at page 67):

"... These considerations have a direct bearing on the role of the United Nations in the Middle Eastern conflict. The fact that the United Nations was unable to prevent the war has a direct bearing on the question of its capacity and title to impose a peace. The interests of the parties and of the Organization itself require that United Nations action be realistically adapted to United Nations capacities. A call to Middle Eastern States to negotiate the conditions of their future coexistence is the most constructive course which the General Assembly can take. What the United Nations should strenuously avoid is the tendency to make its existence a substitute for negotiation and a barrier to direct settlement. This danger was frankly discussed by our Secretary-General in his annual report to the twenty-first session when he wrote:

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

(A/6301/Add.1, page 5)

Mr. BROWN, United Kingdom (A/PV.1567 at pages 46 to 48):

"... First the Middle East. It is deplorable that over three months after the end of the Arab-Israeli war we in the United Nations have not been able to agree on a constructive resolution tackling the main causes of the conflict. The debates in the emergency special session this summer and the proposals discussed privately at that time showed clearly that the weight of international opinion was for a balanced approach from which stability might emerge. Let us now build on this common ground.

"I should like to repeat what I said when I was here before: Britain does not accept war as a means of settling disputes, nor that a State should be allowed to extend its frontiers as a result of a war. This means that Israel must withdraw. But equally, Israel's neighbours must recognize its right to exist, and it must enjoy security within its frontiers. What we must work for in this area is a durable peace, the renunciation of all aggressive designs, and an end to policies which are inconsistent with peace.

"As I suggested in June and as the Secretary-General has himself recommended, there should be a special representative of the Secretary-General in the area, charged with making direct contact with the parties to the dispute. His would be no easy task. But that makes his appointment, we believe, the more necessary and the more urgent.

"Without delay we must tackle the question of ensuring the free use of international waterways. The denial of this right was one of the root-causes of this summer's trouble. As things stand, no country enjoys the use of the Suez Canal. Unless this route is quickly available again, there must inevitably be damaging changes in the pattern of world trade. The economies of the world would permanently reduce their dependence on routes of communication which can be blocked or interrupted for a long time.

"A perhaps even more urgent problem, if that is possible, is the problem of the people -- the individual people -- who have suffered personal loss and the disruption of their lives. The Assembly rightly expressed urgent concern for the refugees during its special emergency session. Last month a limited step was taken towards the alleviation of the problem when some former residents of the West Bank were allowed to return there. It is a matter of great regret to my Government and to myself that there has not been more progress in the return of innocent people to their homes. I heartily endorse Mr. Gussing's plea that the humanitarian aspects of the refugee situation be divorced from the political and military aspects.

"Looking to the future, imagination, co-operation and resources all will be needed. I believe that this Organization can play a decisive part in launching a constructive scheme for development in the Middle East which could show the way to wipe out that human misery which we call the refugee problem. What we need is a new and comprehensive and imaginative approach to the whole problem.

"I believe that Jerusalem too requires a special mention here. The British position was made quite clear when, with the vast majority of the Members of this Assembly, we voted this summer for the resolutions calling on Israel to do nothing to prejudice the status of Jerusalem. We stand by what we then said. This is not an issue between Israel and Jordan alone; three great religions of the world turn to the Old City as a sacred place.

"Speaking of actions tending to prejudice the status of Jerusalem, I am bound to add that I was concerned by the report which I read yesterday in The New York Times, according to which Israeli settlements are to be established in the occupied territories. I feel that the implications of this are clear and disturbing.

"It may well be that a wider United Nations presence will have a part to play in all this. Under the devoted leadership of General Odd Bull, UNTSO has done so much to restore calm where it has been allowed to operate. Perhaps this should be built upon. We would hope that the need for any such force would be short; we hope that a stable peace and good-neighbourliness will grow in the Middle East. We all know that the Secretary-General is right when he says that "The essential precondition ... in the Middle East is an end to incitement to hatred, the achievement of calm and a recourse to reason". (A/6701/Add.1. paragraph 51) We think that a United Nations presence could be crucial to the first steps on this path.

"My own view is that a settlement in the Middle East can come only through the United Nations Organization, and that we, the Members, must without delay seek to agree on the framework within which the Organization is to operate."

Mr. COSTA MENDEZ, Argentina (A/PV.1569 at page 7):

"... We should also like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for the prompt dispatch of his Special Representative, thus proving his concern over the protection, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place, as well as his concern to ensure scrupulous respect for the humanitarian principles which govern the treatment of prisoners of war and protection of civilians in times of war, pursuant to resolutions 237 of the Security Council and 2252 (ES-V), which my country had the honour to co-sponsor."

Mr. MARTIN, Canada (A/PV.1569 at page 42):

"... The first priority must be to see whether the efforts which were made at the special emergency session in July to work out a resolution combining some or all of these principles can be resumed and carried to a successful conclusion. If an agreement on principles could be reached, we should also, I think, take the advice of the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report and give him an appropriate authorization for the designation of a special representative to act as a much-needed channel of communication between the parties and as a reporter and interpreter of the events for this Organization. But even if it should prove impossible to reach agreement on a statement of principles, I believe that the United Nations should none the less send out to the area a special representative of the Secretary-General -- and do so without delay -- with a broad mandate to establish and maintain contacts with all sides and assist in the return of peaceful conditions. This appointment would not be a victory for any party, but a genuine demonstration of the responsibility of the United Nations to encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes.

