



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1356th MEETING: 10/11 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1356)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902)	1
Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, is repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907)	
Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)	
Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled: "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression" (S/7967)	

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.

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 10 June 1967, at 9.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Hans R. TABOR (Denmark).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, India, Japan, Mali, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1356)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902).
3. Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907).
4. Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910).
5. Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled: "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression" (S/7967).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902)

Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907)

Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)

Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled: "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression" (S/7967)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council, I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan to take places at the Council table, and the representatives of Lebanon, Iraq, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Tunisia and Libya to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. Rafael (Israel), Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic), Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) and Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan) took places at the Council table, and Mr. S. Chammas (Lebanon), Mr. K. Khalaf (Iraq), Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco), Mr. J. M. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. S. Al-Shaheen (Kuwait), Mr. M. Mestiri (Tunisia) and Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya) took the places reserved for them.

2. The PRESIDENT: When we adjourned this morning it was on the understanding that all members would keep themselves available for an urgent meeting in case of an emergency situation. Against this background I decided, in response to an urgent request of the Permanent Representative of the United of Soviet Socialist Republics, to convene this meeting on short notice.

3. I have received the following letter from Mr. Fedorenko, the representative of the Soviet Union:

"In view of the continuation of military activities by Israel despite the adoption of the cease-fire resolutions by the Security Council, I have the honour to request an immediate meeting of the Security Council on 10 June 1967 to consider the question of the flagrant violation by Israel of the Security Council's decisions calling for the cessation of military activities."/S/7970.]

4. The Security Council will now continue its discussion of the four items inscribed on its agenda. Since our last meeting, a joint draft resolution has been submitted by Argentina, Brazil and Ethiopia, and distributed in document S/7968.

5. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): This urgent meeting of the Security Council has been convened at the request of the Soviet Union in connexion with a further flagrant violation by Israel of the Security Council's decisions calling for a cease-fire and cessation of military activities.

6. Soon after the Security Council had adjourned this morning, a further raid was carried out on the capital of the Syrian Arab Republic, Damascus, by Israel military aircraft. The city was subjected to a new bombing attack by Tel-Aviv's marauding air force. In addition, according to accurate and verified information, fighting continued in the direction of Damascus, fifty-five kilometres from the capital of Syria, in the region of Kuneitra. According to the Soviet Union's own reliable sources of information, the Israel air force carried out a bombing attack at 12 o'clock New York time on the capital of Syria, the city of Damascus. Thus, the Council is once again witnessing a most flagrant violation by Israel of the Security Council's decisions and of its repeated appeals for an immediate cease-fire and the cessation of military activities.

7. At the morning meeting, when the Council was considering the question of the continuation of Israel's aggressive acts against the Syrian Arab Republic, it was perfectly obvious, as is clear from the Secretary-General's reports, that the Israel aggressor had not abandoned his intention of acting in defiance of the Security Council's decisions, and of trying to achieve his military objectives in the territory of the Syrian Republic.

8. Many members of the Security Council have in their statements condemned these acts by Tel-Aviv. The delegations of a number of countries members of the Security Council have noted with alarm in their statements the fact that the Israel air force has been carrying out gangsterous raids on the capital of Syria and the surrounding area, and they have pointed out that this fact has been confirmed beyond doubt by United Nations representatives in their reports to the Secretary-General which are before us on the table.

9. However, while the representatives of certain Western Powers—and particularly the United States of America—were endeavouring to lead the Council into a morass of casuistry and to obscure the perfectly clear picture of the crime committed by Tel-Aviv, Israel's aggression against Syria was continuing and indeed it is still going on.

10. We have already noted with indignation that it is intolerable for the Security Council to be involved in a shameful spectacle, a farce, a competition in false statements; and at the very moment when the person who speaks here on behalf of Tel-Aviv was incessantly repeating the false assertions that Israel had accepted the cease-fire, squadrons of the Israel air force were crossing the frontier of the Syrian Arab Republic—a sovereign State, and a

Member of the United Nations with the same right as other Members—in order to carry out a further aggressive raid on its capital.

