



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

SEP 20 1980

1735th

MEETING: 26 JULY 1973

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1735)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973); (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)	
Expression of farewell to Sir Colin Crowe, representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	19

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 26 July 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1735)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929).

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken previously by the Security Council in the course of the discussion of the item before us, I shall now proceed, with the consent of the Council, to invite the 20 representatives of States non-members of the Council participating in the discussion to be seated in this chamber in conformity with the established practice.

2. Accordingly, as I hear no objection, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Israel and Jordan to take places at the Council table, and the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, Chad, the Syrian Arab Republic, Nigeria, Algeria, Morocco, the United Arab Emirates, Somalia, Guyana, Mauritania, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Iran, Bahrain and Tunisia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to be seated at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan) took places at the Security Council table; and

Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. E. O. Ogbu (Nigeria) and Mr. R. Driss (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to recall that a draft resolution has been submitted by the delegations of Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, the Sudan and Yugoslavia and circulated in document S/10974.

4. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): Mr. President, my delegation is delighted to welcome you back in the Security Council in order to preside over its meetings in the debate on the whole Middle East question. It is a matter of great satisfaction that your Government has seen fit to highlight the importance of these meetings by calling you back to preside over the Council during these deliberations. My delegation is very pleased that the Council is once more able to profit from your vast experience, skill and admirable character. I am pleased that my Foreign Minister was here to extend appropriate compliments and appreciation to your predecessor in the Chair, Ambassador Malik of the USSR.

5. I have asked to speak in order to make a short statement after the introduction by the representatives of India, Kenya, Indonesia and Yugoslavia, with their well-known clarity and forceful argument and on behalf of the eight sponsors, of the draft resolution in document S/10974.

6. I should like to state that my delegation has sponsored the draft resolution as a member of the non-aligned countries and as one of the eight delegations empowered by the last African summit to convey to the Council the decisions of the totality of Africa condemning Israel for its military occupation of Arab lands and demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied territories and the establishment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

7. My delegation agrees that, as already pointed out by the representatives who introduced the draft resolution, it was formulated in what we consider to be the minimum that can be adopted with unanimity in the Council at this stage. Therefore, the draft resolution deals primarily with the actual conditions in the region which frustrate the efforts being deployed by the Council in order to bring about a just and lasting peace in the region.

8. During the early stage of this debate Mr. Tekoah indulged in sweeping generalizations and romantic and yet inconceivable theories like the theory of nations which he

then volunteered to submit to this Council. In order to refresh his memory, I beg to quote his own words:

"It was at the dawn of time . . . that the Jewish people emerged as a nation, distinct not only in its political personality but also as a separate cultural and religious entity. For more than a thousand years this people maintained its sovereignty over the land of Israel." [1724th meeting, para. 154.]

He went on to say:

"In the meantime, the Jews exiled to foreign lands preserved their identity as a nation and remained bound to their homeland by the civilization and religion of which they were bearers. Their faith, culture, customs . . . and even their clothing made their lives a continuation of the existence in their homeland." [Ibid., para. 159.]

9. Since we are now beyond the debating stage in the Council, I shall refrain from indulging in drawing the implications of such a wild argument. The facts are these: The Palestinian Arabs have been in Palestine for over 13 centuries and, until the Balfour Declaration, they owned—as they still own—94 per cent of its total land. At the time of that Declaration they constituted 94 per cent of its population, while only 6 per cent was the Jewish community. In addition to factors of religion, culture, civilization, customs, and even clothing and food, they have legally owned 94 per cent of the land of Palestine for the last 13 centuries, and they constitute a nation of over 2.5 million people. Such legality cannot be transferred to any people who have lived under different nationalities and States for the past 13 centuries, nor can it be justifiably conferred on a community that constituted only 6 per cent as against 94 per cent at the time of the Balfour Declaration.

10. Yet the statement of Mr. Tekoah is significant in what it deliberately omits; I refer, for example, to the implication that the Jewish immigrants should continue the policy of annexation of Arab lands and eviction of Palestinians and other Arab citizens. For the same reason, Israel has committed, and continues to commit, these acts in the region, even after the Arab side has agreed to abide by the Charter for a political solution. Indeed, in addition to the injuries committed by Israel against the Palestinian people during the last 25 years, and in addition to the three wars it has waged against the Arab States, in 1948, 1956 and 1967, together with the acts of aggression and terrorism, Israel adamantly refuses to abide by the principles of the Charter and withdraw its military forces from all the Arab territories it continues to occupy.

11. It is well known now that the announced policy of creating facts that is being executed in the occupied Arab lands through vast evictions and dispersals of Palestinian people, and through the creation of military settlements and by changing the physical character of these lands, is in itself complete evidence of Israel's policy of permanent occupation, to be followed by annexation, to be followed in turn by yet another occupation.

12. We have repeatedly affirmed our absolute conviction that it is beyond the capacity of any aggressor, of any

Power, of any weapons to hold back the tide of national aspiration of any people, and it is equally impossible and inadmissible in this age to maintain any military occupation indefinitely. It is most certain that persistence on the part of Israel in maintaining such aggression will render peace more and more remote from realization.

13. It is also our conviction and our position that immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all of the occupied Arab territories is the first step and the only step that can pave the way to a political solution. For achieving a real, a just and a lasting peace, the Palestinian people must obtain their inalienable rights.

14. It is from this conviction and this position that my delegation has sponsored the draft resolution before us. It is our understanding also that, should Israel persist in frustrating and blocking the United Nations efforts to promote peace in the region, the views expressed by the majority of delegations in this Council during the present debate will be presented again and more forcefully to the Council at the highest level of representation.

15. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the Foreign Minister of Egypt, on whom I now call.

16. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, it is indeed with a sense of great respect, even of awe, that I address these final words to the Council—under the light in this chamber. We believed in the Charter of the United Nations; we decided to guide our steps by its words. You represent a country that has tried all policies in the furthering of its national aims and aspirations. But victors though you were at the end of the Second World War you, together with other united nations, knew very well that victors and victims are both losers in any war, and that therefore there is no salvation for the world except through a decision, a determination by the peoples of the world to live by law, under law, under the Charter freely accepted by all Members of the United Nations.

17. Mr. President, I sit in this hall, and behind you I see a mural with dungeons and chains depicting the forces of domination, of occupation, of imperialism, of coercion of the will and the wishes of the world's peoples in order to make them serve some passing national policy. But I also see that those who have dreamed of a "brave new world" have seen the chains broken, have seen domination ended, and indeed have seen the phoenix rise from its ashes to create a new world under the Charter, under law. In this I believe. Unlike the sceptics, unlike those who, by reason of their shortsightedness, believe only in the power of today, I believe in the United Nations. In the end we will find that all power comes to an end; in the end we will find that all occupation will be removed; in the end we will find that law and justice will prevail.

18. In one of the statements made by Israel here it was made very obvious that they regard the light in this chamber as only an artificial light. In other statements they said that, unless we do this or that, the United Nations will have no role to play, Waldheim will have nothing to do. We must really know whether or not the United Nations has any role at all.

19. We came to this Council in 1967, asking for what we thought—and still think—was right: an order for unconditional, immediate and total withdrawal of the forces of aggression that had invaded our lands—while all the big Powers were admonishing us not to be the first to shoot, not to be the first to defend our territorial integrity. The USSR, for example, is indeed now logical in the light of its admonition because, having found that this has been defied by Israel, it has broken off relations with Israel. France is in the same logical situation. But I am not going to go on enumerating countries and their positions. As I said, in 1967 we came with this request; and I say very openly that the Council found that the request was perhaps really logical and indeed legal. The Council thought it had an opportunity to put an end to all the problems of the Middle East. They came with a “package deal”; they came with resolution 242 (1967); they came with the special mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. We have obeyed, again because we believe in the United Nations—not only as a shelter for nations that have no atom bombs, but because it is really in the best interests of all mankind, as found by the victors in the Second World War themselves.

20. We accepted resolution 242 (1967), we accepted the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, we accepted his aide-mémoire of February 1971; and not a single one of those acceptances was based on our view that this was the legal or the right thing to do: we thought that this was what the United Nations, what mankind, wanted us to do. We accepted this in obedience to the will of the United Nations.

21. Again, it would have been our request now to have a very short draft resolution ordering the occupation forces to be removed immediately and unconditionally. Again, it would have been our position now to ask that all the rights of the Palestinian people be given to them—as, indeed, they should be given to every nation in the world. But again there is before the Council a draft resolution prepared by its eight non-aligned members. Again in deference to world will, we accept it because if this draft is adopted, the Council would reaffirm that the occupation of the Arab territories is contrary to the Charter and that those territories must therefore be restored. The Council would in no ambiguous terms support the initiatives of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and confirm that they were well within his mandate and that, as contained in his aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971, they should be complied with. The Council would express its conviction that a just and lasting peaceful solution of the problem can be achieved only on the basis of respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity and the rights and legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians. That would go some way towards meeting our request. The Council would also declare what is obvious: that in the occupied territories no changes which may obstruct a peaceful and final settlement or adversely affect the political and other fundamental rights of all the inhabitants of those territories should be introduced or recognized.

22. Israel's position has been made only too clear. It believes in the right of conquest—indeed, the right to conquer and conquer so that Israel may in the end be

complete, realizing the Zionist dream of ingathering in Palestine all the Jews now in exile in other parts of the world. Mr. Ben-Gurion once said in London that the Israel of today is only 14 per cent complete—meaning that since only 14 per cent of the Jews of the world are in Israel its borders or boundaries must remain open-ended until it can indeed ingather the rest of the Jews of the world and fulfil the Zionist dream. Many times he told us that it was his intention not to mention borders for Israel in Israel's so-called Declaration of Independence—which was against the wishes and the will and the determination of many prominent Jewish lawyers. He was asked what country had ever been declared without boundaries. His reply was, “The United States of America.” And he said that thanks to the non-mention of boundaries in the American Declaration of Independence, the original states have been extended so that present-day America extends from one ocean to the other.

23. Expansion was in the minds of the dreamers of the Zionist State; it is still in their policies and in their minds. That is not really very dangerous, except that we now have new theories from the new globalists of the world. In President Nixon's latest report to the Congress, we came across this sentence:

“New patterns of stability have not yet been established in the area of the Middle East. Two world wars and the rising tide of nationalism have broken down the pre-1914 order”.