./.

"I wish to say a special word concerning the refugees. The most recent report of the Secretary-General, based on the findings of his Representative, brings us once again face to face with our responsibility to preserve and strengthen "the dignity and worth of the human person". His report points to the urgent need for more international assistance of all kinds, and the Government of my country is considering how it can help further such assistance. Whatever generosity we can summon -- and I know that many Governments have been generous over the years in their response to the needs of the refugees in the Middle East -- this will not, however, be sufficient to solve the underlying problem. It is essential that justice be done to the rights and claims of the refugees in the framework of a general settlement."

Mr. BOURGUIBA, Tunisia (A/PV.1570 at pages 33 to 36):

"... We understand the concern of those who, like the Secretary-General himself, are afraid to see events return to the starting point; we understand that the majority of delegations in this hall refuse to accept a pure and simple return to the both confusing and explosive situation which prevailed before. But all Member States of the Organization must also understand what a dangerous precedent it would be if we were to link directly the withdrawal of troops from the territories occupied by force to conditions which would only end up as conditions imposed by the victor. If the Arabs were merely to submit -- which is of course what Israel seeks -- it would be tantamount to barring the United Nations from the debate, depriving our Organization of its very *raison d'être*, and endorsing the position taken by Israel, which would then logically demand direct negotiations. I say "logically" because such an attitude is part and parcel of the logic of the victor, of the law of the jungle, to which the Israeli leaders seem so joyously to cleave.

./.

"Tunisia, for its part, within the framework of Arab and human solidarity, will not fail to deploy its modest efforts to that end. The United Nations, by pronouncing itself clearly on the need to end the state of affairs created by force, will be able to play the role incumbent upon it in the search for the desired solution, a necessary and decisive role."

Mr. AIKEN, Ireland (A/PV.1571 at pages 2 to 5):

"... As the Secretary-General has stressed, there are many ingredients in the cure for belligerency. He rightly gives first place to conciliation and has suggested the designation by him of a Special Representative to the Middle East whose task would be to harmonize ideas, help find solutions for the current situation and prevent the recurrence of war in the area.

"My delegation feels that the powers of the Secretary-General are such as to enable him to designate on his own initiative a Special Representative for an area such as the Middle East in which a state of war exists or is threatened. In this connexion we recall that when, last December, in response to the strong urging of all the Members of the Organization, he accepted to serve for an additional term, the Security Council formally declared that it would "respect his position and his action". It seems to us, therefore, that, "having regard to the Secretary-General's conviction as to the usefulness of having a Special Representative for the Middle East, no further authorization is required. But, should a contrary view prevail, my delegation would urge that the requisite authority be granted at once by the Assembly, or by the Security Council.

"In his report of 12 July on UNEF the Secretary-General when dealing with conciliation referred to a peace-keeping operation as "a practical adjunct of peace-making" and said that its true function is "to create a climate of quiet which is more congenial to efforts to solve the underlying problems". (A/6672, para.21)

./.

Mr. MALIK, Indonesia (A/PV.1572 at page 43):

"... The Government of Indonesia cannot conceal its great disappointment over the outcome of the emergency special session of this Assembly that recently considered the crisis in the Middle East. Again, we should like to call upon all parties concerned to exert their most strenuous efforts towards reaching a lasting settlement. The large and powerful States have a special responsibility in this direction, since their very size and power give them unique responsibilities when the peace and security of the world are at stake. It is Indonesia's conviction that Member States, by utilizing the machinery available through the United Nations, ultimately serve their own best interests; we maintain that the United Nations is the best forum and machinery in which to seek a peaceful settlement. We continue to support the struggle of the Arab States. We remain convinced that the first step on the only path to permanent peace in the area is for the Israeli troops to be withdrawn to the positions they occupied prior to 5 June.

"Indeed, there was near unanimity in the emergency special session on the principle of no territorial gains by military conquest alone. We fully endorse the view of the Secretary-General that such a policy would lead to disastrous consequences if the United Nations were to compromise on this fundamental principle. Only then will it be possible to solve the other urgent problems, including the plight of the refugees and war casualties."

Mr. RIAD, United Arab Republic (A/PV.1573 at page 41):

"... In its meeting today the United Nations has another opportunity through which it may ascertain its role in the maintenance of international peace and security, the elimination of aggression and the safeguarding of the territorial integrity and political independence of States. We are in full agreement with the statement of the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his Annual Report in which he said:

"It is indispensable to an international community of States -- if it is not to follow the law of the jungle -- that the territorial integrity of every State be respected, and the occupation by military force of the territory of one State by another cannot be condoned."
(A/6701/Add.1, p.21)

"In considering the aggression which has taken place against the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries, the International Organization must be fully aware that it is also determining the future of international relations and the rule of law. If the General Assembly fails to perform this fundamental duty, what in the future would deter a State from committing aggression against another State, and what would make other countries feel secure? We are all faced today with one question: whether we are to live in a civilized world or whether we are on the threshold of an era of international chaos where force will rule supreme.

