

C-7380 Transcription

Eban, Abba. Address for peace negotiations at the  
United Nations. 13 July 1948.

Abba Eban:

[clears throat] [coughing in background] Mr. President, members of the Security Council, there is not a single person in this room, or outside it, who does not know in the depths of his heart, that the Arab states, by resuming their attacks upon Israel, have committed an act of aggression within the meaning of Chapter 7 of the Charter. Their armed forces are operating beyond their frontiers for purposes which the Charter specifically forbids. They are using force against the territorial integrity and political independence of the State of Israel, in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Their object, which they openly confess, is to secure the violent extinction of the State of Israel [01:00], the establishment of which was recommended by the general assembly. They have rejected the solemn appeal of the Security Council, to agree to a prolongation of the truce agreement initiated by the May 29<sup>th</sup> Resolution, with the result that that truce agreement has become void and has no validity at this time. On the third

of July, the mediator appointed by the United Nations, appealing to all governments concerned, for a prolongation of the truce, made the following observations. "There is little doubt that a decision to resume fighting would be universally condemned, and that a party taking such a decision would be assuming a responsibility which would be viewed by the world with the utmost gravity." Well, Mr. President, the Arab states have taken that decision [02:00]. They have assumed that responsibility. They have resumed fighting. Their violence is directed against the recommendation of the general assembly, against the appeal of the Security Council, against the call of the mediator, against the principles of world peace, against the people and the State of Israel. And the State of Israel, which is the victim of this renewed aggression, now turns to this great organ of the United Nations to ask, is that decision universally condemned? Is that responsibility viewed by the world with the utmost gravity? Does this Council condemn the decision to resume fighting? Does this Council view with the utmost gravity? And if so, what steps does the Council propose to take in order to vindicate the Charter against flagrant aggression, to impose the penalties [03:00] which aggression imperatively incurs and to place moral and material support behind the state of Israel,

defending its integrity and independence against aggressive attack? It should not be necessary at this stage, Mr. President, to provide elaborate evidence in order to prove the aggressive character of these warlike movements upon which the armies of the Arab states have launched themselves with conspicuous and welcome lack of success since Friday last. The Charter, which its explicit distinction between the legitimate and illegitimate use of force, provides a spontaneous response to those who would question the aggressive character of these acts. Neither article 51, which allows to members of the United Nations of the right of self-defense only if an armed attack [04:00] occurs upon them, nor the preamble of the Charter which lays it down that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest, can possibly be invoked in support of these squalid attacks. For Egypt, Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Yemen have not been individually or jointly attacked. And they have certainly not been invited by the United Nations to storm into territory not their own for purposes of havoc and murder. Therefore the principals of the Charter themselves proclaim these operations as acts of aggression, and the same result is reached if we apply to these acts the commonly accepted criterion of responsibility and initiative, for here we are in

the unusual position of not being faced with any conflict of views on the question of who began the fighting. [05:00] When the first official phase of this aggression began on May the 15<sup>th</sup>, representatives of the Arab states showered documents upon this Council as they have done again this week, asserting that they had taken the initiative for using armed force outside their frontiers with the purpose of overthrowing the political independence and territorial integrity of a neighboring state whose existence they dislike.

Under the Charter, they are, of course, entitled to dislike the existence of the State of Israel. But under the Charter, they are most emphatically and categorically forbidden to use armed force against the political independence or territorial integrity of that state, or indeed to use armed force against anybody in Palestinian territory, for any purpose whatever, save in the common interest of the United Nations, [06:00] or in defense of their own territories, if those territories had been unprovokedly attacked. Not one of the conditions which make the use of armed force legitimate under the Charter exists or has been claimed to exist in respect of these acts.

At the 302<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Security Council, representatives of the Arab states read statements similar in

substance and tone to those which now lie before us, asserting the political ambitions whereby they are animated, and the violent means which they use in their support. On that occasion the distinguished representative of the United States said of those declarations, "Their statements are the best evidence we have of the international character of this aggression. They tell us quite frankly that their business in Palestine is political, [07:00] and that they are there to establish a unitary state. Therefore we have evidence of the highest type concerning the international violation of the law, namely the admission of those who commit this violation."