Nothing has replaced the pattern of stability which existed in 1914. What order was there prior to 1914? Colonialism, great empires, subjugation of the peoples of the Middle East—all have existed for decades. Are we to understand that the solution of the problem of the Middle East really depends on remapping the Middle East, on the establishment of another imperial order under which new subjugation and new hegemony would be the new pattern of stability in the Middle East? Is this really an opening for the wild Zionist dream of enlarging the 14 per cent to 100 per cent? Are we really to see a new imperial pattern in our area of the world which, indeed, would allow the spokesman of Israel to speak for Jordan, to speak for Egypt, to invade Lebanon, to take prisoners from Lebanon and try them according to Israeli new law, giving Israel the possibility of trying any citizen of any country for anything it considers to be a crime against the security of Israel? Is that the new empire I and my children are going to see? Is that really the desire of Israel and its supporters?

24. But today we limit ourselves to considering the draft now before the Council, and we say that voting in favour of that draft so that it could be adopted would be a message to the Arab peoples of Egypt and all the Arab countries. Voting against it will also be a message to the Arab peoples of Egypt and all the Arab countries. The first message would be, “The world is with you, and with patience, and supported by our responsibility for collective security, peace can be established on the basis of justice”. That is the message that will come from every affirmative vote cast in this Council.

25. The other message, the message that we shall get from any negative vote, is this: “Regardless of what you think is

legal, you must think of what is possible; regardless of the Charter, you must think of world realities, and those realities say to you: Either surrender to Israel—and we can help you save face by saying that the negotiations took place under occupation, with Israeli pre-conditions, and that Israel will never go back to the lines from which it attacked you; that is, that you must negotiate what part of your country you would “willingly” give away—or, if you can, go and fight for your rights and show us what you can do. We can tell you that you will not be able to do anything, because no matter what force you have Israel will be put in a position to frustrate your resistance.”

26. A great American representative whom I had the honour and pleasure of knowing, Adlai Stevenson, told us once, “The hopes of mankind are in the Charter; the realities of life are in *The New York Times*.” But I must say, in respect to his memory, that he added, “In the end the Charter will prevail”. Apparently now a negative vote would tell us, “Never mind the Charter; what is in *The New York Times* will prevail”.

27. The belief that Egypt is bound eventually to bow to Israel’s terms, perhaps in two years, is only an illusion. We have fought empires before and we shall fight now against any effort to dominate or stifle our life. We do not want to go back to any other empire. We do not want to lose another 400, 100 or 80 years of our life. We shall not live in a world or in an area dominated by intimidation and by the threat of force.

28. It is not really worth taking the Council’s time to say that the people of the United States of America did not in 1776 accept the facts of power. It is not really necessary to tell the Council that the French people in resisting Hitler did not accept the facts of power. I can say the same thing about the people of almost every Member State around this table. I can certainly say it about Africa, because indeed the thesis of the vacuum of the new stability which did not succeed the empires-that-were is applicable to all countries in Africa.

29. Before I conclude this last intervention in the Council, I wish to express my profound feelings to all those who have supported us. Egypt will forget the wrong done to it, but Egypt will not forget any good deed. First, to the representatives of Europe—to the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and Austria—I should like to state that I am returning to my country with an obligation to Europe because of their stand based on what they thought was right. To the people of the Socialist countries, to whom Mr. Dayan referred yesterday as Communists—alongside Africans and Arabs—I say that we shall never forget their assistance and we shall always depend on it. To the non-aligned peoples, to the people of Yugoslavia, to the peoples of Asia represented in the Council by India and Indonesia, I say that we know that countries with such great and ancient civilizations were not expected to take any stand other than the one they took. To the people of Latin America, I say that I am indeed proud that we have the names of Peru and Panama on the draft resolution before the Council. I am proud but not surprised, because they are really the foster parents of all the principles that are the basis for this draft resolution—the non-use of

coercion, the non-acquisition of territory by force and the determination to live free, proud, and independent. With respect to Africa, I do not think I have enough words to express my thanks to the Foreign Ministers who left their heavy tasks to come to this Council to plead the cause of the third world, of the world that wants to live free and to live in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. They gave to the Council the word of Africa and that word, I am sure, will gain momentum. In the end it will be stronger than the guns and the bombs.

30. People from the Middle East, if they are really true sons of the Middle East, can look into the history of the armies that passed through our area and of the empires that were established and later destroyed, and compare those events to three books: the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Koran. Those words have proved to be more permanent and, indeed, stronger than all kinds of guns and the ways of coercion and domination—whatever they were—throughout the centuries of man’s existence.

31. Having thanked the Council and you, Mr. President, for the many courtesies that have been extended to me and our country, I propose to end by repeating my question: What do I take back to our people: hope or despair? Strengthening of their belief in a world based on order wherein every country—especially every great country—meets its responsibilities and does not try to evade them, or despair because this world will recognize only force and the results of force? But in asking this, I will say that we will not do that; we will not recognize force and we will not live by it—we will resist it. And, in saying that, I send my greetings from this most important hall in the world to those who are fighting against oppression and occupation in Gaza, on the West Bank, in Jerusalem, in the Golan Heights and everywhere else; to those who are fighting and will fight in Sinai and in every other part of the Arab lands now occupied and in every part of the Arab lands that are threatened with occupation if we let this policy of force dominate.

32. I always ask people to read the Jarring aide-mémoire, because this so-called impediment to peace will, in the future, be shown to be the best piece of paper ever offered to Israel, to the Zionist State. Mr. Jarring is here; he knows that this has been my opinion since 1971. If we accept it now, if it is still acceptable—until it is vetoed by this Council—it is because we want to make every sacrifice in order to live in a world of law.

33. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

34. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): As we are reaching the moment of voting by the Council on the only draft resolution before it, my delegation wishes to make some comments in explanation of its position on an evaluation of this or any other draft resolution on the subject.

35. In our opinion, any resolution coming out of this Council on the problem in the Middle East resulting from the war of June 1967 must, in order to be fair and appropriate, embody the following provisions and principles.

36. First, an explicit and categorical call for the withdrawal of the Israeli occupation troops from all the territories occupied in June 1967. Those territories, which include the national territories of three States Members of the United Nations, comprise Sinai, Gaza, the West Bank of Jordan including Arab Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights.
37. Second, an endorsement of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs who were forced out of their homes in Palestine and dispersed in 1947-1948. These rights have repeatedly been recognized since 1948 by the General Assembly.
38. Third, a condemnation of the continuing Israeli occupation of the Arab territories captured in 1967 and a clear indication that the absence of a political settlement and guaranteed peace, while lamentable, is no justification for the continuing occupation.
39. Fourth, an explicit allocation of responsibility for the failure of the peace-making efforts undertaken by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in accordance with his mandate contained in resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.
40. Fifth, a clear denial of the validity of any changes undertaken by the occupying Power in any of the occupied territories with the aim or the effect of destroying or eroding the physical character or the demographic composition of those territories or the political and civil rights of the inhabitants.
41. Sixth, the principle that the United Nations, and its Charter and resolutions are the framework for the settlement of the general problem.
42. Seventh, the reactivation of the United Nations machinery envisaged in and defined by the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) with a view to establishing a just and lasting peace on the basis of the principles just outlined and the other provisions of that resolution.
43. Those points are the criteria by which the Jordan delegation evaluates any draft resolution on the question as a result of the present debate. While most of these principles were generally valid as a solution to the 1967 conflict, some are necessary as a judgement on the situation as it has now evolved and as guidelines for future peace efforts.
44. In this context I wish to make some comments on some of the interpretations given during and outside the present debate on some of the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. I make these comments because any new resolution must not fail to take account of the need for a corrective formulation, closing the door to the distortions and misinterpretations occasionally given to resolution 242 (1967).
45. I need not reiterate what my delegation has emphasized on numerous earlier occasions: that the provision for withdrawal in resolution 242 (1967) could only mean total Israeli withdrawal from all the territories occupied in June 1967. As the Council should never allow territorial aggrandizement by States against others, no matter what the extent of that aggrandizement, its resolutions should reflect this basic position from which resolution 242 (1967) initially stemmed.
46. Another concept that should not be distorted and injected outside its proper place in the interpretation of the past resolution or the formulation of any new initiative is the concept of "agreement". While agreement has a necessary and proper place in the peace-making efforts, it should not be allowed to be employed as a subversive tactic and pretext. One cannot reopen every established and fundamental principle of the Charter and its logical consequences to agreement at every juncture at which a party to a dispute deems it serviceable to its illegitimate interest to veto the application of the principles of the Charter and the logical consequences thereof.
47. This is an essential and incontestable basis for the philosophy and functioning of the Council. We wish that complete withdrawal should occur through agreement. We wish that the establishment of a just peace should take place through agreement. But if the party in occupation and in objective opposition to a just settlement insists on placing its non-agreement as a barrier to both withdrawal and peace, what are we to do? Again, the formulation and interpretation of resolutions by the Security Council on the broad issue should take account of this fact.
48. Let me now speak on an issue raised both in the debate and by the draft resolution before us. The issue is the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. From 1948 until today, the Jordan Government has consistently supported and fully identified with the rights of the Palestinian Arabs rendered homeless by the violent establishment of Israel between 1947 and 1948. It was during that holocaust that the vast majority of Palestinians were dispossessed and expelled from their homes in what later became Israel. Those Palestinians were uprooted from their homes in Haifa, Jaffa, Acre, Tiberias, Bir Sheba, West Jerusalem and other areas of Palestine. Their right of return has been recognized by the General Assembly of the United Nations since December 1948. This recognition has been subsequently reaffirmed every year. The Palestinians of the West Bank who stayed in what remained of Palestine and elected to join with their Arab brothers of the East, democratically and constitutionally in a solid union, were spared the misfortune of uprooting and dispersal. United Jordan remained loyal to the rights of the Palestinian kinsmen who had lost their homes and the ability to return to them. The disaster of 1967 brought nearly half the Palestinians, citizens of Jordan and others, under Israeli occupation.
49. When we speak of the rights of the Palestinians we speak of a concrete and not a rhetorical issue. The Palestinians are either in exile or under Israeli occupation. Restoration of their basic rights consists in ending the occupation and enabling the exiles to exercise the right of return to their homes. There is no other moral and realistic way within the Charter of restoring the Palestinian rights. Surely, least of all is the unthinkable notion that Israel should absorb and annex the occupied lands and drive the

Palestinians to seek a substitute homeland east of their own homeland.

