



ISRAEL'S GOAL: PEACE

By GOLDA MEIR

Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs

ISRAEL OFFICE OF INFORMATION

*Text of Address by Mrs. Golda Meir, Israel Minister for
Foreign Affairs, before the General Assembly of the United Nations
on December 5, 1956*

Published by the
ISRAEL OFFICE OF INFORMATION

11 East 70th St., New York 21, N. Y.

Los Angeles, Cal.
659 So. Highland Ave.

Washington, D. C.
1621 — 22nd St.

Chicago, Ill.
936 N. Michigan Ave.

Atlanta, Ga.
795 Peachtree St., N.E.

Ottawa, Canada
45 Powell Ave.

Montreal, Canada
1555 McGregor St.

This material is filed with the Department of Justice where the required registration statement, under 22 U. S. C. 611 et seq., of Israel Office of Information as an agency of the Israel Government is available for inspection. Registration does not imply approval or disapproval of this material by the United States Government.

Printed in the U.S.A.

December, 1956

Mr. President,

I should like first on behalf of the Israel Delegation to express to you our warm felicitations on your election to the high office which you now occupy. Your unanimous election is a tribute not only to your country and to the peoples of Asia but to you personally, in recognition of the long and distinguished service which you have rendered to the cause of international understanding, and of the high qualities of chairmanship which you have shown in previous sessions.

The past year has been an important milestone in the progress of the United Nations. It has been marked by notable developments both in its composition and in its responsibilities. Our membership is at last approaching that ideal of universality to which my delegation has always subscribed. Many European nations, which had until now been unrepresented among us, have at last been admitted in our numbers. At the same time the swift process of African-Asian emancipation is reflected by the addition to our body of many countries which, like my own, had until very recent years been under colonial or mandatory tutelage. We, on the western limits of the Asian continent, are identified with these other countries of Asia in their struggle for independence and we have rejoiced with them in their ultimate triumph. We look to them, out of their own experience, to have understanding for our desire and determination to maintain our national existence in peace and independence.

In our belief that the interest of the world community will best be served by a maximum representation within this body, we have not refrained from voting in favor of countries where our own goodwill has yet to be reciprocated. It is our assumption and hope that every state which accepts the privileges and responsibilities of our Organization will abide by the basic principles of its Charter, which enjoin upon every member the duty to live in peace and friendship with every other member.

Mr. President, I shall inevitably be obliged to concentrate most of my statement on the political problems which directly affect the people of our area and which have taken up so much of the time of

this Assembly in the past weeks. If I fail to deal with other important problems it is due to no lack of interest or attention on our part to matters which affect the world community in general. On the matter of Hungary, my Delegation has already given expression to its position in the statement made and the vote recorded. We shall express ourselves on other issues in the relevant committees. I should however like to take this opportunity to refer to one aspect of United Nations work which is, I believe, a source of satisfaction to all of us — that of the Technical Assistance Administration. The work of building up and reconstructing our land and integrating our immigrant population has continued uninterruptedly despite the heavy tensions and difficulties of the past years. Our relations with the United Nations and with the Specialized Agencies in the field of technical assistance are highly valued by us. It has been a fruitful association. We have received the advice and help of experts in various fields from health and labor relations to productivity and taxation techniques. We are glad to pay tribute to the manner in which the officials concerned have carried out their assignments and to their devotion to the ideal of international cooperation and mutual help amongst nations. At the same time we, for our part, take some pride in the fact that we are not only recipients of international technical assistance, but have also been able to make a modest contribution in supplying expert help to other countries in certain fields in which we acquired a more specialized experience.

On the broader scene, Mr. President, I would like also to add the following on a topic which affects the very destinies and existence of mankind.

During the last decade the world suddenly became aware of the invisible danger lurking in the background: the possible biological effects of atomic radiation, — a danger which may cause irreparable harm to many generations to come.

Many countries of the world are vigorously carrying out scientific investigations of the various facets of the new and extremely complicated problem of radioactive contamination. However, the United Nations bears a particular responsibility in this matter, since it has the authority as well as the technical means to deal also with the political problems involved — such as the control of nuclear weapons' tests.