On May the 28<sup>th</sup>, supporting a resolution submitted by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union, the representative of the United States succinctly expressed the purposes of Arab aggression in these words: "We, they say, are there only for the purpose of overwhelming the government of Israel. We are going to overwhelm it by power, and we are going to determine an international question ourselves." Continuing, he said, "An existing independent government cannot be blotted out in that way, it cannot be blotted out by just sitting at the Security Council table and ignoring it. The Arab states are taking the only course [08:00] that can be taken to blot it out,

and that is marching in with their armies and blotting it out. That is a matter of international concern, a matter of so great importance that we cannot sit here and say, 'Oh, we wash our hands of it. We shall not do anything about it to make it effective.' We know of course that this is a violation of the Charter." And finally, referring to the claim of the Arabs aimed at the maintenance of peace, the representative of the United States said, "This is equivalent in its absurdity to the legend that these five armies are there to maintain peace and at the same time are conducting a bloody war."

Mr. President, during the earlier episodes of this conflict, which began in December and took official form on the 15<sup>th</sup> of May, the aggressive character of the Arab invasion was so clear to many members of the Security Council [09:00] that five of them were already prepared, before any truce procedure or investigation had taken place, without any intervention by an agent of the United Nations to test the peaceful intentions of the two parties, to determine on the basis of existing evidence, even at that early stage, that there existed a threat to the peace. Those other members of the Security Council who were unable to view that drastic view at so early a stage, were not prepared that such a threat to the peace or act of aggression

existed. Not one of them, except that member of the Security Council whose government has been directly implicated in every act of aggression that has taken place in the Near East for the last six months, not one member of the Security Council, with that obvious exception, was prepared to assert that the Arab armies had any moral or legal justification [10:00] for the military operations which they were carrying out. Those members, however, wished to make sure, that all methods of pacific settlement provided for in Chapter 6 of the Charter had been tried and exhausted. They wished to give a final chance for the counsels of moderation to assert themselves. To this end, ceasefire resolutions were repeatedly sponsored, accepted by the government of Israel, rejected by the Arab states, reexamined by the Security Council, and eventually served up on May the 29<sup>th</sup> in the form of a resolution which combined the call for a ceasefire with the satisfaction with what the United Kingdom representative called "the political demands which the Arabs consider reasonable." These demands were expressed in a universal arms embargo, which denied arms equally to the State of Israel engaged in its defense [11:00] and to the Arab states bent upon a consider-...upon what a considerable body of international opinion was already willing to label as

aggression. This equation of principle between the defending State of Israel and its attackers enabled the invading states to maintain the preponderance of arms which they had built up...through the long and uninterrupted exercise of their sovereign rights and their military alliance with a great power. We attach great significance to paragraph seventeen of the mediator's report, in which he describes Jewish and Arab military activity in terms of defense and attack, respectively: As a further inducement to the Arab states to refrain from the use of armed force, encroachments were demanded upon the sovereignty of Israel in that matter wherein its sovereignty is most vital and cherished [12:00], the matter of immigration. Unwarranted restrictions placed upon the state of Israel in this regard were extended still further by the mediator's assumption of discretion and by the action of certain governments which misinterpreted those immigration provisions beyond the limits of the truce resolution and of the mediator's interpretation. Of these cases, Mr. President, the most striking is that of Cyprus, to which the provisional government of Israel has drawn the attention of the Security Council in document S 886. 11,000 men of military age, many of them victims of persecution for over a decade, are held on that island in captivity without elementary



human rights. The matter concerns the Security Council because its name has been invoked to cover that injustice. [13:00] It has been represented that the truce resolution justified these detentions, yet we have learned here only this morning that the only authority competent to interpret the recent truce resolution considers that these detentions rest upon no authority, no request, no interpretation, and no discretion on his part. It is therefore an arbitrary, unilateral, and dictatorial act.