50. As I say this, my Government wants to make it very clear that its citizens under occupation will never be abandoned or let down. The unity of the Kingdom, built by consent and social realities, will not be undone by physical occupation, no matter how long it lasts. We shall continue to defend the territorial integrity of Jordan against the existing occupation of its Western wing and make it possible for its people to determine their future in freedom. We shall continue to work for an end to occupation of all the occupied Arab territories. We shall continue to support, as we have done for over a quarter of a century, the rights of the Palestinian Arabs victims of the colossal violence of 1948. Jordan has a special link and a deep association with Palestinian agonies, achievements and aspirations. It will not fail to live up to the historic responsibility all this entails.

51. I come now to the draft resolution before us. It is the product of long and arduous work and reflects a compromise achieved through mutual accommodation. It falls short of our hopes, goals and expectations, but the draft resolution moves in the right direction. It tries to be explicit on the issue of occupation. It registers a judgement on the responsibility in the failure of the United Nations to achieve progress towards peace in the Middle East. It tries to give expression to some essential principles and requirements of peace in the Middle East. It is also the result of hard and painstaking negotiations and mutual accommodation among a number of tendencies within the Council. It reflects positive steps forward by some friendly countries that are exploring more and more the realities of peace and justice in the Middle East.

52. My delegation, therefore, views positively the spirit and efforts behind this draft. We hope that its constructive elements will become the basis for broad agreement in this Council and outside it. We hope that the phase beyond this draft, whether accepted or rejected, will witness renewed and effective efforts aimed at a speedy and just settlement and the establishment of a stable, just and creative peace in the Middle East.

53. The PRESIDENT: The list of speakers has been exhausted. There being no further representatives wishing to address the Council at this stage, the Council will now turn to the consideration of the eight-Power draft resolution contained in document S/10974.

54. Before we proceed to the vote on that draft resolution, I shall call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

55. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by eight sponsors and contained in document S/10974. This text, which is the result of numerous consultations, does in fact, we believe, meet the basic needs which, in the matter of the Middle East, should be the primary concern of our Council. It also meets the concerns expressed by the Foreign Minister of Egypt on behalf of his Government, concerns which attest to his

desire to continue to seek a peaceful and acceptable solution consistent with respect for the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations.

56. I should like here to pay a tribute to the way in which Mr. El-Zayyat calmly and objectively put before the Council the position of his Government. I listened to his moving statement with rapt attention, and I assure him that France shares his faith in a world that will not be governed solely by relations of force, a world that places over and above all the law and the rights of peoples.

57. Reverting to the draft resolution on which we are about to vote, I would say that, confronted by the dangers of a situation that is a standing threat to international peace and security, it is for the Council to reaffirm, on the one hand, its specific responsibility and, on the other, the principles of a solution acceptable to the parties, and, finally, our support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative.

58. I believe that the draft resolution submitted to us does in fact meet this three-fold concern. In reaffirming resolution 242 (1967), whose principles are still entirely valid, it defines the bases of any solution likely to establish a just and lasting peace in the region. The only new element in relation to resolution 242 (1967) is to be found in the reference to the rights of the Palestinians but that reference, which was already made in resolution 2949 (XXVII) adopted on 8 December 1972 by the General Assembly, only reflects a growing concern of the international community as expressed in a whole series of official declarations.

59. With regard to the renewed support that the Council is duty bound to give to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, it is quite in keeping with our concern to emerge from the present stagnation and thus to encourage any initiative that may facilitate the search for a solution. As far as we are concerned, we hope that this support will not remain a dead letter and that the Secretary-General and his Special Representative will very soon have the possibility of resuming their consultations with the parties.

60. In conclusion, I would voice the hope that this draft resolution, which is both balanced and realistic, will be unanimously adopted by the Council.

61. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, the USSR delegation, speaking in explanation of vote, would first like to point out the positive fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted for the consideration of the Security Council are eight non-aligned countries—eight who express the unanimous will and demands of the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America and socialist Europe with regard to one of the most critical issues in international relations, the Middle East problem.

62. The very fact that the sponsorship is so broadly based—the sponsors of the draft resolution represent a majority of the members of the Council, 8 out of 15, and an overwhelming majority of the non-permanent members of the Security Council, 8 out of 10—is, on the one hand,

evidence of the deep concern of the peoples of the world at the continuing explosive situation in the Middle East, which threatens peace and security throughout the world, and, on the other, a reflection of the serious and determined efforts of the international community to achieve a just and lasting peace in this region.

63. The USSR delegation notes with particular pleasure that the position of the non-aligned countries, or, as they are sometimes called in United Nations circles, the third world countries, coincides almost entirely with the position of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. We are also deeply convinced that the sponsors of this draft, like ourselves, the Soviet representatives, would like the Security Council to adopt a stronger draft resolution on the matter under discussion than that which they have submitted.

64. The sponsors of the draft resolution have taken into account the desire and the demands of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council and of other States Members of the United Nations as expressed in their official statements during the Council's discussion in June of the question of the situation in the Middle East. The draft also reflects a number of the fundamental provisions and principles of the United Nations Charter and of the well-known United Nations resolutions on the Middle East.

65. The Soviet delegation is gratified to note that the draft resolution contains basic provisions relating to the existing United Nations machinery for a political settlement in the Middle East. It reaffirms resolution 242 (1967), which is the basis for a Middle East settlement. The draft reflects firm support for the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and for his well-known aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 as being fully in keeping with resolution 242 (1967) on all matters, including the crucial question of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories. The USSR delegation has already pointed out that during consultations on the Middle East among four permanent members of the Security Council, all four participants in those consultations officially and unreservedly supported this initiative of Ambassador Jarring and his aide-mémoire. They all recognized and stated officially that this initiative of Ambassador Jarring was in full accord with his mandate under resolution 242 (1967). We should like to hope that they all still adhere to that position with regard to the aide-mémoire, despite the fact that the document is not to the aggressor's liking.

66. At yesterday's meeting of the Security Council, quotations were made from a recent interview of Mr. Dayan about his dissatisfaction with the United Nations. But who is most dissatisfied with it? The history of the discussion of the Middle East question in the United Nations and the Council's repeated condemnation of Israel as the aggressor, as well as the discussion of questions relating to decolonization, show that those who are dissatisfied with the United Nations are the aggressors, who do not wish to leave the territories they have seized, and the imperialists and colonialist racists, who refuse to grant the colonial peoples they oppress freedom and independence in implementation of United Nations resolutions. It is this very dissatisfaction

and hatred for the United Nations which bring together such countries as aggressive Israel and racist South Africa.

67. The Soviet delegation fully supports the basic idea behind the draft, which is the need to maintain and make active use of the existing United Nations machinery to achieve a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

68. During the debate, the aggressor and some of his protectors have referred constantly to talks. But, when doing so, they remain silent about just what are the conditions on which a peaceful political settlement can and should be reached in the Middle East—with the assistance of and through the United Nations: should it be on conditions imposed by the aggressor upon the victims of aggression or on the basis of the universally recognized principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force or war and the mandatory withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories, a principle repeatedly affirmed by the United Nations, conferences of non-aligned countries and the recent anniversary meeting of the Assembly of Heads of State and Governments of the members of the Organization of African Unity? Unless this fundamental principle is recognized, and as long as the aggressor stubbornly refuses to get out of the lands which have belonged from time immemorial to the victims of aggression, a Middle East settlement is unthinkable and, therefore, impossible.

69. Talks on the conditions proposed by the aggressor, whose occupation forces are almost at the walls of the capitals of the States which are victims of the aggression, would be like the talks between the Soviet Union and Hitler when his forces, which had occupied a considerable portion of the European part of the USSR, stood at the gates of Moscow. And in the present situation in the Middle East, no references and appeals to the long history of the Jewish people over many thousands of years can either justify or pardon the seizure and annexation by Israel of lands belonging to others. It is a most repulsive spectacle to see someone use the pretext of past sufferings in an attempt to cover up and justify his own present misdeeds which cause suffering to others who are not responsible for those past sufferings.

70. The USSR delegation also agrees with the provision in the eight-Power draft resolution to the effect that a just peace in the Middle East can be achieved only on the basis of respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity, the rights of all States in the area and for the lawful rights and aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine.

71. The sponsors of the draft resolution also indicate to a certain degree the State which bears the major responsibility for the continuation of the dangerous situation in the Middle East, namely, Israel, which has unleashed aggression against three Arab States Members of the United Nations, which continues its occupation of those countries' territory in defiance of the wishes of the peoples of the entire world, and which challenges the United Nations and world public opinion by continuing to sabotage and block a peaceful political settlement of the Middle East question. At the same time, we are obliged to point out that, as the sponsors themselves admit, this draft represents a compromise and

thus it must be said quite frankly that some parts of it are not only the minimum that could be expected but are even too weak. In particular, it does not reflect fully enough the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war or force, which has been recognized and affirmed by the United Nations and was supported during the June discussion by all members of the Security Council, as well as by all the Arab, African, Asian and Latin American States which participated in the discussion, with, of course, the exception of Israel. This is a serious shortcoming in the draft resolution. However, it should be pointed out in this regard that at the same time it does firmly and specifically stress the principle of respect for the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States in the Middle East.

72. The USSR delegation once again reaffirms its position that the basis for a just solution of the Middle East question is the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories. For this reason, it would prefer to see included in the draft resolution a paragraph concerning the need for the immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories. At the same time, it notes that the provision in the draft resolution concerning Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire compensates for this shortcoming.

73. The Soviet delegation is gratified to note that the draft resolution includes a paragraph providing for a just and peaceful settlement in the Middle East on the basis of respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity, the rights of all States in the area and for the rights and legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. These principles for a Middle East settlement were confirmed in the Soviet-United States communiqué issued in connexion with the visit of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, to the United States. *Inter alia*, the communiqué stressed that a settlement in the Middle East:

“... should be in accordance with the interests of all States in the area, be consistent with their independence and sovereignty and should take into due account the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people.” [see S/10964.]

74. We consider that the draft resolution does not contain sufficiently strong criticism or condemnation of Israel's responsibility as the aggressor against three Arab States Members of the United Nations or of its responsibility for the continuation of the present dangerous situation in the Middle East and the blocking of a Middle East settlement.