A few days ago the distinguished representative of Norway sug-

gested to this Assembly that as a first step, any planned weapons' tests, expected to cause measurable world-wide radioactive fall-out, should be registered with the United Nations. My delegation was impressed by this proposal, and hopes that it will receive the attention of the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

The desire for peace, Mr. President, is deeply rooted among the people of Israel. And when, just nine years ago, the United Nations General Assembly, by more than a two-thirds vote, adopted its resolution that a Jewish State be established in Palestine, our profoundest wish was that the hand of friendship which we then extended to our Arab neighbors would be accepted. Can it be doubted that, had that then been done, the benefits to all the peoples of our region resulting from the peaceful cooperation endeavor of the Arab nations and of Israel would have been of the highest order?

It is revealing to recall the reactions on that very day of the delegates of Iraq and Syria respectively to that Resolution of 29 November 1947. The Iraqi representative said:

"I wish to put on record that Iraq does not recognize the validity of this decision and will reserve freedom of action to its implementation."

The Syrian delegate, in referring to the United Nations resolution, declared:

"My country will never, I repeat never, recognize such a decision"

and he went on to say:

"Gentlemen, the Charter is dead."

These statements were echoed by the representatives of all the other Arab member states.

On that same day we in Jerusalem heard of the decision of the United Nations. As head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem it fell to my lot to address a huge demonstration there of our people and to appeal to the Arabs in Israel and in the neighboring countries: "Our hand is offered to you in peace and friendship." A few hours later we buried our first victims of Arab attacks.

Six months passed and on 14 May 1948, in pursuance of the United Nations resolution, Israel was proclaimed an independent state. Within twelve hours Tel-Aviv was subjected to bombardment by Egyptian planes.

The story of the invasion of reborn Israel by the armies of the Arab countries is too well known to need repetition. But in view of the new-found enthusiasm of Egypt, witnessed by us here in the past few weeks, for the resolutions of the United Nations it is worth while to recall the statement made to the Security Council at that time by the Egyptian representative when, after battle had raged for eleven days against Israel, the Council called for a cease-fire:

“The Egyptian Government regrets that it cannot abide by a recommendation of the Security Council to cease fire in Palestine.”

And Egypt and the other Arab countries *did not* comply with the United Nations Assembly resolution. Israel was left to her own fate. If Israel is alive today it is due solely to the heroic self-defense of its people, young and old.

Mr. President, if I have ventured briefly to recall the events of eight and nine years ago it was to emphasize three things: one, the role played by the United Nations in the establishment of Israel; two, the immediate attempt at its destruction by the Arab States — all but one of whom were already then members of the United Nations; and three, Israel’s profound and unequivocal desire for the establishment of peaceful relations with its Arab neighbors.

The same day in May 1948 that Egyptian bombs began to fall on Tel-Aviv, the first Jewish refugee ship from the camps in Germany reached the shores of Israel. Six million of the seven and a quarter million Jews of Europe, outside of the Soviet Union, had been slaughtered by the Nazis; and now the survivors were coming back not as the banned “illegals” of the mandatory regime, but to the greeting prophesied by Jeremiah. “Thy children shall come back to their border.”

These two episodes are symbolic of the life of Israel since its inception: Rescue and reconstruction, menaced constantly by the destructive efforts of its neighbors.

Israel’s people went forth into the desert or struck roots in stony hillsides to establish new villages, to build roads and houses and schools and hospitals. Marauders, later organized as fedayeen, entering from Egypt and Jordan, were sent in to kill and destroy. Israel dug wells, brought water in pipes from great distances. Egypt sent in fedayeen to blow up the wells and the pipes.

Jews from Yemen brought their sick, undernourished children

with a tradition that two out of five die. They are now down to an infant mortality of less than 4%, that is one out of 25. While we are feeding these babies and curing them of their diseases, the fedayeen were sent in to throw bombs at children in synagogues and grenades into baby homes.

This parallel went on for eight long years. Day in, day out, and night after night. Men, women and children — the remnant who survived the Hitler atrocities, and the more than 400,000 Jews from Arab speaking countries of the Middle East and from North Africa; sick, scared and undernourished, broken in body and spirit; people seeking to rebuild their lives, the new settlers of the Negev desert, these were the objects of the terror to which we were subjected.