(A/PV.1573 at page 56):

"... On 23 May 1967, President Lyndon Johnson sent a message to President Gamal Abdel Nasser in which he urged the avoidance of hostilities.

./.

On 26 May, Mr. Eugene Rostow, United States Under-Secretary for Political Affairs, called the Ambassador of the United Arab Republic in Washington to inform him that Mr. Abba Eban, the Foreign Minister of Israel, had just arrived from Israel and had asked for an urgent meeting with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, on a matter which could not be delayed. During that meeting, Mr. Eban informed Mr. Rusk that the United Arab Republic was going to launch a surprise attack within the following twenty-four hours. Mr. Rostow informed the Ambassador of the United Arab Republic that he had been instructed by President Johnson to warn the United Arab Republic against any such action. He said that if this were to happen, it would have far-reaching consequences and added that the United States Government affirmed that it would continue to exert all its efforts with the Government of Israel to refrain from any military action against the United Arab Republic. President Nasser replied to President Johnson in a later message that the United Arab Republic would not initiate any use of force and would not go beyond its position of defence. President Nasser also informed Secretary-General U Thant of this same position during his visit to the United Arab Republic. This was stated by the Secretary-General in his report to the Security Council (S/7906).

"The United Arab Republic also declared its readiness to co-operate in seeking a solution to the crisis. It welcomed the visit of the Secretary-General to Cairo on 24 May, extended full co-operation to him and reacted positively to the proposals he made."

Mr. LEIGH, Sierra Leone (A/PV.1574 at pages 18 to 21):

"... For the third time in two decades there has been a full scale war in the Middle East and, but for the timely intervention of the Security Council which took prompt cease-fire action, the last war would still have been with us. The situation in the Middle East is not only well documented, but it has been discussed in almost every session of the Assembly. The fifth emergency special session was devoted entirely to a discussion of the basic issues in that area. But notwithstanding the long debates and the various resolutions which have been adopted, there is still the threat of war. It has been suggested that the parties to the dispute should themselves resolve their differences and try to effect a peaceful settlement. Since such a settlement has not been effected, it is incumbent on this Organization to take appropriate and concerted action in order to establish a just and lasting peace.

"The Secretary-General, in his introduction to the annual report, has indicated certain measures which should be taken to effect a lasting peace. The various delegations which have addressed this Assembly have dealt with these measures with varying degrees of emphasis. It is not my intention to reiterate these measures. There are, however, two principles which, in the opinion of my Government, are fundamental to any lasting settlement of the dispute. First, the occupation by military force of the territory of one State by another is a contravention of the provisions of the Charter. Secondly, it is the right of every State to exist in security within its own borders."

Mr. LUNS, Netherlands (A/PV.1576 at pages 28 to 31):

"... Once again, in this Assembly, the Middle East is on our agenda. The situation at issue is one which clearly threatens world peace. Therefore, we feel that the Assembly should discuss this question with restraint, because it is a problem which falls under the competence of the Security Council. Our hope is for a concerted effort by all parties to create a new and stable order in the Middle East, making possible the peaceful co-existence of countries and nations with all of whom we have age-old ties of close co-operation and freindship; nations whose civilizations, wisdom and spiritual contributions to the world have been most impressive.

"The positions taken by the various parties to the dispute during the present debate are rigid, and understandably so. But understanding is not enough. It is conceivable that the traumatic events of last summer will bring about new patterns of thought that may bring us closer to a solution. In a part of the world where so much intellectual energy is concentrated the creation of new structures must be possible. To continue aggravating present differences in the General Assembly seems pointless. Speaking for my Government, I recommend an early debate in the Security Council and a strengthening of the United Nations' peacekeeping role in the area. We support all initiatives to this end: the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General, observers and -- when desired and accepted by both sides -- a United Nations buffer force to give extra guarantees against a new explosion.

"All such measures will have our full support, and if necessary we are prepared to assist in guaranteeing permanent frontiers, security arrangements, and free passage through international waterways."

./.

Mr. KARJALAINEN, Finland (A/PV.1577 at pages 8 to 11):

"... Our conviction that we should strive to make this Organization universal has been strengthened by the experiences of the Middle Eastern crisis. While the war has caused damage to the normal fabric of relations between States, the United Nations offers all the parties a forum for discussion and contact. The events in the Middle East have also demonstrated once again that the United Nations has become indispensable to the international community as an instrument for keeping the peace. In spite of all the setbacks that we have experienced in the field of peace-keeping and the disagreements that prevail on the principles involved, the United Nations last June was able to act speedily and effectively when its services were needed for the supervision of the cease-fire agreements. In this situation neutral countries, whose objectivity is accepted by all the parties to the dispute, have once again been called upon to provide personnel for United Nations operations.