75. However, in determining its attitude to the draft resolution under discussion, the USSR delegation bears in mind the position of the non-aligned countries which are members of the Security Council and have sponsored this draft and also the positive attitude towards the draft of the delegations of Egypt and Jordan.

76. In the light of this, the USSR delegation views the draft resolution as a definite positive step towards the achievement of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East and the curbing of the aggressor's imperialist aspira-

tions. Accordingly, the USSR delegation supports the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries and will vote in favour of it.

77. We listened with great attention to the brilliant speech by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat, which was an irrefutable accusation against Israel's aggressive and adventuristic policy in defence of the cause of the Arab peoples. We are grateful to him for the high esteem he expressed of the friendship and brotherly relations between the Soviet Union and its peoples and the Egyptian people and the peoples of other Arab countries.

78. In view of this, the Soviet delegation would like once again to declare and emphasize that the Soviet Union will continue consistently and firmly to pursue its fundamental policy of all-round support for the just cause of the Arab peoples and their struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israeli imperialistic aggression and establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of the well-known decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

79. Mr. SEN (India): Yesterday when I introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the eight sponsors I deliberately did not give the Indian views on it, which are in any event fully explained in my statement of 14 June [1726th meeting].

80. I should like, however, briefly to give my delegation's views before the vote on the draft resolution before us and also to meet some of the arguments voiced yesterday and today. I have the highest respect for any man who fights well for his country in the field or in the Council, whatever be the quality of his armour or of his arguments. This does not absolve us who are not directly involved or whose specific national interests are not affected from applying the Charter and considering the facts as objectively as we can.

81. The preambular part of the draft resolution says, *inter alia*:

“*Emphasizing further* that all Members of the United Nations are committed to respect the resolutions of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter”.

This text was taken from an alternative draft and is much weaker than a reference to Article 25 of the Charter, but in a spirit of compromise we accepted it.

82. Secondly, we reaffirm resolution 242 (1967) and we are aware that that resolution has not made the necessary progress, for, unexpectedly, Ambassador Jarring faced insurmountable difficulty in obtaining acceptance of his aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971. It is our hope that this draft resolution will help remove this difficulty.

83. Alternatively, the threat that Israel will withdraw its acceptance of resolution 242 (1967) should the present draft resolution be accepted will not in our view be a welcome development either for Israel's interests or in the

interest of the Council's efforts for a peaceful solution. None the less, speaking to the parties, we perceive that there are elements on both sides who wish to avoid their obligations under resolution 242 (1967) so that they can revert to the situation before the 1967 conflict. Similarly, continued refusal by Israel to accept Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 may enable Egypt to withdraw its initial acceptance of these proposals. While Egypt may legitimately consider itself free to take this action, we believe that such a development will oblige the Council, the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to start all over again and will therefore mean going back even on the small progress we have made.

84. It is because of those two considerations that we have indicated that resolution 242 (1967) still provides a valid basis for a solution, and that Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire should be the point of resumption.

85. As regards withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied lands, we make no distinction among the types of territories captured and occupied. Israel's withdrawal is to take place from the lands of the three Member States as well as from Gaza. In this respect we abide by our statement in 1967 that such adjustments as may be made by agreement between sovereign States would of course be acceptable, provided that such agreements are reached after the troops have been withdrawn, provided that there is no coercion, and provided also that they relate to minor adjustments or insignificant changes or do not reflect the weight of conquest or victory or military superiority.

86. Now we come to the need for negotiations between the parties. I think we are all agreed that eventually negotiations will take place, but at the moment conditions simply do not exist for opening such negotiations. The Ambassador of Tunisia has described the present conditions as impossible, and it is because of this that we are asking in our draft resolution that these conditions be brought about. As stated in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General and his Special Representative are "to resume and to pursue their efforts to promote a just and peaceful solution". When we say "resume" we mean exactly what we say—to resume at the point where Ambassador Jarring left off and within the framework of resolution 242 (1967). However, we totally reject any claim that either resolution 242 (1967) or the cease-fire agreement in any way gives tolerance, much less authority, direct or indirect, tacit or implicit or explicit, for Israeli forces to continue to occupy Arab territories.

87. We are glad that the Secretary-General will shortly be visiting the countries of the area and that he will have an opportunity to speak to their leaders and make his own assessment. For this purpose he does not need any resolution from the Council. He has already visited many other Member States, including my own, and he will no doubt visit many others. In these circumstances, to relate the Secretary-General's visit to the draft resolution is, in our view, both irrelevant and undesirable. After his visit to the area, he and his Special Representative will be better able to contribute to each other's thinking and thus to make greater headway. I do not wish to say much on this subject, for we are all aware how this intended visit and its

timing have been planned, and of how at one stage this visit was cited as a reason for the Council to delay its consideration of this problem. We wish the Secretary-General a successful trip.

88. We have been told that this draft resolution will be vetoed. This is a privilege of all permanent members. But I would ask the Council to reflect on whether decisions regarding these distant wars, taken unilaterally and without adequate attention to the views of the countries of the conflict area, as distinct from the parties, have always produced the best results. The responsibility lies with all of us and indeed we are all aware of it.

89. Finally, before I conclude, I should like to thank the representative of Israel for the particular notice he took of my country in his statement yesterday. He paid many compliments to India. Most of them are, however, undeserved. He paid compliments to us for our fidelity to our clients. This is, of course, admirable, except that clients do not exist, and Indian foreign relations are not conducted on the basis of a patron-client equation, as is done in some other bilateral relations. We are friendly, or at least wish to be friendly, to all countries, including Israel. But friendship involves a two-way traffic and requires from all Members of the United Nations adherence to the Charter in its totality.

90. This should also explain why Israel's diplomatic recognition has not been as widespread as it could have been, either among the members of the Council or the Members of the General Assembly as a whole—a grievance to which Israel constantly refers.

91. Ambassador Tekoah wondered why our friendship for Egypt is not used to better purposes. In my statement of 14 June I explained why India, as a friend of Egypt, could not advise a course of action as suggested by Israel. I should again draw the attention of the delegation of Israel to that statement, in which I asked for a declaration from Israel accepting the principle of the non-admissibility of the acquisition of territory by force—but no such declaration was forthcoming.

92. Israel also said the Council had put itself into the hands of such countries as India and Yugoslavia. I have far too great a respect for truth and for the integrity of the other members of the Council to accept this compliment. Out of eight sponsors of the draft resolution, only India and Yugoslavia were mentioned. This does not surprise us, as any wider reference would have been inconsistent with the recent practice of the Israeli delegation not to be critical of the Africans after the resolution of the Organization of African Unity was adopted about two months ago. But of course I know to my cost that instructions to ambassadors are often less flexible than those to cabinet ministers, and presumably that is why Defence Minister Moshe Dayan was able to say that one of the defects of the United Nations is that it is full of Communists, Arabs and Africans.

93. Lastly, the Israeli representative wondered if the Indian impact on the United Nations is due to our record for upholding international peace and security. I do not believe that our impact is due to that at all. But if it is,

there is nothing to prevent the Israelis from following Indian ways and to persuade itself and its friends to do likewise. I can assure them all that they will find me ever ready to give whatever help I can to make progress in that process.

94. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation is honoured to see you, Sir Colin Crowe, presiding over these historic meetings of the Council. Your wisdom and your kindly manner have guaranteed a proper atmosphere for the very delicate deliberations that are now drawing to a close.

95. At the 1726th meeting, on 14 June 1973, the Government of Panama made known its views regarding how the complex and difficult situation obtaining in the Middle East might be resolved.

96. At this time we wish only to add that we have sponsored, together with the delegations of Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Peru, the Sudan and Yugoslavia, the draft resolution contained in document S/10974, which will doubtless receive the support of the great majority of members of the Council. This is our view because it seems to us that the draft resolution contains a certain number of constructive elements on which the majority of members of the Council has already agreed. We feel that if those elements are supported and approved by the Council, constructive steps will have been taken towards the achievement of peace in the Middle East.

97. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution sponsored by Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, the Sudan and Yugoslavia and contained in document S/10974.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Austria, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia.

Against: United States of America.

The result of the vote was 13 in favour, 1 against.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

One member (China) did not participate in the voting.

98. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon members of the Council wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

99. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has seriously studied the draft resolution on the Middle East question. At the 1726th meeting of the Security Council, on 14 June, the Chinese delegation clearly pointed out that when the Middle East situation was being reviewed in its totality the Council should truly act upon the principles of the Charter, draw a clear distinction between the right and the wrong, uphold justice and speak up for the right. The Chinese delegation

firmly maintains that a Security Council resolution must strongly condemn the Israeli Zionists for their prolonged aggression against the Palestinian people and other Arab countries and peoples; it must ask the Israeli authorities immediately to withdraw from the Egyptian, Syrian and all the other Arab territories they have occupied; it must call for the restoration of the Palestinian people's national rights; it must call upon all Governments and peoples to give firm support to the Arab peoples and the Palestinian people in their just struggle to resist aggression, recover their lost territories and restore their national rights.

100. The Chinese delegation has consistently held that the Middle East question is, in essence, a question of aggression versus anti-aggression, a question of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples striving for national independence and their national rights and a question of opposing the super-Powers' interference and contention for spheres of influence in the Middle East.

101. In view of the fact that the present draft resolution has failed to reflect fully the principles of the United Nations Charter and the aforesaid position of the Chinese Government, the Chinese delegation has decided not to participate in the voting on that draft resolution.

102. The Chinese delegation reaffirms that the Chinese people will, as always, stand together with the Arab peoples and the Palestinian people and firmly support them in their just struggle to resist aggression, safeguard national independence and territorial integrity and restore their national rights. The Chinese delegation is deeply convinced that, persevering in unity and struggle, the Arab peoples and the Palestinian people who have been tempered through anti-imperialist struggles will certainly overcome the difficulties on their road of advance and finally realize their national aspirations.

103. Mr. MADDY (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): In becoming a sponsor of the draft resolution in favour of which my delegation has just voted, we wished once again to express our total solidarity with the Arab peoples and the Palestinians whose territories are illegally occupied by the forces of the military State of Israel. Apart from this manifestation of solidarity, we considered that the draft submitted for the consideration of the Council today could only represent a strict minimum that would open the way to progress towards a fair solution of the distressing problem of the Middle East, where the rights of peoples are denied and flouted by a Member of our Organization—a country which has, however, subscribed to the principles of and respect for the Charter and which, moreover, owes its birth to the United Nations, upon the effectiveness of which it is casting doubt. For our part, we are firmly convinced that our Organization remains the hope of all peoples—strong or weak, rich or poor.