For eight years now Israel has been subjected to the unrelenting violence of physical assault and to an equally unrelenting intent to destroy our country economically through blockade, through boycott and through lawless interference with the development of our natural resources. Since Israel's efforts to repulse the concerted Arab onslaught in 1948, my country has had no respite from hostile acts and loudly proclaimed threats of destruction.

It would be idle to pretend that the present situation can be discussed without regard to this background, or that the causes that precipitated Israel's recent security action can be ignored. If this Assembly is genuinely determined to restore peace to the Middle East it must first determine from which source aggressive policies derive. It will serve little purpose to isolate one link in the chain of circumstances, to thrust the weight of resolutions upon one incident without considering the total effects. Unless the United Nations is prepared to use its influence to prevail upon the countries of the Middle East to negotiate a fundamental solution, the Middle Eastern cauldron will continue to seethe and the region will be a powder keg for others anxious to exploit its inflammable possibilities. Not only the well-being of Israel, but perhaps the peace of mankind, demand that the question of responsibility for unrest in this part of the world be squarely faced and the causes of tension removed.

Mr. President, Israel is ringed by hostile states which invoke the terms of the 1949 Armistice Agreements when they find it convenient, and which flout those agreements when they find them oppressive. They refuse to sign peace treaties, clinging desperately to the discredited theory of a "belligerent status" against Israel, while at

the same time piously demanding the protections of peace for themselves. As long ago as 12 June 1951, an official Egyptian representative defended his country's obstruction of Israel shipping through the Suez Canal with the following extraordinary words:

"We are exercising a right of war. We are still legally at war with Israel. An armistice does not put an end to a state of war. It does not prohibit a country from exercising certain rights of war."

We know from agonizing experience what these "certain rights of war" are. They include indiscriminate terror, arson and economic attack. At the same time any Israeli effort to stop murder and pillage, to make existence tolerable for its beleaguered population is met with an outcry about the violation of peace, a peace which exists only in so far as it accords with the convenience of those who have broken it. A comfortable division has been made: The Arab states unilaterally enjoy the "rights of war"; Israel has the unilateral responsibility of keeping the peace. But belligerency cannot be a one-way street. Is it surprising if a people laboring under this monstrous distinction should finally become restive and at last seek a way of rescuing its life from the perils of a regulated war conducted against it from all sides?

For the people of Israel this paradox is not merely a question of logic or semantics. Among the "rights of war" exercised against Israel has been the fedayeen campaign unleashed by Colonel Nasser in the summer of 1955. You know who these fedayeen are. They are gunmen, trained by Egyptian army officers and recruited chiefly from among the Arab population in the Gaza strip, which was captured by the Egyptian army when it invaded Israel in 1948. Fedayeen gangs have been planted in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. Very heavy concentrations of these fedayeen units were stationed in the Sinai desert. Israel's narrow borders and long frontiers make it particularly vulnerable to terror squads who cross the border at night with the sole objective of indiscriminately shooting or bombing any Israel house, or any man, woman or child. The murders committed by the fedayeen were hailed by the Cairo Radio on 31 August 1955, with words which left no doubt as to the identity of the organizers of these outrages:

"Weep, O Israel, because Egypt's Arabs have already found their way to Tel-Aviv. The day of extermination draws

near. There shall be no more complaints or protests to the United Nations or the Armistice Commission. There will be no peace on the borders because we demand the death of Israel."

The slaughter of six children and their teacher in the agricultural school of Shafrir, the bombing of a wedding in the Negev village of Patish — these are examples familiar to the world of the kind of heroic exploits so lustily applauded by Colonel Nasser when he addressed a fedayeen unit in the Gaza strip in the following terms:

"You have proven by your deeds that you are heroes upon whom our entire country can depend. The spirit with which you entered the land of the enemy must spread."

The list of daily murders, of acts of robbery and sabotage, can be indefinitely extended. But let me only remind this Assembly of the events of 23 September of this year on another front, when a group of archaeologists was fired upon at Ramat Rachel from the Jordanian border. Five Israelis were killed and 16 wounded. The next day two more Israelis, a man and a woman, working in their fields in different parts of the country, were killed by Jordanian units. When, in response, on 25 September, deterrent action was taken at Husan by an Israel army unit, this action was officially described by a United Nations representative as "unprovoked."