"Finland was among the Member States which, at the request of the Secretary-General, have sent observers to the Middle East. Finland's active and extensive participation in United Nations peace-keeping activities prompt me to lend our support to the suggestion of the Secretary-General that an effort be made to improve the practical capabilities of the United Nations to undertake necessary action in crisis situations. We on our part, together with the other Nordic countries, have already set up standby forces and regular training courses for United Nations service."

Mr. PACHACHI, Iraq (A/PV.1577 at page 82):

"... The main issue, therefore, before the United Nations is whether or not it should do nothing about a situation which the Secretary-General himself, in the introduction to his annual report, describes as a matter of grave concern to the future of this Organization. Are we going to allow the occupation of Member States? Are we going to allow that occupation to be used as a means for obtaining political advantages? If we are going to do this, then we shall have destroyed any possibility of establishing the kind of civilized international order that the Charter of the United Nations seeks to establish."

./.

Mr. LYNG, Norway, (A/PV.1578 at page 56):

"... My Government is of the opinion that it must be an important undertaking for the United Nations to bring this conflict out of the present deadlock. I shall not in this context elaborate on the various formal and procedural questions involved. I shall confine myself to say that my Government fully supports the idea to designate a special United Nations representative who could assist in the return of peaceful conditions. We also welcome the efforts of third parties to aid in creating conditions for a settlement. It would be particularly helpful if the understanding reached between the United States and the Soviet Union during the emergency session could serve as a basis for progress."

Mr. PICCIONI, Italy (A/PV.1579 at pages 57 to 60):

"... In the first place, it seems evident that the majority of Member States of the United Nations agree on two specific points: every State has a legitimate right to its own existence and security, and military conquest does not imply territorial gain.

"In the second place, as has been clearly stated in the Introduction to the Annual Report of the Secretary-General, there cannot be any disagreement over the fact that the underlying cause of the present crisis was the failure during the previous twenty years to find a solution to the fundamental problems of the region, namely, the right of all States to free and innocent passage through the Strait of Tiran and the Suez Canal, the formal and effective cessation of the state of belligerency between the Arab countries and the State of Israel and the problem of the Arab refugees.

"On those aspects of the problem, there is a significant concurrence of views in the General Assembly. There has been no official change, however, in the position of the parties directly concerned, and they still do not appear to be ready to accept the view of the majority, views for which the Secretary-General has acted as spokesman.

./.

"Faced with this situation, we must not only not be disheartened, we must not, even for an instant, either relax our efforts to achieve the peaceful solution for which we all hope or lose sight of our clearly defined obligations.

"Those obligations are manifold. In the first place, we have an obligation to promote a relaxation of tension by refraining from inciting one party against another. Secondly, we have an obligation to halt the dangerous arms race in the area. Thirdly, we must all do our utmost to heal the wounds suffered by the innocent victims of the military conflict. Lastly, our main task is gradually to bring the parties concerned, by means of example and persuasion, to accept the rules of international law as the supreme law and to fulfil strictly all the obligations imposed by the Charter.

"The world is watching us, the world is watching you. If we, who are not among the parties most directly involved, are guided by our conscience, then I have no doubt that our attitude and our conduct will greatly help those States which are directly involved to readjust their respective positions gradually and on a reciprocal and simultaneous basis, so that it will be possible to achieve the satisfactory lasting and peaceful solution which at present is still so remote. If any help in this direction can be provided from such sources as a Special Representative of the Secretary-General or by a mediator appointed by him, such a development will be most welcome.

Mr. KHOMAN, Thailand (A/PV.1580 at page 21)

"... The fact that there has been an outbreak of large-scale war three times in the Middle East in the past twelve years is a clear indication of the explosive situation in the area. Yet previous efforts were mainly directed towards making arrangements for bringing about a cease-fire and a cessation of hostilities without attempting to resolve the fundamental causes which led to such hostilities. Failures of the United Nations so far to face the problem squarely have been, to quote the Secretary-General, "a major contributing factor to the war last June."

It is therefore advisable for us now to try not merely to liquidate the consequences of the war but also to seek at the same time to create necessary conditions which could ensure better prospects for more lasting peace in the Middle East? Withdrawal of troops from occupied areas however immediate and imperative, should, in our view, also be accompanied by additional steps which would remove the basic causes of the armed conflict."

Mr. NIKEZIC, Yugoslavia (A/PV.1580 at page 41)

"... The general debate and the consultations which are taking place seem to point to basic elements of what at this moment might represent the framework of a solution. Here I have in mind in particular the disapproval of territorial claims, the withdrawal of forces, respect for the independence and territorial integrity of States, and guarantees for their security. If we could agree on the reaffirmation of those principles it would facilitate the solution of other complex issues, such as the Palestine refugees and the Suez Canal. It would be possible, within such a context, to consider engaging a special representative of the Secretary-General to assist us in that task. We believe that it is reasonable to expect that the acceptance of such a

basis, followed by an understanding on the measures to be taken, would clear the way for comprehensive solutions and for peace in the Middle East."

Mr. DUGERSUREN, Mongolia (A/PV.1580 at page 52)

"... We are in full agreement with the opinion of the Secretary-General that there should be no territorial gains by military conquests, that it would lead to disastrous consequences if the United Nations were to abandon or compromise that fundamental principle."