104. It was with great regret and disappointment that we noted the negative vote of the United States delegation, a vote which not only renders even more remote the chance of peace in the Middle East but reinforces the determination of the peoples of the occupied territories to continue their liberation struggle. We ask the allies of Israel to search their consciences more profoundly so as to bring

peace to that part of the world. We remind them that every subjugated people will continue to struggle by all possible means until final victory. That is inexorable.

105. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): Mr. President, let me first of all join my colleagues in expressing our pleasure over this belated opportunity of conducting our business under your presidency. Of course, this gives me special pleasure as a colleague and friend of some 30 years' standing. We should all like to think, or at least to hope, that the sense of gratification with the power of the gavel which you have so far been denied in your long and highly distinguished service to your Government and country in the United Nations and elsewhere may offer compensation for being temporarily separated from the charms of rural Gloucestershire.

106. As I have made clear on earlier occasions in this Council, the Government and people of Australia have enjoyed and hope to continue to enjoy the most friendly relations with Israel and with Egypt and its Arab neighbours alike. But, of course, that does not mean that we can or would wish to close our eyes to their long-standing and bitter dispute, painful as it is to us. We are fully alive to all its inherent dangers, to its deplorable consequences for the whole of the Middle East and to the tensions it has created around the world. We can no more dissociate ourselves from it than can the rest of the international community, which can only mean that we must continue to support the efforts of the United Nations, and particularly the role of this Council, in helping to bring this intolerable situation to an end through a just and lasting peace that would ensure the right of all States in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

107. That brings me to draft resolution S/10974, on which the Council has just voted. In the view of my delegation, it is by no means an ideal text. It is lacking in balance and the Australian Government had a good deal of hesitation in authorizing us to vote in favour of it. For one thing, it makes no specific mention of the ultimate necessity for negotiations between the parties directly concerned. My delegation is well aware of the difficulties that stand in the way. But whatever independent role the Council can play in helping them towards a settlement, both sides must surely recognize that neither of them would be willing to accept a solution imposed from outside; that only they themselves, whether in the short or long run, can reach a mutually acceptable settlement; and that this can come about only through some process of negotiation, whether direct or indirect.

108. Again, while we can understand very well the deep concern of Egypt and its Arab neighbours over the present and future welfare and status of the Palestinians, we see some complex problems ahead that suggest to us that it might have been preferable at this stage to refer to the Palestinian refugees, or simply to the refugees, as in resolution 242 (1967).

109. The positive features of the text, as seen by my delegation, include the unqualified reaffirmation in the preamble of resolution 242 (1967), which the Australian Government continues to regard as containing the essential

elements for a settlement of the Middle East problem. By the same token, it is no less than reasonable that the Council, while reaffirming the principles contained in resolution 242 (1967) nearly six years after its adoption, should wish to review and comment on the impact of that resolution in the light of the demonstrably insignificant progress achieved in those six years.

110. I am confident that there is no member of this Council who has found the text altogether satisfactory from his or his Government's point of view. It may be a slightly blurred reflection of an intensive exchange of views, but it is all that could be obtained, and that is what the United Nations is all about. This is the only way the United Nations, and with it this Council, can operate. And that is why, in order to support a continuing and active effort by the United Nations in the Middle East, we decided to vote in favour of that text.

111. In view of the fact that the draft resolution has not been adopted because of the negative vote of a permanent member, my delegation would still greatly hope that the threefold message contained in its operative paragraphs 7 to 9 can be accepted and acted upon by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, by the Council as a whole and by all the parties concerned, so that the Secretary-General can carry out his proposed visit to the Middle East and lend his personal efforts to the search for a just and lasting peace.

112. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): Mr. President, before explaining the vote of my delegation, I should like to express the satisfaction and indeed the delight of my delegation that this last and dramatic phase of our debate has taken place under your guidance. Wise leadership is an epithet often applied to the context of the presidency of this Council. I feel, on my part, that there have been few occasions on which this epithet has been applied with more justification than in the case of the presidency of Sir Colin Crowe.

113. The Council has just voted on a draft resolution submitted by eight of its members with a view to translate the efforts of this Council on the problem of the Middle East since the beginning of June into meaningful action. This is the occasion for my delegation to restate the spirit and the attitude in which it has approached this debate and in which it has cast its vote. When I had the first opportunity to address this Council on the problem of the Middle East on 14 June 1973 [1725th meeting], I made it clear that our approach was based on friendship and respect for the peoples and nations of the Middle East, to which my country feels bound by past and present history and a wide variety of human, cultural, economic and political links.

114. It is therefore not in a spirit of narrow partisanship that we have taken part in the work of the Council over the past weeks and that we have cast our vote, but because my country shares the feelings of concern so often and so emphatically expressed by the international community at the tragic conflict besetting that region.

115. Whatever judgement we may bring to the problem of the Middle East can only be the expression of the search for

an independent, objective and impartial evaluation of international problems to which my country is committed by the very nature of its international status.

116. As the members of the Council know, my delegation has developed a number of procedural ideas to break the existing deadlock without at this stage going into the substance of the matter. We still believe that such an approach would have been in the interest of the parties concerned and in line with the prevailing spirit of détente in the world. We have thus not found it easy to come to a decision concerning the draft resolution on which the Council has just voted. What our vote has expressed, above all, is our firm attachment to the principles contained in the widely recognized basis for the solution of the Middle East conflict, namely, resolution 242 (1967).

117. Our vote has expressed, furthermore, our equally firm attachment to the principle of a peaceful solution of the conflict, making available all peaceful means which the Charter of the United Nations provides. It is the thrust of the draft resolution in affirming those principles and in mobilizing such peaceful means as are specifically provided in resolution 242 (1967) that has had a decisive influence on our attitude towards it.

118. Since it became a Member of the United Nations, Austria has consistently given its support to the role and functions of the high office of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. In a similar vein, Austria has supported the tireless efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement. Austria, therefore, could not fail to lend support to initiate a new United Nations effort based on the longstanding experience of the Secretary-General's Special Representative and on the high moral power of the office of the Secretary-General. In expressing this support, we also have a duty, however, to state clearly our understanding of other parts of the draft resolution. Austria has never been insensitive to the plight of the Palestinian people, in the same manner in which my country has always felt a moral obligation when confronting the problem of the large refugee populations which were such a frequent phenomenon of post-war European history.

119. It is a measure of the legitimate attention of the international community to the indisputable existence of this problem that many important international documents have confirmed the need for its just settlement which must be a part of any solution of the Middle East conflict. The most important of those documents is resolution 242 (1967); another is the recent communiqué issued at the conclusion of the talks between President Nixon and General-Secretary Brezhnev, which reaffirms that any settlement "should take into due account the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people" [see S/10964]. Our understanding of the relevant provisions of the draft resolution is therefore based on the language and spirit of resolution 242 (1967).

120. We have also made it clear that we consider a situation characterized by tension, military occupation and a persistent threat of the outbreak of hostilities an

anomalous and most dangerous one. The end of military occupation must mean, however, the realization of all the other goals set out so clearly in paragraph 1 of resolution 242 (1967), namely:

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

121. It was with those considerations in mind and with that view that we gave support to the main principles of the draft resolution and its search for peace.

122. The Council, despite many weeks of hard work by all its members, has not been able to reach a decision. It is not our intention at this stage—as, indeed, it was not our intention at any previous stage—of the debate to attribute blame and dispense judgement. We feel there is only one hope that we can now express: the hope that, notwithstanding the fact that at this point the Council could not reach agreement on the draft resolution, the search for peace will continue and no avenue will be left unexplored to bring the parties closer to an agreement and to attain a peaceful settlement. All efforts towards this goal deserve, today more than at any time before, our full and loyal support.

123. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): Mr. President, I wish to express my warm appreciation for the impartial, considerate way in which you have presided over this Council during the past few difficult days. I also wish to express my admiration for your patience, your tact and the great efforts you have made to achieve a harmonious result.

124. The history of the Middle East problem is a history of lost opportunities. Today's action by the Council represents another opportunity missed. My delegation profoundly regrets that the Council has not achieved a result that would give impetus to realistic efforts to work towards peace and stability in the Middle East. The United States Government is committed without qualification to continue such efforts.

125. In my statement of 14 June before this Council I said:

"My Government views this meeting of the Council as a challenge and an opportunity. It is a challenge to deal responsibly with one of the most . . . difficult . . . problems facing the world community. . . . It is an opportunity to create circumstances in which, at long last, Arab and Israeli might engage in a genuine negotiating process." [1726th meeting, para. 2.]

Unhappily, the Council did not meet the challenge; it lost the opportunity.

126. The draft resolution before us was highly partisan and unbalanced. Its adoption could only have added another obstacle to getting serious negotiations started

between the parties. It would have contributed another impractical and cosmetic result invoking the unreal rather than the real world. It is our hope that one day the choice will be made to face up to the hard reality that the job of peace in the area—the procedures and its contents—must be assumed by the parties themselves in an unprejudiced way.

127. Unhappily, the draft resolution put to the vote today, instead of focusing on possibilities for efforts towards agreement between the parties and trying to encourage such efforts, concerned itself with moral judgments about the past. The past is too much with us. We have been looking backward to grievances rather than forward to solutions. To put it most succinctly, if this draft resolution had been adopted, it would have changed fundamentally, it would have overturned Security Council resolution 242 (1967). It would, in other words, have undermined the one agreed basis on which a settlement in the Middle East could be constructed. That is why my Government felt compelled to veto the draft resolution.

128. As members of the Council are aware, my delegation did its utmost to avoid this result. We presented to the sponsors a series of reasonable and carefully thought-out amendments. Had they been accepted, the Council would have taken a modest step forward rather than a confused step backward. Our suggested amendments are known to the members of the Council and I need not review them in detail here. One, however, bears special emphasis because it goes to the heart of the distortion which the draft resolution voted on today would have perpetrated if it had been accepted.