May I say that the people of Israel cannot emulate, nor do they understand, this legalistic detachment. When their peaceable fellow-citizens are murdered in cold blood, in the course of their daily occupations, they *are* provoked and they demand that their Government reflect that sense of provocation by affording them the protection which every state owes its citizens and which international bodies are apparently unable to provide. If moral distinctions are to be made, then let me suggest that controlled military actions — with limited and well defined military or police objectives — are less abhorrent, even to the most sensitive conscience, than wanton and indiscriminate murder which strikes not at military targets, but solely at civilians.

The campaign of terror unleashed against Israel was not stopped by the intervention of the United Nations. The cease-fire secured by the Secretary-General last April was not honored. Instead, despite Israel's exemplary restraint practiced by Israel immediately after that cease-fire agreement, violence increased on every border.

Every sign pointed to the fact that the Egyptian dictator was about to realize his cherished and fully publicized ambition of a second round aimed at destroying Israel. He had amassed huge stocks of heavy armaments, secured largely from the Soviet Union and affiliated countries. He had concluded treaties with Jordan and Syria according to which the military forces of these countries were placed under the Egyptian High Command. We knew of large concentrations of armor and fedayeen in the Egyptian bases in the Sinai desert and the Gaza strip directly along the borders of Israel. There was a minimum of reticence about the proposed "extermination" of the small neighboring State. We recognized the symptoms. Within the life-time of nearly every person here present a dictator arose who, like this disciple of his, informed the world in advance of his blood-thirsty plans. The ashes of the crematoria, the carnage of millions, a world in ruin, testified to the fidelity with which he kept his promises.

Such a lesson should not be forgotten. Certainly the people of Israel are not likely to forget what the threat of total extermination means.

It is not my intention to enter here into a description of the acts of hostility of the Egyptian government in many other fields. But the Assembly cannot remain indifferent, above all, to the fact that ever since the Resolution of the Security Council of 1 September 1951, and, indeed, before that, the Government of Israel has patiently striven to solve the grave international problem of a double sea blockade imposed against Israel by Egypt in the Suez Canal and in the Straits of Aqaba. The Security Council confirmed the illegality of this blockade and rejected the Egyptian argument of a "state of war" by which it sought to justify it. The Council ordered Egypt to terminate these practices. In October 1956 the Security Council repeated its call for free passage without any discrimination, "overt or covert."

These decisions have been flouted. At the same time Egypt and the other Arab countries have sought by every means, direct and indirect, by organized boycott and by indiscriminate threats and attempted blackmail of countries friendly to Israel, to cripple Israel's commerce and to strangle her economic life. It has extended that boycott of Israel even to the agencies of this very organization, the United Nations.

Mr. President, we are a small people in a small barren land which we revived with our labor and our love. The odds against us are heavy; the disparity of forces is great, but we have no alternative but to defend our lives and freedom and the right to security. We desire nothing more than peace, but we cannot equate peace merely with an apathetic readiness to be destroyed. If hostile forces gather for our proposed destruction they must not demand that we provide them with ideal conditions for the realization of their plans. Nor should it be permitted that the sincere desire for peace, shared by so many, be used as the shelter for such preparations.

The action of the Israel army in the unpopulated Sinai desert served to disrupt well-laid Egyptian plans and to liquidate new bases of active hostility against us. The texts of captured Egyptian military documents which Israel presented to the Security Council on 15 November indicate how imminent was the attack. I shall not repeat the long and detailed directives to the Egyptian commanders. But it would be salutary for all of us not to forget the introduction, which read:

“Every commander is to prepare himself and his subordinates for the inevitable campaign with Israel for the purpose of fulfilling our exalted aim which is the annihilation of Israel and her destruction in the shortest possible time in the most brutal and savage battles.”

I wonder, Mr. President, if there are any other countries represented in this Assembly who live under similar conditions. And I wonder whether there is a people in the world prepared to commit itself to a policy that, if placed in Israel's situation, it would take no action in self-defense.

Is it conceivable that this Assembly should view the situation in Israel preceding 29 October 1956 as one of peace? Why should acts of cowardly murder of unarmed men, women and children, carried out for years, evoke less resentment than an open military operation against nests of fedayeen and bases of hostile forces?