"It is most urgent in these days that this principle be strictly observed."

Mr. HAKIM, Lebanon (A/PV.1582 at pages 7 to 15):

"... In the introduction to his annual report, our distinguished Secretary-General spoke of a "'crisis' of confidence" which the United Nations is facing. He said that:

"... this 'crisis' is in itself an index of the high hopes that Member States have come to place in the Organization, and their faith that these serious problems can and should be solved by determined efforts and a spirit of co-operation on the part of the Governments of Member States" (A/6701/Add.1, para. 169).

He described the United Nations correctly as an instrument of multilateral diplomacy which could be used effectively by Member States. As the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, the Right Honourable George Brown, put it, our Organization is what we make it. The question is why should we not make it an effective instrument for peace and international co-operation. This is a question which I would address to the great majority of Member States which are the small and developing countries and which need the United Nations most for their national security and their economic and social development. Perhaps the great and rich Powers can do without it. They can take care of their own national security and progress. But we the small and developing nations would suffer a grievous and irreparable loss if the United Nations becomes ineffective and unable to fulfil the promise of the Charter.

"We must work together to prevent the withering away of our Organization. To us, the small and developing nations, it is indeed our Organization, and we must do everything in our power to bring it back to health and strength. We cannot afford to let it sicken and fail and fall into disrepute. We cannot tolerate violations of its Charter. We cannot condone aggression. We must rise above our narrow national and regional interest and uphold the Charter in the common interest of peace and progress for all the peoples of the world.

"That leads me to comment on Israel's attitude to the United Nations responsibility for peace in the Middle East. In his statement of 25 September, the Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Eban, sought to limit the role of the United Nations in what he called "the Middle Eastern conflict". He said:

./.

"The fact that the United Nations was unable to prevent the war has a direct bearing on the question of its capacity and title to impose a peace. The interests of the parties and of the Organization itself require that United Nations action be realistically adapted to United Nations capacities. A call to Middle Eastern States to negotiate the conditions of their future coexistence is the most constructive course which the General Assembly can take. What the United Nations should strenuously avoid is the tendency to make its existence a substitute for negotiation and a barrier to direct settlement."
(1566th meeting, p.67)

"In his intervention on 3 October he repudiated the Armistice Agreements and called for the conclusion of peace treaties between Israel and the Arab States and asserted that:

"Apart from the cease-fire agreement, there are now no valid effective contractual engagements between the States of the Middle East." (1577th meeting, p.72)

"I wish now to make the following observations:

"Firstly, the United Nations has exercised authority and responsibility for the Palestine question for the last twenty years. In fact, Israel owes its very creation to the United Nations. By its resolution of 29 November 1947 on the partition of Palestine the General Assembly created a Jewish State, which became Israel in 1948. But the Zionists were able to expand the territory of their State by force beyond the borders assigned to it by the Assembly. Thus from the day of its birth Israel committed aggression against, and occupation of, Arab territory, thus proving beyond any doubt its expansionist nature and ambitions.

"Secondly, the United Nations was responsible for the conclusion of the Armistice Agreements which Israel now repudiates. Mr. Eban stands in

./.

contradiction to Secretary-General U Thant's statement on the validity of those Agreements in the Introduction to his Annual Report. Our Secretary-General says in paragraph 43 of that Introduction:

"On the other hand there has been no indication either in the General Assembly or the Security Council that the validity and applicability of the Armistice Agreements have been changed as a result of the recent hostilities or of the war of 1956; each agreement, in fact, contains a provision that it will remain in force 'until a peaceful settlement between the parties is achieved'. Nor has the Security Council or the General Assembly taken any steps to change the pertinent resolutions of either organ relating to the Armistice Agreements or to the earlier cease-fire demands. The Agreements provide that by mutual consent the signatories can revise or suspend them. There is no provision in them for unilateral termination of their application. This has been the United Nations position all along and will continue to be the position until a competent organ decides otherwise." (A/6701/Add.1)

"There can be no more forceful expression or more authorized opinion on the status and validity of the Armistice Agreements.

"Thirdly, the Arab States have declared their willingness to work for a political settlement through the United Nations. They are supported by the great majority of Member States. Such a settlement should provide for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab territories occupied after 5 June. In view of the history of the Palestine question, however, there can be no recognition of Israel, negotiation with Israel, or conclusion of a peace treaty with Israel. The Arab States are all committed to these basic principles of Arab policy. It is up to the United Nations, which has assumed responsibility for the Palestine question and peace in the Middle East during the last twenty years, to work out a peaceful solution to the present conflict.

./.

"Fourthly, Article 33 of the Charter provides for several different means for the pacific settlement of disputes among States. Negotiation is only one of them. The others are: "enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice". Article 33 also provides that "The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means."

"Finally, conditions of peace do not always result from diplomatic recognition or negotiations or peace treaties between States. The greatest war in history, the Second World War, ended in 1945, and conditions of peace exist in Central Europe. But there have been no peace negotiations or peace treaties between the States concerned.