I shall now read a telegram reaching me from Cyprus a few hours ago, dispatched from Famagusta on the 12<sup>th</sup> of this month, from the central committee of Cyprus refugees: "The army authorities at Karaolos camp distributed the following on July the 9<sup>th</sup>, quote, 'The latest outbreak and demonstration will no longer be tolerated and must cease. Henceforth, every attempt to escape will be dealt with; with strongest...measures [14:00] if necessary. Troops will fire with the aim not to wound but to kill. In addition, all privileges such as free distribution of cigarettes and special supplement of the American Joint Distribution Committee will be stopped immediately. No further warning will be given. Despite Sir Godfrey Collins's assurance to the Jewish Distribution Committee today, this is a mistake,

the army stands firm.'" That, sir, is how a military authority addresses these innocent and unoffending people, detained without trial, for no offense under any existing law. And I raise the matter here not merely to register a protest, which I do, but to elicit if we can from the United Kingdom representative, whether he now agrees that there is not resolution of the united Nations valid at this time which now justifies, if it ever justified, which we deny, [15:00] the use of force against their people and their detention in Cyprus against their will. And also to enquire, as a matter of principle, under what offense, in any existing law they are penalized in this way, or what authority the government of Cyprus possesses to influence their movement in any manner at all. [coughs] Despite these difficulties, Mr. President, for a period of four weeks an uneasy truce has existed, during which time the mediator reports that no military advantage was gained by either side. It was, of course, the mediator's duty to preserve that military equilibrium, but after the event, faced as we are with open aggression, it does not comfort us to recall that the party which has loyally accepted every honorable means of avoiding bloodshed, and the party [16:00] which now stands guilty of having broken forth into aggression, have for the past

four weeks, been equally impeded in their preparations for defense and attack, respectively. [clears throat]

Mr. President, I doubt whether the Council is concerned at this moment to investigate the detailed history of the truce, in all the phases of its application. Were it to do so, I doubt whether it would come to endorse the Egyptian account in Document S 883, portraying how the Arabs sat patiently by in splendid and immaculate virtue, amidst an unceasing torrent of Jewish violations. Indeed sir, if I were to give an account of Arab violations, two of which were reported to this Security Council, and fifty-five of which were yesterday communicated by Mr. Shertok to Mr. Reedman, I should detain the Council far beyond the limits of utility and relevance. [17:00] It is sufficient to state that this theme, that legitimate Arab interests were adversely affected by this truce, is exactly the opposite of the truth. Addressing the Security Council five...the Security Council five weeks ago, I took leave, sir, to enquire whether any state represented round this table would willingly neglect opportunities for improving its defense for a period of four weeks, if it had complete certainty that at the end of those four weeks the armies of five neighboring states would sweep upon it in converging aggression. We further

expressed doubt whether any state represented here would willingly submit its immigration policy, based upon its own right of internal jurisdiction, to the scrutiny or control of anyone else. Yet the State of Israel did accept these restrictive conditions, [18:00] which it believes should never have been imposed upon it. It allowed its scanty defensive resources to remain unaugment during the period which it knew to be merely a prelude for further attacks upon its boundaries and its political integrity. It allowed the hand of external control to reach into the rights of immigration, which are the very substance of its national purpose and ideal. It was able to accept these limitations because they were imposed for a specified period of very brief duration, and because the government of Israel, borne out of a United Nations judgment and recommendation, has been eager at all times to affirm its fidelity to the principles and the processes of the Charter. In later weeks, this government, establishing itself in the very turmoil of war, revealed its ability to assert its internal authority, and its respect for international obligations [19:00], even in the cruelest and most poignant of circumstances. Therefore, when we read documents emanating from the Egyptian government and the Arab League, portraying that

period of truce as one of Jewish advantage, we lose faith in the integrity of those who formulated these documents, knowing as they must that the main brunt of those restrictive conditions fell heavily upon Israel alone. [clears throat] On the morning of July the 9<sup>th</sup>, the period of the four weeks truce expired. [clears throat] Owing to the Arab refusal to grant a prolongation, it was not renewed. It is therefore no longer in force, and no government, either in the United Nations or outside it, is bound any longer by any of its provisions or restrictions. In this connection, Mr. President, I draw attention to document S 889, [20:00] submitted by the government of Israel on the 12<sup>th</sup> of July, referring to an episode on the 15<sup>th</sup> of June, when your predecessor as president of the Security Council informed all member states and some non-member states that a truce with certain terms and conditions existed and was valid. We consider, sir, that it is now necessary, by the same procedure, for all governments addressed by the Council on the 15<sup>th</sup> of June to be told that the period of the truce agreement has expired and has failed of renewal. We consider that as a matter of procedure, it would be sufficient simply to submit that truthful information, without drawing any consequences from the part of the Security Council. At any rate, the truce is

dead. The apparatus of observance and supervision has disintegrated. [21:00] The readiness of the government of Israel to agree to a four weeks continuation was most contemptuously rejected on the Arab side, and in the absence either of continuous validity or of mutual acceptance, that Jewish offer belongs to the history of these recent weeks. In an admirable last minute effort to keep war at bay while the next stage was contemplated, the mediator turned to both parties and asked them to agree to an unconditional ceasefire for a period of ten days. Here, Mr. President, was a searching test of peaceful intention...Here was a request the refusal of which could be nothing but an avowal of aggressive purpose, for what legitimate political objectives could anyone have which can be threatened by the preservation of peace for ten days? What are the moral or legal justifications on which such a refusal can be based?