Mr. President, the practical problems which, it is claimed, divide the Arabs and Israel are not beyond solution. The world has, for instance, known and still knows refugee problems of far wider scope than those of the Arab refugees. In Korea, in India and Pakistan, in Greece and Turkey, in Europe after World War II, these numerically far larger problems have or are being successfully handled.

Who more than the Jewish people has endured the tragic fate of the refugee? If to-day there is no bitter Jewish refugee problem in the world, it is because Israel supported by the solidarity of the Jewish people everywhere and with the aid of friendly governments has largely solved it. There need never have been a Palestine Arab refugee problem at all, had it not been created by the action of the Arab states. Given the cooperation of those same Arab states this distressing human problem could readily have been solved and can be solved to-day. In its solution Israel, as has been previously stated on behalf of my government, is prepared to play its part. But while Israel was absorbing Jewish refugees to a number exceeding that of all the Arab refugees — and hundreds of thousands of those whom we absorbed came from these same Arab lands — the Arab states for their part, with the exception of Jordan, were erecting an iron wall between themselves and these kinsmen of theirs. And since then they have lost no opportunity for exploiting these people as a political weapon in their war against Israel.

The fundamental problem in the whole situation is the systematically organized Arab hostility against Israel. Arab enmity towards Israel is not a natural phenomenon. It is artificially fostered and nurtured. It is not, as has been here alleged, Israel which is an instrument of colonialism. It is the *Israel-Arab conflict* which keeps the area at the mercy of dangerously contending outside forces. Only by the liquidation of that conflict will the people of the region be able to work out their own destinies in independence and hope. Only in that prospect lies hope for a brighter future of equality and progress for all the peoples concerned. If hatred is abandoned as a principle of Arab policies everything becomes possible.

Over and over again the Israel government has held out its hand in peace to its neighbors. But to no avail. At the Ninth Session of the General Assembly the Israel representative suggested that if the Arab countries were not yet ready for peace, it would at least be useful as a preliminary or transitory stage to conclude agreements committing the parties to policies of non-aggression and pacific settlement. The reply was outright rejection. Our offer to meet the representatives of all or any Arab country still stands. Never have we heard an echo from across our borders to our call for peace.

The concept of annihilating Israel is a legacy of Hitler's war against the Jewish people, and it is no mere coincidence that the

soldiers of Nasser had an Arabic translation of "Mein Kampf" in their knapsacks. Those concerned sincerely with peace and freedom in the world would, I think, have been happier had some more ennobling literature been offered these men as a guide. We are convinced that these dangerous seeds have not yet succeeded in corrupting the Arab peoples. This fatal game is one which the Arab political leaders should halt in the interests of the Arab peoples themselves.

I wish at this point to renew an appeal already heard from this rostrum to Egypt to desist from the shameful and disastrous policy recently initiated of wholesale persecution of its Jewish population.

I shall not elaborate on the mass of detailed information now reaching us in this connection, some of which has been incorporated in a memorandum which it was my honor to transmit to you last Saturday afternoon — the sordid and disgraceful story of deportations and concentration camps, of indignity and spoliation, the holding of hostages to ensure silence on the part of those expelled, and of callous brutality. I can only hope that the shocked conscience of the world will have its effect on the rulers of Egypt and that they will yet desist, and desist at once, from the measures on which they have embarked.

Mr. President, what ought to be done now? Are we, in our relations with Egypt, to go back to an armistice regime which has brought anything but peace and which Egypt has derisively flouted? Shall the Sinai desert again breed nests of fedayeen and of aggressive armies poised for the assault? Will certain countries rearm Egypt for the renewed pursuit of its announced aims? Must the tragedy be re-enacted in the tinder-box of the Middle East? The peace of our region and perhaps of more than our region hangs on the answers which will be given to these questions.

In a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of 30 October 1956, we put the following questions:

- (a) "Does Egypt still adhere to the position declared and maintained by her over years that she is in a state of war with Israel?"
- (b) "Is Egypt prepared to enter into immediate negotiations with Israel with a view to the establishment of peace between the two countries as indicated in paragraph 3 of the

aide-memoire of the Government of Israel of 4 November 1956 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations?

- (c) "Does Egypt agree to cease economic boycott against Israel and lift the blockade of Israel shipping in the Suez Canal?"
- (d) "Does Egypt undertake to recall the Fedayeen gangs under her control in other Arab countries?"