129. Operative paragraph 2 of that draft resolution treats in isolation the Israeli presence in territories occupied in the 1967 conflict. It speaks of “the” territories, ignoring the significance—recognized when resolution 242 (1967) was adopted—of the omission of this definite article, the word “the”, from the text of resolution 242 (1967). And it takes no notice of the other fundamental and inseparable elements of that resolution, namely: that the ending of the occupation must be in the context of peace between the parties; that it must be in the context of the right of all States in the area to live within secure and recognized boundaries; and that it must be on the basis of agreement between the parties. Operative paragraph 2 bears no relationship to the provisions and principles of resolution 242 (1967). It would constitute an entirely different resolution, contrary to the entire concept of resolution 242 (1967). Our proposed amendment—one of several we offered—read as follows:

“Deeply regrets the failure to reach agreement on a just and lasting peace, including Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict and secure and recognized boundaries”.

130. If accepted, our proposed amendment would have preserved the essence and balance of resolution 242 (1967)—agreement, peace, withdrawal, and secure and recognized boundaries—which, I submit, remain the only hope if ultimately there is to be a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

131. To our regret, these proposals did not evoke the response, the careful consideration we believed they merited. Some argued that the proposals came too late. I understand what that implies about tactical factors in the processes of the Security Council. But, I submit that, if there is the will, it is never too late to work for peace and security. It is not too late now, and my delegation believes that, while this debate is ending, our responsibility to search for solutions to the Middle East problem continues.

132. The purpose of our amendments was to bring the eight-Power draft resolution into some measure of conformity with the essential provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which remains the only agreed—I repeat: agreed—basis for a peaceful solution. The draft resolution voted on today would have done irrevocable and permanent damage to that landmark resolution of this Council—a resolution which admittedly is interpreted differently by the two sides and whose constructive ambiguity can be resolved only in the caldron of negotiations between the parties, not by fiat of this Council or a group of outside Powers.

133. Casting a veto is never easy. It is a most serious decision—one we do not take lightly. However, the essence of statesmanship is to take a longer view, to persevere in the tough task of peace making, to find ways toward a lasting peace, and not to seek to score political debating points which have no lasting value.

134. All need not be lost. We note that the Secretary-General has the agreement of the parties to consult with them in the area. He has the continued support of the United States for this renewed effort; and, despite the differences revealed in our deliberations here today, there are no differences on this point. I believe we all agree with the Secretary-General’s stated intention to engage himself in the pursuit of peace in the Middle East. He needs no new mandate. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remains the basic framework.

135. Allow me to make one more general observation about the approach embodied in the draft resolution we have today rejected. I would earnestly urge those who share my delegation’s profound desire for a stable Middle East to ponder the lesson of history—that step-by-step diplomacy most often leads in an orderly way to important results. The effort to get across a broad chasm of difference in one leap involves the risk of falling all the way to the bottom of the chasm.

136. In closing, I would like to comment on allegations about the ineffectiveness of the Security Council and the United Nations made by certain speakers in this chamber yesterday. I do not concur for a moment with these counsels of despair. It is true that we have not yet found the institutional antidote to many of the ills of mankind. I, too, am deeply disappointed by the outcome of this debate. In past years of observing the United Nations I have been disappointed many times. But there is also a record of United Nations successes on important issues. My Government believes that through sincere, patient and determined efforts by its Members the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, can become more effective, can deal

successfully with the complex and difficult problems that face us. Our vote today was a carefully considered action calculated to move the United Nations away from empty judgements on the past and toward concrete, positive results in the real world. It is only through such positive results that we can restore the confidence of those who doubt the United Nations—the institution which, in our view, still embodies some of the noblest aspirations of mankind.

137. Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, at the very outset may I express my happiness at seeing you preside over our debates with your well-known competence. However, that pleasure is somewhat tinted with sadness at the knowledge of your approaching departure from the United Nations. You are leaving on the United Nations an indelible mark of distinction, experience and ability.

138. My delegation sponsored and voted in favour of the draft resolution in document S/10974: first of all, because we considered that it stood as a true contribution to solution of the Middle East problem and, secondly, because it coincided with the position that my own delegation stated to the Council in the course of the general debate six weeks ago [1725th meeting].

139. Thus my delegation fully adheres to the reaffirmation of the validity of resolution 242 (1967) which appeared in the preamble to the draft resolution, since we have always considered that resolution to be the juridical framework for a just solution of this problem, containing as it does the necessary elements for its achievement. The responsibility of the parties and of the Organization is to ensure the effective implementation of that resolution, without letting themselves be distracted by questions of semantics or of intentions, since the golden rule in the interpretation of juridical instruments is that nothing in them can oppose the general principles of law and jurisprudence, which in this case is the Charter of the United Nations.

140. In the operative part of the resolution on which we have just voted, the Security Council deplors the continuing occupation of the territories occupied as a result of the 1967 conflict; and we believe it could do no less, considering, on the one hand, the Council's responsibility for the preservation of international peace and security and, on the other hand, the obligation of all Member States to comply with resolutions of the Security Council; and considering furthermore, the tacit obligation of this organ to ensure implementation of and respect for the principle of respect for the tenets of the Charter and of international law.

141. The draft expressed concern over Israel's lack of co-operation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and supported the efforts of the Special Representative, contained in his aide-mémoire of 8 February, which leads me to recall that in my previous statement I had mentioned the fact that the document presented by Ambassador Jarring raised fundamental questions flowing from paragraph 1 of resolution 242 (1967) and that positive replies by both parties would have

constituted the *quid pro quo* that might have allowed the consultation procedure to continue.

142. This draft also contains the basic concept that a just and peaceful solution can be achieved only on the basis of respect for the national sovereignty, territorial integrity and rights of all States of the region, as well as the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians. This again is in keeping with the statement I made in the Council that the key to security in the Middle East lies in recognition of the State of Israel, the withdrawal by that nation of its forces from occupied territories and the solution of the Palestine problem. The declaration that in the territory they occupy there should be no changes that might affect the achievement of a final settlement or might adversely affect the fundamental rights of the inhabitants is only the statement of something that flows logically from the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, a principle which all members of the Council have stated and reaffirmed in the course of the June debate.

143. Furthermore, the request to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to resume and continue their efforts and the statement of the support to be given them also fully coincide with the declaration of my delegation that there is an urgent need to resume and reactivate the diplomatic machinery of the United Nations.

144. My delegation is convinced that the document that we voted upon, despite the fate meted out to it, will be a new standard and a new step in the peaceful solution to the question of the Middle East.

145. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): It is the firm belief of my delegation that the solution to the Middle East situation lies in honest vindication, affirmation and implementation of the formulas and principles contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). My delegation voted for draft resolution S/10974, which has just been vetoed, because we believe that that draft very carefully reflects the spirit and principles of resolution 242 (1967).

146. Specifically, we voted for the draft in order to register our complete rejection of occupation of the territories of other States by force. Secondly, we voted for the draft in order to register our support for the rights of the Palestinian people. Lastly, we voted for the draft in order to exemplify our commitment to the Charter and the principles of international law.

147. Peace, justice, human dignity, the territorial integrity of our States and the integrity of the political sovereignties of our countries are indispensable matters; they are matters which are universal in their application. If we do not insist on their application to the present case, if we do not support the Palestinians, if we do not support Egypt in its quest to recover its territories, we will have lost moral authority in relation to other troubled situations, such as those in South Africa, Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau), or for that matter any other, similar situation where justice, law, peace and human dignity are threatened.

148. It is in support of all those principles that we voted for the draft resolution which has just been vetoed.

149. The PRESIDENT: There being no further names on my list of speakers for explanations of vote, I should like to make a *brief statement* as UNITED KINGDOM representative in order to explain my own delegation's vote.

150. The United Kingdom's vote in favour of draft resolution S/10974 marks no change in the position which successive British Governments have taken on the Middle East question since the adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in November 1967. Our position has been explained sufficiently often for it to be unnecessary for me to repeat it here. But the draft resolution reaffirmed 242 (1967) and I too should like to reaffirm that in our view resolution 242 (1967), which reconciles the Arab requirement for Israeli withdrawal with the Israeli requirement for secure and recognized boundaries, continues to provide the only firm foundation on which a Middle East settlement can be built; and my delegation does not accept that its value has been weakened or down-graded by anything said in the course of this debate or contained in the draft resolution. I should make it clear in particular that our views on withdrawal remain unaffected; they are in accordance with the text of resolution 242 (1967) and of my Foreign Secretary's speech at Harrogate in October 1970. My delegation accepted the wording of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution because it in essence reflects the undoubted fact that Israeli armed forces remain in occupation of the territories which they occupied in the June 1967 war. We deplore this fact. We also deplore the fact that a just and lasting peace has still not been achieved in the Middle East although more than six years have elapsed since the June war. We thus welcomed the inclusion of a reference to this fact in operative paragraph 1 of the draft.

151. I should also make clear that there has been no change in my Government's position with regard to the question of the "rights of the Palestinians". In our view this phrase as used in the draft resolution refers essentially to the refugees and their rights under General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and its inclusion here does not constitute a fresh prerequisite for a settlement or affect the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Nevertheless, as I have said elsewhere in the United Nations, we believe that any peace in the Middle East, if it is to be truly just and lasting, must take account of the legitimate interests and aspirations of the Palestinians.

152. That said, the draft resolution seemed to my delegation a reasonable distillation of the views held by the bulk of the members of this Council on the Middle East problem as it now confronts us, and we regret that it has not been adopted. The non-adoption of the draft nevertheless should not be allowed to obscure what seemed to me to be unanimity among Council members on a number of the elements contained in it. One point on which I am sure there was full agreement was the request to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to resume and pursue their efforts to promote a just and peaceful solution of the problem. As my delegation said here on 11 June [1721st meeting], it is not the task of this Council to impose a solution on the parties to the conflict; but it is the task of the Council to do what it can to provide renewed impetus to the diplomatic process. It is only when a

genuine negotiating process has been instituted that progress will be made towards solving the problem. It is *unfortunate that the Council has not gone on record with a specific request to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to resume their efforts. But I am sure they would be the first to agree that even without a specific request their existing responsibilities both entitle and indeed require them to act accordingly.*

153. Speaking as PRESIDENT, I invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, the next speaker on the list, to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

154. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, permit me to convey to you the high regard in which you are held by the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic. Your return among us to conduct the proceedings of the Council in a debate so important for the cause of international peace and justice testifies to your statesmanlike qualities and your human compassion.