[22:00] What are the national or political ambitions which rest upon so flimsy a foundation that they cannot endure ten days and ten nights of peace? The government of Israel accepted this proposal. It is for research to determine whether this was the seventh, or the eighth, or the ninth such acceptance. The Arab governments rejected it. Before the previous truce had even expired, Egyptian forces in the coastal sector of the Negev

launched their assault. Their commander was found on capture to possess operation orders which show conclusively that his government has planned not merely to avoid prolongation but even to launch the aggression anew before the statutory period of the existing truce had expired. [clears throat] In these circumstances, anybody who will not determine these acts to constitute aggression must be hard pressed to demonstrate that the [23:00] word aggression can have any meaning at all. If governments that are members of the United Nations use armed force against- outside their frontiers, when they have not been attacked, with the avowed aim of overthrowing the political and territorial integrity of a state established by recommendation of the General Assembly; when they do this in defiance of an appeal by the Security Council and its accredited representative; when they rekindle the flames of a war which the whole world passionately wishes to see extinguished; when they decline a respite of ten days during which devices of peace may still be considered; when they do all this, how can you say that they do not commit aggression, unless you are prepared to erase the word aggression from the Charter and from the dictionary, and to sign and advance certificate of impunity for any act of aggression that future history may bring? [24:00]

It is obvious, Mr. President, that those who reject proposals for ceasefire and commit their destiny to military action must be prepared to take the full military consequences of their acts. And this the Arab states are now doing in the field. But surely if the Security Council wishes to retain its authority in the eyes of both parties, it cannot pass over aggression in silence and allow no political consequences to flow from it. It is for that reason that the provisional government of Israel, in its cable to the Secretary General, Document S 871 concludes with the following words: "While its armed forces are ready for the most determined action on all fronts, the provisional government of Israel is most interested to learn what the Security Council will decide in the present emergency. [clears throat] We believe that this interest [25:00] is most earnestly shared by peace-loving peoples throughout the world, who with all respect to other provisions of the Charter, regard it as the central function of the United Nations to suppress threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. It is therefore the considered view of the government of Israel that the only action consonant with the duty of the Security Council at this hour would be to determine an act of Arab aggression, arising out of the Arab decision to



resume hostilities, and as a provisional measure under Article 40, to order that aggression immediately and unconditionally to cease. We believe that to address further appeals to these aggressor states, or to harness them again to truce proposals imposing restrictions upon the defenders, or to look pathetically for any unexplored shelter along the well-trodden paths [26:00] of Chapter 6, would be entirely out of accord with the new situation in which the May 29<sup>th</sup> truce has lapsed and has been succeeded by open acts of aggression, which the Security Council should without delay and without condition bring to an end. The idea that any outbreak of violence after the expiration of the truce would exhaust the methods of pacific settlement is inherent in the very terms of the truce resolution itself, the concluding paragraph of which reads, in the words of the United Kingdom representative, 'The Security Council decides that if the present resolution, having been accepted, is subsequently repudiated or violated, the situation in Palestine will be reconsidered with a view to action under chapter 7 of the Charter.' "

Mr. President, action under Chapter 7 cannot be a mere repetition of measures previously taken under Chapter 6. The May 29<sup>th</sup> resolution was a typical instrument of action under Chapter