11. We would ask what limits are there to this cynicism. What do the so-called representatives of Tel-Aviv take the Security Council for? When are these lies and this deceit going to be stopped? Surely all this confirms the assessment of the situation and of the Israel Government's activities, which was given by the Soviet delegation at the Security Council's last meeting, namely, that Tel-Aviv is deliberately deceiving and misinforming the Council.

12. It is a matter to be deeply deplored and condemned that the mighty protectors of the hardened liars who represent Tel-Aviv are sitting here at our table. The Council cannot associate itself with war maniacs, who look at things blindfolded and not with open eyes.

13. The new facts concerning Israel's war crimes confirm that there is no reason whatever for the Security Council to have any confidence in Tel-Aviv. Israel's actions towards the Arab States and its unceasing violations of the Security Council's decisions are nothing but a direct mockery—I repeat, mockery—of the principles of international law, and a mockery of the United Nations and of the Security Council itself and its decisions. We say this in order to ensure that no one shall have any doubts on this score, and that no one shall be under any delusion. We understand perfectly well what is going on here and we know in what direction they are trying to side-track the work of the Security Council.

14. In our earlier statements we have already drawn attention to the fact that, in pursuing their aggressive policy tactics, Israel's leaders are copying the infamous tactics of the Nazi criminals. As you will remember, this comment aroused the hypocritical displeasure of the representative of Tel-Aviv.

15. But facts speak louder and more convincingly than any excuses. And the facts are as follows: the Israel Minister of Information and the Minister of Defence, Moshe Dayan, hastened to declare that Israel would never go back to its old frontiers which were established under the Armistice Agreements, and that they were intending to demand that the land seized from the United Arab Republic, Jordan and other countries should be annexed to their territory.

16. We would like to ask what right have they to do this. What right does the aggressor have to claim that his brigandage should be rewarded with land seized from neighbouring peoples? Does this not bring to mind the grievous memory of the demands made by the leaders of the Reich for so-called *Lebensraum*—I do not think there is any need to remind you of this, Mr. President—that *Lebensraum* for which they unleashed the Second World War? Does this not remind us of the Hitlerite leaders' cynical arguments about the "natural frontiers" which Fascist Germany was to reach in its criminal predatory war?

17. The Security Council must call the high-handed aggressors to order and compel them to respect the Security

Council not in their statements—to which no credence whatsoever can be attached—but in their deeds, and to cease military activities against Syria and other Arab States immediately.

18. The Council has no right to wait any longer in decisively condemning the Israel aggressors for their flagrant violation of the Security Council's decisions. The peoples know full well the value of the false assertions made by the aggressors and their accomplices concerning their love for peace.

19. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker on my list, I shall give the floor to the Secretary-General to give the Council the information currently available to him on the question before us.

20. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: As members will recall, at the end of this morning's meeting [1355th meeting] I had informed them of the proposal for a cease-fire arrangement which was being presented to both sides by the Chief of Staff, General Odd Bull. Shortly after the meeting adjourned, word was received from General Bull that he had been notified by both sides of their acceptance of his cease-fire arrangement which was to go into effect at 1630 hours GMT. That message was circulated to the Security Council as document S/7930/Add.2.

21. Since the time fixed for the cease-fire I have received very little information and therefore I can give the Council only a limited report. I must say frankly that I prefer not to make fragmentary reports because they can often be misleading, but in view of the fact that the Council is requiring information from me while its meetings are under way, and since the observers themselves, because of war conditions and restrictions on their movements and communications, are unable to observe and report as they normally do, I have no choice but to give you the information as I get it, which is in the form of "flash" reports from the field. Before the Council had adjourned this morning, I sent to the Chief of Staff, General Odd Bull, a request for information on the following five questions:

(1) Has aerial activity stopped, does it continue and if so where?

(2) Does artillery shelling continue and if so where and by whom?

(3) Is there a continuation of shelling of Israel villages and if so where or has it ceased?

(4) To what extent have the troops of Israel penetrated into Syria and where do they remain?