"Israel's attitude to the United Nations and the Armistice Agreements concluded under the authority of the Security Council is not new. Israel denounced the Armistice Agreement with Egypt in 1956 when the Israeli army invaded Egyptian territory and occupied large areas in the Sinai peninsula. It also refused to participate in the Syrian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission for many years."

(A/PV.1582 at page 17):

"... Can anyone explain why Israel has annexed the purely Arab old city of Jerusalem? Can anyone justify the refusal of Israel to accept the two General Assembly resolutions 2253 and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967 regarding Jerusalem? Those two resolutions call on Israel to desist from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. The Holy City is of concern to all Christians, Moslems and Jews and to the whole of mankind. But Israel insists on defying the United Nations and the whole world by taking unilateral action amounting to annexation of the Arab old city of Jerusalem. Whether it is called

./.

integration or annexation, it means the same thing. The Israeli answer to the two Assembly resolutions is given clearly in the Secretary-General's report (S/8146) of 12 September 1967. The report states:

"The Israel authorities stated unequivocally that the process of integration was irreversible and not negotiable." (S/8146, para.35)

Mr. WANE, Mauritania (A/PV.1582 at page 27):

"... The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania fully shares the opinion expressed by the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his report, which states in paragraph 49:

"It is indispensable to an international community of States -- if it is not to follow the law of the jungle -- that the territorial integrity of every State be respected, and the occupation by military force of the territory of one State by another cannot be condoned." (A/6701/Add.1, paragraph 49)

"Therefore, the United Nations must put an end to the grave violations of the sacred principles of the Charter and insist on the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories which they occupy in the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan."

Mr. SWARAN SINGH, India (A/PV.1582 at pages 36 to 37):

"... In the days preceding the outbreak of conflict last June, it was India's earnest and constant endeavour, both inside and outside the United Nations, to help preserve peace in West Asia by urging restraint on all parties. We stood firmly behind the Secretary-General's efforts to gain a breathing spell during which quiet diplomacy could be used to resolve the crisis. After Israel's attack on its Arab neighbours we and several other members of the Security Council advocated an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed

./.

forces to the positions held prior to the outbreak of hostilities. We did this because of our firm conviction that a cease-fire without a simultaneous call for a withdrawal of alien armed forces was not only contrary to the eminent practice of the United Nations but also against its fundamental principle of non-use of force in international relations and the principle that territorial gains should not be made through military conquest. The deliberations of the fifth emergency special session, even though inconclusive, have shown a near unanimity among member nations on these fundamental principles. It is a matter of regret, therefore, that no progress has been made in securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories and in bringing peace and security to the area. India firmly urges that this impasse must be broken. We must all realize that failure to find a solution for the problems of West Asia would lead to even graver threats to peace. It is our belief that the foundation of lasting peace in West Asia should be built on certain basic and fundamental principles of our Charter, in particular those contained in Article 2. First, there must be a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab lands under their occupation. Secondly, all States must respect the territorial integrity and political independence of one another in accordance with the Charter of this Organization. Thirdly, all outstanding problems in the region should be settled exclusively through peaceful means. Finally, the just rights of the Arab refugees must be safeguarded. As the Secretary-General has reminded us:

"... people everywhere, and this certainly applies to the Palestinian refugees, have a natural right to be in their homeland and to have a future". (A/6701/Add.1, para. 49)

Mr. AL-JABER AL-SABAH, Kuwait (A/PV.1583 at page 36):

"... Israel has persisted in flouting General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) calling upon it to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. These resolutions had been adopted by an overwhelming majority.

./.

Israel also disregarded General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) and Security Council resolution 237 (1967) calling upon it to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities. Suffice it to draw the attention of the Assembly to the reports on these issues prepared by the Personal Representatives of the Secretary-General which furnish incontrovertible proof of Israel's contempt for the will of the United Nations and its rejection of the norms of international law."

(A/PV.1583 at pages 37 to 40):

"... The State of Kuwait which firmly believes in the principles and aims of the United Nations considers the world Organization as the proper forum for eliminating the consequences of Israel's aggression on the Arab States. We assert this for many reasons. We should keep in mind that the United Nations has assumed a special responsibility towards the Palestine question twenty years ago and over the years adopted numerous resolutions which have not been implemented on account of Israeli intransigence. Israel's perennial policy is aimed at usurping the legitimate rights of the native inhabitants, and facing the world with a *fait accompli*. Israel was admitted to the United Nations on the faith of an undertaking to discharge its obligations towards the world Organization. Foremost among these are the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly regarding the Palestine question which, inter alia, recognize the right of the Arab refugees to return to their homes and live in dignity in their fatherland.

"The United Nations reaffirmed its responsibility on many occasions through the medium of its main organs. This same responsibility was acknowledged by the Palestine Conciliation Commission in its previous reports and has been reaffirmed by the Secretary-General in his recent report. It is a legal responsibility which the United Nations originally assumed and cannot abandon

./.

by allowing the *fait accompli* to be the final arbiter. We welcome the statement in the introduction to the annual report of the Secretary-General that:

"There is a desperate need for a determined, immediate and urgent effort by the United Nations to help bring about the conditions essential to peace in the Middle East." (A/6701/Add.1, para.46)

"We should like to express to him our appreciation for the sincere efforts he made to put into practice the principles and the aims of this Organization."