155. Your predecessor, Ambassador Yakov Malik, as all honest people have had ample opportunity to realize, discharged admirably his duties as President. We should like to pay him a tribute and to express our great gratitude to him for his firm attitude, based as it is upon right and justice.

156. The Syrian Arab Republic delegation believed that the fact that six years had elapsed since the Zionist colonialist act of aggression was more than enough to convince the Security Council of the need radically to re-examine the situation in the Middle East. It could not have done this without going deeply into the root causes of the Israeli-Arab conflict, nor would any action have been effective if its principal aim was not to prevail upon Israel to respect the principles of the Charter with regard to the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of the territory of others by force. In any case, the Council could not possibly be casual about applying these principles in the firmest possible way, permitting neither the aggressor nor his protectors to enjoy the least advantage as the result of aggression and complicity in it.

157. However, the Council has found itself unable to impose upon Israel the application of the principles of the Charter because of the negative attitude of a permanent member, the United States of America, which has paralysed all efforts to this end and which continues to do so every time the roots or the ramifications of the Palestinian question are under discussion or when it is simply the incessant acts of Israeli aggression against the neighbouring countries which are under consideration.

158. Of course, the Syrian Arab Republic delegation believed that these facts would have focused the attention of the Council on an examination of the roots of the conflict and not simply on its symptoms, for the origin of the conflict lies in Zionist colonialist aggression against Palestinian soil and the Palestinian people. Unless the Arab people of Palestine has restored to it its inalienable,

legitimate national rights to its land, its homeland, and self-determination; unless there is an Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, Zionist aggression will persist interminably and, hence, the security of this region will remain vulnerable and constitute a dangerous source of conflict which will inevitably expose international peace and security to the gravest peril.

159. Any resolution which failed to embody these two conditions without the least ambiguity could not contribute to peace in the region. Superficial and temporary solutions would only serve to tempt Israel to pursue its aggressive expansionist designs. The Syrian Arab Republic delegation has absolutely no doubt that Israel has been able to pursue its expansionist policy only because of the material, military and moral support provided by the United States of America, which has made it possible for Israel to pursue its aggression and to consolidate its acquisition of the territory of others by force.

160. Thus, the United States of America rallies to the side of the aggressor against its victims, supporting the law of the jungle against the Charter and assisting in the dispersal of the Palestinian people, who have been reduced to refugee status, living in tents, and denying the right of this people to decide freely its own fate.

161. We have just seen the United States once again confirming this policy today by vetoing a draft resolution which in any case did not embody with the necessary clarity and without ambiguity the two conditions just mentioned—the rights of the Palestinian people and total withdrawal from occupied territories. The United States is denying the Palestinian people even the right to be called Palestinian, a right which is supported by ancient and contemporary history and which the whole world recognizes because of that people's constant struggle to recover its usurped motherland and legitimate rights.

162. The Security Council, whose members are moved by the best of intentions and inspired by wisdom and goodwill, could have dealt with the problem in depth in the light of the principles of the Charter if the action of a permanent member of the Council had not paralysed it and prevented it from taking the necessary measures to bring about the withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied territories and to create the conditions necessary for the return of the Palestinian people to its homeland and the recovery of its national rights and the exercise of its right to self-determination. This is a new blow at peace and security in the Middle East, and Israel and its protectors are entirely responsible for it.

163. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

164. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): This being my closing statement in this debate I should like to precede it with a few observations on some of the statements we heard today.

165. The last statement, that delivered by the representative of Syria, requires no comment. The spectacle of a State which openly calls for the destruction of a State Member of the United Nations, rejects all United Nations resolutions—in particular, Security Council resolution

242 (1967), which constitutes the basis for the search for peace in the Middle East—bars the Secretary-General's Special Representative from its territory, and then comes before this Council to exploit its facilities and advise us on international law and proper conduct, really needs no reaction whatever.

166. The representative of India was kind enough to suggest that Israel should follow India's ways in the United Nations. As far as the Arab delegations are concerned—delegations which are critical of Israel's attitude to resolutions of the United Nations—Israel in fact is already following India's ways, is it not? As far as other delegations are concerned, I am certain that they would advise us against following India's example in the United Nations. But I should like to assure the Security Council that Israel will continue to pursue its own course, a course determined by the defence of its legitimate rights under international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and by the need to resist Arab aggression pursued against it since 1948.

167. The representative of the Soviet Union found it necessary to support the Egyptian refusal to enter into negotiations with Israel, by saying that Israel should first withdraw from territories held by it since the 1967 hostilities. To what is this suggestion similar? To a suggestion to an Admiral Doenitz, who followed a Hitler, to inform the Soviet Government and other Allied Governments that until and unless the Soviet and Allied armies withdrew from German territory, the Germans would not sit down at a table to establish peace, tranquillity, a cease-fire and an armistice in Europe.

168. For 25 years Israel has been subjected to aggression by the Arab States, with Egypt at their head. Today we have finally succeeded in repelling the aggressor, in pushing back its armies. Are we to turn the wheels of history back and restore the situation of vulnerability and chaos which invited the Arab Governments to resist peace, to continue illegitimate warfare against us for two and a half decades? Or are we, as the founders of the United Nations did, to insist that, after a war of aggression lasting 25 years, the time has come for the Arab States to sit down and start building peace with us?

169. May I say, therefore, to Ambassador Malik: Do not suggest to Israel what you yourselves would not have been ready to do, whether in the Second World War or at any other time. By now the Soviet Union knows that in its relations with the Jewish people no discrimination and no inequality under law will be accepted. And this applies also to the Soviet attitude to the Jewish State.

170. I have listened with attention and great interest to the statement made by the representative of Jordan regarding the question of the so-called Palestinian rights. I take note of his comments. However, as he himself and all of us know, the views expressed by him are not the views held by Egypt and by the terrorist organizations which, when using the term "Palestinian rights", call for the denial of Israel's sovereign rights and for the dismemberment of Jordan. This fact in itself is sufficient to make references to the so-called Palestinian rights contrary to the principles and provisions of the Charter and detrimental to the cause of peace.

171. The mantle of innocence, of kindness and respectability does not lie well on the shoulders of those who violate law and sow bloodshed. Today's statement by the Foreign Minister of Egypt reminded me of an old Arabic proverb: "He hit me, and he cried out; he came out ahead of me, and he complained".

172. For 25 years, as I said, Egypt has been waging a war of aggression against Israel, and now that Israel has finally seized Egypt's arm, Egypt comes to complain before the very Organization whose Charter it has been violating for years and years in its attitude, in its policies, in its actions towards Israel. Minister El-Zayyat has spoken almost lyrically of a new world, a world of law, a world in which all of us would live under the Charter. These are laudable slogans, but only slogans as far as Egypt is concerned. For how has Egypt contributed throughout these decades to the construction of such a world, to making sure that international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations are respected in our region, in the Middle East? Is it by tearing the Charter to pieces in its policies and actions against Israel? The Foreign Minister of Egypt says that his country has accepted resolution 242 (1967) and remains faithful to its provisions. How did Egypt accept the basic principles and objectives of that Security Council resolution? By adopting the Khartoum resolution in 1967, which declared no peace, no recognition, no agreement with Israel, and which was again reiterated, in a speech by President Sadat of Egypt only three days ago, on 23 July? Did Egypt accept and respect resolution 242 (1967) by rejecting Ambassador Jarring's proposals one after another, in particular the crucial proposal, made as far back as 1968, that Israel and the Arab States should send delegations for conferences in Cyprus? Or did it respect resolution 242 (1967) by resorting again to force, contrary to that resolution and contrary to the cease-fire established by the Security Council, and by waging a war of attrition for almost two years against Israel in the hope that in this way it would be able to avoid the need for agreement on genuine peace with its neighbour? Or did Egypt show respect for resolution 242 (1967), which called for just and lasting peace in the area, by supporting terrorist attacks, by expressing its approval of the Lod massacre, by praising the Munich murderers?

173. Did Egypt really show respect for that resolution by insisting that the Secretary-General's representative should in his aide-mémoire of February 1971 submit Egypt's *diktat* to restore the old insecure lines of 1967, while resolution 242 (1967) called for the establishment through agreement of secure and recognized borders?

174. Finally, there has never been a Middle East without a Jewish people. In a Middle East of independent nations the sovereign Jewish State is the fulfilment of basic precepts of law and of the principles of self-determination and equality of peoples. It is high time that the Egyptian Government accept this truth and not speak of the restoration of the Jewish people's independence in its historic homeland after a struggle of centuries in a derogatory manner, as Egypt's Foreign Minister did today. Such expressions can only increase the feeling that nothing has changed and nothing has moved forward in Egypt's destructive attitude towards Israel since the days when Egypt went to war against the

Jewish State and announced that its purpose was to deprive Israel of its life and to annihilate its people.

175. The result of the vote just taken has averted a grave development in the Middle East situation. The draft resolution contained elements which would have undermined resolution 242 (1967) and which, if adopted, would have destroyed that resolution as an agreed basis for a peace settlement. The vote preserves resolution 242 (1967) as a basis on which agreement can be sought between the parties when the Arab Governments decide to engage in a serious, constructive peace-making process.

176. Egypt, which came to the Security Council in order to obtain support for its persistent war and confrontation with Israel, carried on in defiance of international law and the United Nations Charter; Egypt, which came to the Security Council in order to subvert resolution 242 (1967) by distorting its substance, upsetting its balance and adding to it new and controversial elements, has thus failed in its designs. The objective of establishing peace in the Middle East through agreement between the parties remains untampered with; the concept of imposition of terms of settlement from the outside has been barred. The fundamental premise of resolution 242 (1967) that secure and recognized boundaries must be determined in agreement between the parties, and that until such time the Israeli presence continues to be delimited by the cease-fire lines, has been safeguarded.

177. In the course of the debate, the one-sided, extreme Egyptian demands—for instance, that the Security Council should call upon Israel to withdraw to the insecure provisional lines of 1967, or that it should give support to the idea of an additional Arab Palestinian entity at the expense of Israel and Jordan—have one after another been revealed as specious and dangerous. Those demands have been gradually whittled down, and towards the end of the debate Egypt attempted to cloak them in less specific phraseology. Non-adoption of the draft resolution has thwarted that design as well.