6. Now, however, we enter a field where the existence of aggression, the determination of responsibility and initiative, and a clear differentiation between aggression and defense, must form an organic part of any resolution to which the Security Council could lend its support. We need no repetition of a truce with invading armies poised in suspended violence upon Israel's frontiers. We need a deterrent of aggression. We need those invading armies to go home, so that the frontiers of Israel become the frontiers of a durable peace. A truce, by its very nature, [28:00] crystallizes aggression at the point which it has reached at the time the truce comes into operation. It therefore carries with it the seed of possibly renewed war. What we have to ensure is that the whole tide of invasion is ordered back to the territory from which it arose. With the permission of the Council, I should like, sir, to pass a few reflections on behalf of the government of Israel on the nature of the Arab replies to the mediator's proposals and on the important and illuminating report which the mediator has submitted to the Security Council in Document S 888. [clears throat] "Running through the Arab answers there is a single theme, namely that the Arab states harbor certain political ambitions, which they regard as legitimate but which cannot be advanced if there is

peace." [clears throat] [29:00] We ask the Council whether this fact is not itself a reflection of those ambitions, and whether political aspirations which can only be fostered by successful war do not inherently disqualify themselves from the approval of the liberal world, for we cannot admit that there is a natural equation between the political aspirations of both sides. On the one hand, there is the spectacle of a nation rising up from the ocean of twenty centuries in which it had been submerged, and founding a new unit of the human family, embodying a distinctive tradition, spirit, and culture, the survival of which has not been without significance to the life of mankind. This resurgence takes place on the very soil on which that nation first established its identity. It is accompanied with a hope of personal deliverance [30:00] for the victims of the world's greatest tragedy, and this event which despite its small compass has made an irresistible appeal to the chivalry and sentiment of the world, rests upon the principles of a valid international decision. This is one process, on one side. It can be carried out in peace, though even war does not make it unfeasible.

On the other hand, there is the desire of a people, sated and replete with an abundance of political and territorial independence, to wipe this small nation off the face of the

Earth, in repudiation of international judgment and will. That is an ambition nurtured in the very spirit of war. To establish the State of Israel, and to wipe it out by force, are not political aims of equal legitimacy, certainly not under the terms of the Charter.

[error in splice; jumps backward and repeats]...between the political aspirations of both sides. [31:00] On the one hand there is the spectacle of a nation rising up from the ocean of twenty centuries in which it had been submerged, and founding a new unit of the human family, embodying a distinctive tradition, spirit, and culture, the survival of which has not been without significance to the life of mankind. This resurgence takes place on the very soil on which that nation first established its identity. It is accompanied with a hope of personal deliverance for the victims of the world's greatest tragedy, and this event which despite its small compass has made an irresistible appeal to the chivalry and sentiment of the world, rests upon the principles of a valid international decision. This is one process, on one side. It can be carried out in peace, though even war does not make it unfeasible.

On the other hand, [32:00] there is the desire of a people, sated and replete with an abundance of political and territorial

independence to wipe this small nation off the face of the Earth, in repudiation of international judgment and will. That is an ambition nurtured in the very spirit of war. To establish the State of Israel, and to wipe it out by force, are not political aims of equal legitimacy, certainly not under the terms of the Charter. And when the Arab states confess in these documents that their political aspirations cannot be advanced without resumed war, they do not thereby justify their war; they merely invalidate their political aspirations.

It seems well, Mr. President, for all parties to this dispute, and for all who hope to help bring it to an end, to focus their attention, all the time, upon the central issue [33:00]. That issue is the immovable determination of the State of Israel to exist and survive. This state is the product of the most sustained historic tenacity which the ages recall. Somehow this people, in the very climax of its agony, has managed to generate the cohesion, the energy and the confidence to bring the third Jewish commonwealth into existence. This is no mean heritage. It is not a heritage to be lightly surrendered. It is not to be abandoned at the first smell of danger. The Jewish people has not striven towards this goal for twenty centuries...in order that having once been achieved, with the

full endorsement of international opinion, it will not be surrendered in response to an illegitimate and unsuccessful campaign of aggression. Whatever else changes, [34:00] this will not. The State of Israel is an immutable part of the international landscape. To plan the future without it is to build delusions on sand. Everything that contributes to an Arab belief in the stability and the permanence of Israel brings the prospect of harmony nearer. That is why every act of recognition, every voice uplifted against aggression, every manifestation of international concern for this small republic in its most gallant defense is a milestone on the road which is going to lead us to peace, perhaps more rapidly than we now expect. Mr. President, the report of the mediator to the Security Council reached my delegation late last night, and we should like to reserve our right on a future occasion to comment on what is obviously a most important contribution to a study of this problem. [35:00] The observations of the government of Israel on the suggestions tentatively put forward by the mediator for a peaceful adjustment have already been submitted to this Council as Document S 870. The policy of the government of Israel is to seek relations of harmony with the neighboring Arab states, on the basis of its own complete freedom and