Is it too much to expect clear, simple binding answers? Are we, and not only we but you fellow members of the United Nations, to take as an answer the announcement on Cairo Radio, on 2 December 1956, repeated again later in the day, that: "The Fedayeen command has decided to launch a fierce campaign within Israel during the coming winter season." Can the United Nations make itself responsible for the restoration, once again, on our southern borders of murder and sabotage units pursuing a one-sided belligerency? The blockade in the Gulf of Aqaba is now terminated. The battery of guns installed a few years ago by the Egyptian government on the desolate and empty shore at the southern tip of the Sinai peninsula for the sole illegal purpose of preventing the passage into the Gulf of Israel shipping no longer exists. Would it not be grotesque for an international body to permit the creation anew of the conditions which made that blockade possible; or to permit Egypt to perpetuate unhindered its parallel blockade in Suez. We cannot believe that that is the case. To do so would constitute a distortion of the very meaning and essence of the Charter.

My Government has undertaken an obligation to withdraw its forces from Egyptian territory and we are implementing it. But we must know — I think the Assembly must know — what will be the role of the United Nations Force after the Israel forces are withdrawn. We are certain that it is not the intention of the Assembly to recreate the conditions laden with the identical dangers which produced the explosion of 29 October.

May I remind the representatives of the Soviet Union that there was a time, not so long ago, when they understood Israel's right to self-defense and appreciated the true disposition of forces in the Middle East.

Ambassador Jacob Malik declared in the Security Council in 1948 in words which are as apt today as the day they were uttered:

"Since its birth the State of Israel has declared that it will live in peace and entertain peaceful relations with all its

neighbors. Israel is not to blame for the fact that this appeal did not meet with response from its neighbors."

The truth is that since 1948, when the words of the USSR delegate that I have quoted were uttered, nothing has changed in Israel's desire or intentions. We seek, as before, to fulfill our historic mission of rebuilding our land for our harried people and to live in peace with our neighbors. But I say again neither peace nor war can be unilateral. A boundary must be respected by two sides; it cannot be open to Fedayeen and closed to Israel soldiers.

Mr. President, what does Israel want? Its requirements are simple. We wish to be secure against threats to our territorial integrity and national independence. We wish to be left alone to pursue the work of developing our country and building a new society founded on social justice and individual liberty. We wish to cooperate with our neighbors for the common good of all the peoples of the region.

Mr. President, these objectives do no more than give practical expression to the principles and purpose of our Charter. These are not special claims; they are the aims and policies of all peace loving members of the United Nations.

I would urge this Assembly to think of the future with the same vigor and insistence that it has dealt with recent events. Can this Assembly leave this subject without raising its voice, with all the authority it carries, in a call to all the governments of the region immediately to enter into direct negotiations with the purpose of arriving at a peace settlement? We, the people of Israel, believe not only in the necessity but also in the possibility of peace.

Only last Wednesday the representative of Egypt speaking from this rostrum made the following statement:

"With the great majority of the peoples of the world, Egypt has been saying, and will continue to say, that all nations can and should, for their own good, moral as well as material, live together in equality, freedom and fraternity, and with modern science and its vast potentialities at the service of man, enabling him, carried by the momentum of liberty and faith, to live an infinitely more productive and honorable life."

With that statement we wholeheartedly concur. We for our part are ready to make of it a practical reality. It is now for Egypt to do the same.

Mr. President, the countries of the Middle East are rightly listed in the category of the "under-developed." The standard of living, disease, illiteracy of the masses of people, the undeveloped lands, desert and swamp, all these cry out desperately for minds, hands, financial means and technical ability. Can we envisage what a state of peace between Israel and her neighbors during the past eight years would have meant for all of us? Can we try to translate fighter planes into irrigation pipes and tractors for the people in these lands? Can we, in our imagination, replace gun emplacements with schools and hospitals? The many hundreds of millions of dollars spent on armaments could surely have been put to a more constructive purpose.

Substitute cooperation between Israel and her neighbors for sterile hatred and ardor for destruction, and you give life and hope and happiness to all its peoples.



MR. LOUIS STEIN
STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS
225 KEARNY ST.
SAN FRANCISCO 8, CALIF.

G-1D