178. Thirteen members of the Security Council voted in favour of the draft resolution. That may be regrettable. It illustrates the degree to which voting in the Security Council is divorced from the truth and realities of the Middle East conflict and the merits of the parties' positions. However, that is not new or surprising. The parliamentary imbalance in United Nations organs on Middle East questions is a known and permanent feature. One cannot change the fact that Israel is 1 while there are 18 Arab States and others which automatically vote against Israel irrespective of the merits of the issue. The mechanics of voting and vote-trading have frequently driven further States into joining that large group. Those are the elementary facts of United Nations proceedings, and they have no relation whatever to the morality or lawfulness of the position of one side or the other.

179. In any event, few are those who would seriously assess the realities of an international situation in the light of the arithmetical combinations of votes by States and blocs. Israel, defending its independence against Arab onslaughts for 25 years, has always known that its strength

lies not in such numerical permutations but in the justice of its cause and in the faith and determination of its people.

180. The outcome of the present debate must inevitably strengthen the realization that the only way to attain agreement and peace in the Middle East is negotiation between the parties to the conflict. If the Government of Egypt wishes to be true to itself and to its people, that is the conclusion it will draw from the debate. Israel stands ready to begin, together with Egypt, to build peace in the region. Israel calls on the Government of Egypt to open a new chapter in the history of the Middle East—a chapter of quiet, constructive peace making, of mutual understanding and respect, of harmony and creativity for the good of all the peoples of the area.

181. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

182. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, speaking in exercise of the right of reply, I should like first of all to point out that for the first time in the statement of the Israeli representative the attacks and insinuations were focused not only against the Soviet Union but also against a number of other members of the Security Council, whom he named, and, finally, against all the members of the Security Council who voted in favour of the resolution which was not to the aggressor's liking. This was a novelty in his statement. In the past he has concentrated all his hatred and insinuations against the Soviet Union alone. This is a clear indication that Israel is in total international isolation and no fabrications or insinuations against the USSR, against other members of the Security Council or against the Council as a whole can help to cover up Israel's aggressive and adventuristic policy and position.

183. In his customary manner, he attempted to juggle with historical facts, distorting and falsifying them. The whole world knows that Israeli and Zionist propaganda distorts the facts of history just as Goebbels distorted them in his day. It would be a good thing if the Political Department of the United Nations Secretariat were to analyse the statements of Israeli representatives from the point of view of their consistency with actual historical truth. That would be a very interesting piece of research. It would show how the representatives of Israel juggle with the truth and with historical facts. He mentioned Hitler's order to Doenitz. Read the book, *The Last Ten Days of Hitler*, which was recently published here in the United States. The author of the book was the personal aide-de-camp to the Chief of the General Staff of Hitler's army who remained in the bunker in Berlin until the last days of Hitler's downfall together with his chief, the Chief of the General Staff of Hitler's army. Hitler gave orders to Doenitz and others to contact the Western Powers in order to set the Soviet Union and its allies at odds in the joint war against Hitler's Germany. But this bid of Hitler's failed. The course of events and the outcome of the war did not follow the path along which the despairing Hitler, having lost all hope of implementing his delirious plans for world domination, tried to direct them. And there can be no doubt that the same fate awaits the delirious plans of the modern-day

aggressors who are attempting to appropriate lands belonging to others. The sooner the modern-day aggressors and adventurists understand this elementary truth and the eloquent lessons of history, the better it will be for them and for the cause of peace in the Middle East and throughout the world.

184. Nor can I overlook the Israeli representative's remarks about the position of the Soviet Union with regard to Israel. This position of principle was, and is, unchanged. We voted in the United Nations in favour of the creation of the State of Israel and we are not going back on that. And now our position of principle has been officially recorded in the joint Soviet-United States communiqué signed by Mr. L. I. Brezhnev and Mr. Nixon, in which it is stated that a settlement in the Middle East:

“... should be in accordance with the interests of all States in the area, be consistent with their independence and sovereignty and should take into due account the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people.” [*see S/10964.*]

185. That is our fundamental policy. It is the same with regard to all States. But why have we changed our position with regard to Israel? Why has the USSR broken off diplomatic relations with Israel? Why do we categorically condemn Israel as an aggressor? Why are we fighting with all the means at our disposal against aggression and giving support to the victims of aggression, the Arab peoples? Because the position of principle of the Soviet Union always was, is and will be one of struggle against aggression and aggressors. We have suffered too much from aggressors and aggression; that is why we hate them so much and do not want anyone to be subjected to aggression.

186. We have helped and will continue to help the Arab peoples to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression; we have stated this in the past, state it now, and will state it in the future; we have done this, are doing it and will continue to do it. As far as talks and a settlement in the Middle East are concerned—yes, we do constantly emphasize that the key question in a Middle East settlement is the withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories. Its solution would ensure the solution of all the other aspects of a settlement on the basis of respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and protection of the legitimate rights and interests of all the peoples of the region, including the Arab people of Palestine. That is the USSR's position of principle. We supported Israel when it was fighting for freedom and national independence. We are decisively opposed to it and condemn it now that it has become the aggressor. I would like the Israeli representative to understand this and not return to the question in future.

187. Israel itself is trying to use the methods of Hitler and Doenitz and this is obvious to all. The reference by the representative of Israel to the Jewish question is using the very methods of Hitler. The goal is one and the same: to set at odds, to stir up individual States against each other and, in this case, to set the American Jews against the Soviet Union. And some American Jews have swallowed this deception as a fish swallows a hook. By remarks of that

kind the Israeli representative has just shown the Security Council, the many representatives of other States Members of the United Nations present here, and public opinion throughout the entire world that Israel, by inspiring anti-Soviet feelings and sentiments among American Jews, is pursuing its objective of diverting the attention of the United Nations, the world community and the American people from its policy of aggression and adventurism in the Middle East.

188. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the Foreign Minister of Egypt, on whom I now call.

189. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, I ask your indulgence for just two minutes. First I should like to say that the draft resolution, which had reflected the will of four continents, now reflects, thanks to the vote of Australia, the will of five continents.

190. This is an opportunity to thank all the members of the Council and to welcome into our "mechanical majority" at least 14 members—I am sure that China did not participate in the vote not because it found the draft resolution unjust, but because it found it insufficient. However, I did not ask to speak in order to say that. I asked to speak because of the explanation just given by the representative of Israel of resolution 242 (1967), that is, that what he regards as the fundamental premise of that resolution has been safeguarded—that is, the premise that the secure and recognized boundaries must be determined by agreement between the parties and that until such time, namely, until Israel agrees, the Israeli presence continues to be delimited by the cease-fire lines. That explanation necessitates an immediate and unequivocal statement by us. If that indeed is the meaning of resolution 242 (1967), then that explanation of the resolution is far from agreed. That explanation is simply rejected not only by us, by Syria and by Jordan, but, I fervently hope, by all the members of the Security Council. Indeed, implying that this, the highest Council of the United Nations has decreed the occupation of Syria, Egypt, Jordan and Palestinian Gaza is a calumny and an insult to this Council which does not deserve any more words from me.

191. Mr. President, I said that I anticipated a message, but I have received two. You will leave this Council as I shall leave it now; you will go to your world and I shall go to mine. I wish you well; I hope you wish me the same.

192. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

193. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): It is most regrettable that the Security Council should have concluded its exhaustive review of the grave Middle East crisis without being able to initiate any positive or categorical energetic steps towards a just solution in conformity with justice, the United Nations Charter and the exigencies of the situation.

194. Earlier I expressed certain reservations concerning the final text of the draft resolution, because my delegation felt that it did not rise in adequate measure to the

frightening and full dimensions of the crisis. With the failure of the draft resolution the seriousness of the situation has been doubly compounded, for if the highest implementation organ of the United Nations finds itself helpless and immobilized, from where could constructive hope be expected to come? But, be that as it may, the failure of the Security Council to act does not end the acute problem which we face and will continue to face in the area. A totally unjust and intolerable *status quo* which has stemmed from a flagrant act of violence will continue to torment the area and world peace at large so long as it is allowed to persist.

195. My delegation has been motivated all along by a genuine desire to see a real and not a rhetorical movement towards a just and lasting peace. In association with our brothers in Egypt and with all the other true friends of justice and the rule of law, we have unfailingly been open-minded and flexible, the aim being to achieve progress and not to score points in a game of words. The same cannot possibly be said of Israel's position and its intransigence and obstructionism. Let us all remember that it is Israel which still occupies the territories of three Member States; that it is Israel which adamantly denies any rights to its first victims, the Palestinians, by its denying them their homes and forcing them into exile and by its present dismemberment of Jordan and occupation of Gaza.

196. The Security Council's failure to act cannot and does not exonerate it from its primary responsibility for international peace and order, for resisting blatant aggression and for ensuring that in relations among nations force and violence shall not be allowed to prevail over the principles of the Charter.

197. The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of the item on our agenda.

Expression of farewell to Sir Colin Crowe, representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

198. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, now that our work has been concluded may I, in a very few words, perform a duty with which my colleagues around the table have entrusted me, the pleasant duty of speaking for them also while I express views that I personally hold in the light of the very close, trusting and friendly relations that have always existed between you and me.

199. All the delegations represented around the table and all those who for the past two years have sat around the table very sincerely regret the fact that you will soon be leaving. The active and constructive assistance that you have constantly brought to the deliberations of the Council have now culminated in the presidency that you have assumed with the competence and authority that all of us here have learned to expect from you.

200. During the discussions by the Council of one of its most difficult problems—indeed one of the most difficult of those before the Organization as a whole—your experience

as a diplomat and your knowledge of our procedures and usage have been most valuable to us and have doubtless assisted us in concluding this debate in the atmosphere of calm which was to be desired and which alone was in keeping with the gravity of the subject.

201. Now that you will be leaving us to enjoy a peace and quiet that I am sure will not stand in the way of your continuing to make a contribution to the international community as well as to your country, I know that I speak for all your colleagues and all those who have worked with you in saying that we will all retain a particularly pleasant memory of the relations that we have enjoyed with you during your passage through the United Nations and in

expressing to Lady Crowe and you our sincerest and most friendly wishes.

202. The PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Ambassador de Guiringaud. If I had known what you were going to say I should have banged the gavel a good deal earlier. But I am really very deeply touched by the remarks that you have all made. I have valued enormously my collaboration with you and indeed with all my colleagues around this table, and I can only say thank you very much indeed for your indulgence and for all the friendship that I have enjoyed over these years.

The meeting rose at 2.10 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Найдите справку об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