integrity. It was therefore compelled to reject certain proposals, which encroached upon its sovereignty in a way that had seldom been suggested in respect of any independent state. It affirmed, and it now reaffirms, its inability to agree to any encroachment upon or limitation of the free sovereignty of the people of Israel in its independent state. It must be particularly emphatic in its opposition to any infringement of Israel's independence and sovereignty as regards her immigration, uh, policy [36:00]. In its reply to the mediator's proposals, the government of Israel made it clear, that there can be no question of any Israeli government accepting the slightest derogation in favor of any joint or international body from Israel's sovereignty as regards control of her immigration policy. We stress this because in Paragraph 26 of the mediator's report, we regret to see again the unpromising appearance of a suggestion for encroaching upon Israel in this, the most sensitive point of its interest, principle, and conscience. It is simply not accurate to say that unrestricted immigration into the Jewish area over a period of years might give rise to a population pressure such as would justify Arab fears of ultimate Jewish expansion in the Near East. We would not shirk a discussion of the demographic problems of the Near East. [37:00]

If we were embark upon it, we should have to plunge into the works of Cleland and Warrener [?], and Bonnie [?], and Himade and Isawi [?], and would certainly rise with a conviction that the population difficulties of the Near East arise from the pressure of excessive population in Egypt and the consequences of an inadequate population throughout the entire area of the fertile crescent. But to portray the possibilities of Jewish immigration, drawing from a pathetically depleted reservoir of Jewish remnants left alive in the world, to portray this State of Israel approaching its first million of population as a potential threat to the far-flung Arab empire, with its forty millions of population, is to accept uncritically one of the most unfounded of Arab contentions. If the fear is unfounded in practice, it is even more illegitimate to uphold it in principle. [38:00] We cannot, we cannot accept that Jewish immigration into the Jewish area of Palestine, I quote the report, "concerns the neighboring Arab world. We declare that immigration into Israel is the business of Israel alone. The governments of Egypt, Transjordan and Syria have no more jurisdiction in this question than has the government of Israel in any of their internal affairs. The suggestion that a neighboring state might exercise a power of challenge or veto



against Israel's immigration policy is to us as fantastic as it would be to suggest that Canada should be able to influence the immigration policy of the United States on the grounds of geographical proximity and a mutual continental interest. For this reason the government of Israel was compelled to reject the mediator's immigration proposal, which apart from these questions of principle and practice, seemed to us to constitute a double breach of the Charter. [39:00] It awarded the Economic and Social Council a power of binding decision which it does not possess under the Charter, and it constituted an undoubted interference in the domestic jurisdiction of a state. We are disappointed also to find which the horror which convulsed the Jewish world at the suggestion that Jerusalem be incorporated in the Arab state has not yet caused any revision of the mediator's view on this subject, for we find the idea of an Arab Jerusalem recurring in paragraph 28. Here is a city with sacred associations, all derived ultimately from its Jewish origin, with a clear Jewish predominance in its population, its economy, its social and intellectual life, with the closest ties of national sentiment linking it to the state of Israel, and with the status in international law deriving [40:00] from the universal Christian interest in its destiny. It is suggested to

hand over this city to the rule of one who has contributed nothing to it but pillage and destruction. When we read of this proposal, our mind goes back to the deliberations of the general assembly, and to the urgent concern which was then expressed by many representatives, perhaps most eloquently and persistently by the representative of Sweden for the maintenance of Jerusalem as a city held in international trust, combined with the freedom of its population to come within the jurisdiction of the states with which their sentiments and allegiance were bound up."

Mr. President, the insistence by the state of Israel upon its unrestricted sovereignty is by no means incompatible with its vision of Arab-Jewish cooperation. Indeed the doctrine of sovereign equality, which is the basis of the Charter, makes political independence [41:00] the essential condition of regional cooperation in the modern world. When we speak of an independent, sovereign Israel, joining with its neighbors in projects of regional development, we set no precedent, we depart from no principle which is not based upon the Charter and commonly accepted as the most advanced political ideal of the contemporary world. We have previously invited the Council to regard this problem in terms of other analogies. We have pointed to the Bene-Lux union, to the Free Association of Independent