(A/PV.1583 at page 42):

"... The Israeli aggression committed last June which led to the military occupation of Arab territory will not affect the legal status of the Armistice Agreements concluded in 1949. The proper thing to do is to honour the provisions of those Agreements and refrain from violating the Armistice lines. The obligations contained in those Agreements are binding on all parties and cannot be unilaterally abrogated.

"The Secretary-General clearly stated on the second page of his Annual Report: 'Israel had denounced the Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission and for some years had refused to participate in it'. He was thus objecting to Israel's unilateral non-compliance with the provisions of the Agreements as being illegal.

"In chapter 5 of the introduction to his annual report the Secretary-General stated:

"... there has been no indication either in the General Assembly or the Security Council that the validity and applicability of the Armistice Agreements have been changed as a result of the recent hostilities or of the war of 1956." (A/6701, Add.1, p.18)

./.

The Secretary-General added:

"Nor has the Security Council or the General Assembly taken any steps to change the pertinent resolutions of either organ relating to the Armistice Agreements". (Ibid)

He also explained:

"There is no provision in them for unilateral termination of their application". (Ibid)

"That is the policy of the United Nations as expounded by the Secretary-General, which is in harmony with the norms of public international law and the principles of the Charter. While we uphold those obligations we call upon all Governments to reaffirm that the provisions of those Agreements are still in force and to act on that basis."

Mr. PIRZADA, Pakistan (A/PV.1584 at pages 56 to 57)

"Israel's defiance is manifest from many actions and utterances of the Israeli authorities. Their disregard of the universal religious interests in Jerusalem is apparent from one example which I may quote here from the document appended as Annex 1-E of the Secretary-General's report. According to this, the Israeli Minister for Religion stated:

"The Liberation of Jerusalem has placed all the Christian Holy Places, and an important part of the Muslim Holy Places, under the province of Israel, and has returned to the Jewish their Holy Places. But Israel has other Holy Places in East Jordan, and the Holy Mosque in Jerusalem, though Holy to other religions ... is a Jewish shrine, but we are not thinking at the present of building our temple there, though we will do all we can about it, and we will build all the Jewish Synagogues in the Old City and enlarge the area of Al-Baraw Wall as soon as possible.

"As to the Holy Ibrahimi Mosque, the Cave is a Jewish shrine which we have bought, in the same way we have bought the Holy Rock in the days of David and the Yabusins, and our rights in the Cave and the Rock are rights of Conquest and acquisition." (A/6793, annex I, part E, pages 52 and 53)

"We had all thought that, in this day and age when the Charter is already twenty-two years old, colonialism was no longer valid and that no territory was to be conquered or acquired by force. But Israel is determined to disabuse us all of this notion. It talks of the right of conquest or acquisition.

"Such an attitude needs to be checked. Continued defiance of the Assembly's resolutions on Jerusalem has not only jeopardized peace and stability in the Middle East. It has also outraged the sentiments of peoples all over the world. Jerusalem is not only the focus of the conflict in the Middle East. It also commands the deepest spiritual allegiance of the devotees of three great religions in the world."

Mr. KYPRIANOU, Cyprus (A/PV.1585 at page 18-20)

"The current international situation has been very aptly and accurately presented by the Secretary-General in his Introduction to the Annual Report. At the beginning he states:

"During the period under review the international political situation has not only not improved; it has in fact deteriorated considerably. It was only

recently that I noted how the war in Viet-Nam has been progressively intensified during the last two and a half years, how the number of men and the amount of war material involved in the actual fighting have immensely increased, how the savagery of the war has steadily escalated, and the casualties on the part of all parties involved in the fighting have reached frightening proportions. In addition, the flare-up in the Middle East in June of this year, which was sudden though not surprising, has led to a further deterioration of the international scene. The war in the Middle East has tended to overshadow the situation in Cyprus, which has shown no great improvement during this period." (A/6701/Add.1, para.1)."

(A/PV.1585 at page 21)

"We are all aware of the history and the background of the Middle East crisis. The relevant facts are especially well known to this Assembly. We, however, must admit that, despite our long debates over the years, we have not made any effective contribution towards the solution of the underlying problems. The Secretary-General in this respect states:

'There has been no enduring, persistent effort in any United Nations organ to find solutions for them. In my view, the failure of the United Nations over these years to come to grips with the deep-seated and angrily festering problems in that area has to be considered as a major contributing factor to the war of last June ...' (Ibid, page 19)

How true this is. And how wrong have proved to be those, if any, who believed that the problems of the Middle East would be solved by themselves, as time went by. But it is not enough simply to take cognizance of the facts of a situation. We must also determine what can and what should be done."

Mr. EL-BISHTI, Libya (A/PV.1585 at pages 47 to 50)

"... Israel has undertaken certain basic measures designed to change the administrative and educational structure of the occupied areas. I may mention here that even the property and personnel of the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force did not escape Israeli aggression and arrogance. We read in the Secretary-General's Report how United Nations property was looted and its personnel molested by the Israeli troops. The latest news of Israeli settlements in the illegally occupied areas, and in defiance of the United Nations Charter, testifies to their expansionist and territorial ambitions. In this connexion, I would invite all Members of this Assembly to compare these facts with the statements we all heard from various Israeli leaders at the beginning of the present crisis — that their war was purely defensive and that they sought neither territorial expansion nor conquest."