Nations within the British Commonwealth, to regional cooperation Eastern Europe and in South America between states possessed of common principles and ideals, as indicating the typical, modern synthesis of full political independence with close, regional cooperation. We find the same story nearer home. [42:00] The Arab league itself, little as it might have done in the sphere of social and economic progress on a regional basis, at least has the merit of respecting the sovereignty of its individual members. And even two countries so akin as Syria and Lebanon, and joined together by common economic interests in so many enterprises, yet cannot envisage their cooperation except on the basis of the free, unrestricted political sovereignty of each one of them. How farfetched then it is to imagine that this principle of political independence, which cannot be compromised even between peoples of similar social and cultural background, can be obscured in the relations of Israel with its neighbors.

We ask the mediator, we ask the Arab states, we ask the United Nations, to examine with greater care this formula which is fundamental to our conception of Arab-Jewish relations, the formula [43:00] of political independence combined with regional cooperation, not the statutory unity of an artificial confederation, but the spontaneous contracts of free and

separate units. That is the vision which we uphold, and we uphold it because it conforms with the essential facts of the Near Eastern situation, the basic truth of separate national aspirations and common economic interests. There is nothing impossible about that solution. There is certainly nothing ignoble about it. And nobody can possibly demonstrate that its promise is less than that contained in the only alternative, which is that of an unceasing, fruitless, and sterile war. We know that once the formula of political independence with regional cooperation is accepted, the objective conditions of harmony will be achieved. The Near East does not need war.

[44:00] The Near East needs scientific agriculture. It needs skilled industry. It needs modern methods of social cooperation. It needs the application of scientific research to regional problems of health and development. It needs the enriching flow of human and material resources. Now these things, which by any objective analysis, the Near East most requires for its own welfare, are the very thing which are most characteristic of Israel's achievement in its regional environment. Therefore we insist that an independent Israel, in free cooperation with its neighbors cannot, by any stretch of fancy, be described as alien to the genuine interest of the Near East. But in conclusion, Mr.

President, I would say that these promising visions do not begin to open up while aggression stalks through the land, for this aggression is not merely a blow [45:00] against the Charter, it is also hostile to the essential truth of Near Eastern harmony. In the replies to the mediator by the Egyptian government, and the political committee of the Arab League, we find the unusual suggestion that while they proceed with their aggressive onslaught, the mediator can still pursue his tasks of peaceful adjustment. It is necessary that we entirely rule out that illusion. While aggression is being committed against it, Israel can hardly be expected to listen to Arab proposals concerning a peace settlement. The Arab states cannot flout the Security Council, reject the appeal of a mediator, launch into naked aggression, and simultaneously expect that the organs of the United Nations will deal with them about the satisfaction of their political aims. You cannot put your faith simultaneously in the arbitrament of war [46:00] and in the methods of peaceful settlement. You must choose between them. It would be an unprecedented anomaly if both of them were to be chosen at the same time, and that is not going to happen. Only when this aggression ceases is there a useful prospect of discussion proposals for peaceful relations between independent Israel and

its neighbors. And once aggression ceases, the only proposals worthy to be discussed will be proposals for peace and amity between an independent Israel with her independent neighbors, on the basis of the closest possible collaboration in all fields. We believe that the most significant phrase in the mediator's report is that contained in paragraph 36: "If armed force is forbidden in the settlement of the problem, and it is made prohibitively unprofitable for the Arab states to employ it, there will be in Palestine [47:00] a Jewish community with a separate cultural and political existence, a Jewish state whose strength and prosperity and capacity for economic and social development by the admission of its own leaders must largely depend on its ability to cultivate friendly relations with its Arab neighbors."

Mr. President, the Preamble to that sentence determines its conclusion. Only when aggression dies down, only when armed force is forbidden in the settlement of this problem, only when it is made prohibitively unprofitable for the Arab states to employ it, only then does the prospect of any peaceful relations emerge upon the horizon, beckoning the initiative and foresight of both parties. We should be wrong to spend time considering a final peace, unless we were sure that these obstacles could be

surmounted. It is for the Security Council therefore to forbid armed force in the settlement [48:00] of this problem. It is for the Security Council make it prohibitively unprofitable for the Arab states to employ armed force. It is for the Security Council, having seen aggression committed, to determine that aggression, to specify its authors, and to demand its immediate, unconditional and permanent cessation. [clears throat]