Mr. ARIKPO, Nigeria (A/PV.1586 at page 51)

"... A long and arduous special session failed to find an agreed solution, but it was none the less a useful session. The gap in thinking is narrower today than it was at the start of that session. It is now generally agreed that no country should be allowed to achieve territorial gains by military conquest. It is also agreed that we must help create a political climate in the Middle East in which all the inhabitants in that area of the world will live hereafter in reasonable peace and security. How to achieve those ends satisfactorily to our conscience and satisfactorily to the requisite majority of the Member States of the United Nations is the unfinished task to which we are going to devote more energy this session, and a task to which Nigeria stands ready as usual to make its contribution both in the Assembly and in the Security Council. Incidentally, we are favourably disposed towards the Secretary-General's suggestion that he should be authorized to designate a special representative who would serve inter alia as a reporter and interpreter of events in the area."

Mr. PACHACHI, Iraq (A/PV.1586 at page 66)

"... The central issue emerging from this debate, as indeed was the case in the emergency session, is the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territories. I can do no better than repeat what the Secretary General said in the introduction to his annual report on this fundamental question of principle. His words express, better than I can ever hope to express, the concern that the military occupation of territories of Member States has evoked throughout the world. He said:

"There is the immediate and urgently challenging issue of the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel from the territory of neighbouring Arab States occupied during the recent war. There is near unanimity on this issue, in principle, because everyone agrees that there should

./.

be no territorial gains by military conquest. It would, in my view, lead to disastrous consequences if the United Nations were to abandon or compromise this fundamental principle". (A/6701/Add.1, page 20)

Further he said:

"It is indispensable to an international community of States -- if it is not to follow the law of the jungle -- that the territorial integrity of every State be respected, and the occupation by military force of the territory of one State by another cannot be condoned." (Ibid., page 21)

"I know that many of my colleagues in this Hall have quoted those passages from the Introduction to the Annual Report, but those words are of such primary importance for the future of the Organization that I considered it my duty to repeat them in this statement."

Mr. GRIMES, Liberia (A/PV.1587 at page 57):

"... In the introduction to his annual report, the Secretary-General enunciated the following fundamental principles which could be usefully applied to the Middle East crisis:

1. The territorial integrity of every State must be respected.
2. The occupation by military force of the territory of one State by another cannot be condoned.
3. Every State's right to exist must be accepted by all other States.
4. Every State is entitled to security within its own borders.
5. The Palestine Arab refugees "have a natural right to be in their homeland and to have a future".
6. There should be free and unimpeded navigation for all through international waterways according to international conventions.

./.

"The Liberian Government endorses these principles and feels that if they could be accepted as binding by all the parties to the conflict, in negotiations direct or indirect, and faithfully executed and guaranteed by the international community, it might open the path to a new era of peace and co-operation in the Middle East."

Mr. KHANDJI, Syrian Arab Republic (A/PV.1590 at page 26)

"For the crisis of the Middle East, and the subsequent inability of the United Nations to act fully to liquidate the results of aggression, reflect the weakness of the existing international order. Consequently, unless the forces striving for the good and peace of mankind are united, and unless the peoples of the Third World, threatened as we are threatened, combine their efforts to stop this deterioration, we shall find ourselves ruled by the law of the jungle, to which the Secretary-General has referred in the introduction to his annual report (A/6701/Add.1)."

(A/PV.1590 at pages 31 to 32)

"As for the fate of the new refugees, our Assembly has received the report of the Secretary-General's Personal Representative regarding the plight of these innocent victims of Israel's recent aggression who have been refused the legitimate right to return to their homes."

Prince SOUVANNA PHOUMA, Laos (A/PV.1590 at page 42)

"The year that has elapsed has been marked by an explosion of violence and hatred everywhere in the world. The escalation of war is paralleled by an escalation of hate, rancour and anguish. Violence, Secretary-General U Thant has said in his report, ceases to be the exception and has become the rule. Millions of men wonder with alarm over their fate. The sacred principles of the United Nations Charter are abused and flouted to such an extent that our Organization, which is now entering upon its twenty-second year of existence, has become weak, surrounded by evil forces. That kind of pollution, disorder and violence has for three years poisoned the international climate and prevented any action and any search for a compromise in the numerous and complex problems confronting the conscience of the world. The representatives who have preceded me to this rostrum have spoken of their apprehension and concern regarding this increasing danger. A very recent war, which should never have broken out, upset the Middle East and gave rise for several days to great alarm in the whole world. My delegation had the opportunity to express its point of view in this most serious matter during the emergency session. It does so again today, not in order to impute guilt and responsibility to any State, but to ask the Powers concerned not to take refuge in a verbal and legal jungle and to put an end to the songs of hate so that that area, which in twenty years has known hostilities three times, will finally be able to live in peace."