(5) How close to Damascus did Israel troops approach?

22. Late this afternoon I received the following response from General Bull on those questions:

"Confirmed reports sparse since no United Nations observation in area of hostilities. Following as full and accurate as possible:

"(1) Tiberias reports from 1400 hours GMT to 1700 hours GMT of continuous helicopter flights to and from

Israel/Syria, probably resupply and casualty evacuation. Helicopters carrying navigation lights as light faded. At 1647 hours GMT, Damascus reported air bombing by two Delta-winged aircraft in area seven to ten kilometres in southerly direction from Damascus. Commenced 1639 hours GMT. Aircraft not identified due to distance but seen by United Nations military observers at Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission headquarters. Confirm definitely bombing, although strike could not be seen due to intervening buildings."

In this connexion I would point out that this was seventeen minutes after the cease-fire arrangement was to go into effect, which was, as I had reported earlier, 1630 hours GMT.

"(2) At 1752 hours GMT, three United Nations military observers in Tiberias area reported four artillery guns firing from position north of observation post Delta. Target area not seen but flashes observed. Indicate firing from east to west (Syria to Israel). At 1805 hours GMT, artillery fire continues from positions one to one and a half kilometres north of observation post Delta.

"(3) No reports from Tiberias, which has no observation over area of Israel settlements excepting Syrian demilitarized zone, but artillery fire reported in paragraph 2 indicates Syrian fire towards Israel from Syrian position location Hill 62.

"(4) Both Israel and Syrian authorities confirm occupation of Kuneitra by Israel forces. Israel claims prior to cease-fire.

"(5) No report of Israel troops closer to Damascus than Kuneitra—approximately sixty-eight kilometres by road south-west from Damascus."

23. I also received the following message from the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission:

"Following message received from senior Syrian delegate on 10 June at 1953 hours GMT: 'Israel paratroops dropped at Tsil (approximately thirty kilometres east of Lake Tiberias) and at Rafid (approximately twenty kilometres south-south-east of Kuneitra) from helicopters'."

24. I have subsequently asked the Chief of Staff to send to me with greatest urgency all information available to him on the reported bombing of Damascus or its vicinity and on any other breaches of the cease-fire arrangement. I have asked him to give me all possible information on the general situation with regard to the observance of the cease-fire arrangement and on the steps being taken to achieve full observance of the cease-fire. I have also asked him to indicate what steps have been taken to deploy observers on both sides of the Line, including Kuneitra, as envisaged in the cease-fire arrangement.

25. The latest report I have received from General Bull, which came in not long ago, is as follows:

"Reference Secretary-General's statement to the Security Council on morning of 10 June, following situation regarding implementation of cease-fire.

"(1) I proposed a cease-fire together with no further movement of troops to be effective at 1630 hours GMT, 10 June. This proposal was accepted by both parties.

"(2) I instructed the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission to re-establish Kuneitra control centre in the afternoon of 10 June and informed Israel authorities accordingly. Chairman dispatched an advance group of observers accompanied by three Syrian liaison officers towards Kuneitra for this purpose, but when they arrived at Sasa (approximately forty kilometres from Kuneitra) it was learned that the latter town had been invested by Israel forces. It was thus impossible to achieve this first stage of deployment of [United Nations] observers as planned.

"(3) It was planned to position first group of observers immediately after cease-fire became effective and as soon as possible on both sides in the battle area. Due to the changing situation this could not be done prior to darkness on 10 June.

"(4) It is our intention as soon as possible commencing morning 11 June to arrange for the deployment of observers from both sides in an orderly fashion into the battle area. Until observers can be deployed, UNTSO is without definite knowledge regarding the troops on the ground and has no ability to observe any developments. Isolated pockets of resistance are likely to exist within which troops may not be under the control of or even in communication with their national authorities. Under such conditions UNTSO is in no position to provide definite information or useful observation on the cease-fire situation.

"(5) The difficulties are heightened by the fact that armed forces of one party are deep in the territory of the other."

26. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We must be grateful to the Secretary-General for his detailed report on the actual state of affairs.

27. We have seen once again how far the Israel forces have gone in their aggressive acts and how far the representatives of Tel-Aviv have gone in their lies.

28. Two very obvious facts, among others, are clear from the Secretary-General's report. First, the raid by Israel military aircraft on the capital of Syria, Damascus. Need I recall how many hours we have spent here listening to the endless, irresponsible and shameless assertions that there had in fact been no bombing? Secondly, the occupation of Kuneitra by Israel forces.

29. You will remember how we spent the whole morning listening to the endless "evidence" given by the Israel representative to the effect that this town had not been occupied by the Israel invaders. Was this not pure deceit? After this, can we really listen to him here and trust what he says? And the Israel representative was not speaking for himself. Look at the verbatim record—he was referring to his Government. If those to whom he was referring do not

know what is going on at the front, then we should like to ask who does know what is going on at the front and who is carrying out this aggression? Perhaps it is someone else? Perhaps it is someone else sitting here at our table? We would like to have an answer to this.

30. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Syria, on whom I now call.

31. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I wish to thank the Secretary-General for the reports that he has read out to us. I should like to emphasize, at the same time, that my delegation would have been able to make a fuller analysis of and a more detailed commentary on those reports if it had had the texts. As members will have noted, many names and many different hours have been mentioned in the reports which makes it difficult for us at this time to comment fully on the aggression by the Israel forces against Syria and on their systematic invasion of the land of a Member State of the United Nations. May I add in passing that this Member State, Syria, is one of the founding Members of the United Nations which took part in the drafting of the San Francisco Charter.

32. My remarks on the reports of the Secretary-General are the following: First, Israel planes attacked Damascus and bombarded Damascus seventeen minutes after the time which had been fixed for the cease-fire. The Israel representative cannot claim, nor can the Israel authorities claim, that they did not know of the time specified for the cease-fire.

33. The second point, one of the utmost importance, has already been established—a point on which you will remember, Mr. President, we had to call you and disturb you last night at 2 a.m.—and that is the occupation of Kuneitra. The representative of the Soviet Union has already taken up and clarified this point. Kuneitra is occupied now and was occupied at the time when the representative of the Tel-Aviv authorities was telling the Council, in one intervention after another, one statement after another, that Kuneitra had not been occupied.

34. Third, that beyond Kuneitra, the invading Israel hordes from occupied Palestine have also occupied Sasa, which is on the way to Damascus.

35. Fourth, that paratroopers have been dropped in Tsil and Rafid. If I followed the Secretary-General closely, as I tried to do, that happened at 19 hours and some minutes. This was also after the cease-fire order.

36. Fifth, that the bombing by the Israel forces and Air Force have not ceased.

37. These were not allegations, as some members of the Security Council have attempted to say in order to decrease the importance and gravity of the situation that we are facing; these were facts.

38. After the reports that have been read to us by the Secretary-General, it must now be crystal clear to all members of the Council who it is that is lying to the Council, to the United Nations and to the international

community. But more important than that, it must be crystal clear who is protecting the liar. For the Security Council this morning saw the protector of the liar remove the mask from his face and come to the defence of the aggressor, in language, to my regret, so vindictive that I would hesitate even to repeat it. I must say, in all humility, that I was one of those who drafted the charter of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in London in 1945 and since then I have been, on and off, in the United Nations. Never in my life have I heard here such vindictive language as I heard today. In saying this, I am not trying to be personal or vindictive; I say it because it is directly related to the problem we are discussing now. It is directly related to the acts of piracy, aggression and genocide committed by the protected Israel Zionist hordes and their benefactors in the United States of America.

39. This is not in the least to be minimized, because as the Security Council sits here discussing this grave situation, we are not facing the Israelis alone. I am glad, in a way, that the representative of the United States unmasked himself this morning and showed his real face, showed who is the real aggressor.

40. The PRESIDENT: I have no other speakers on my list at present. I have listened very carefully to what the representative of Syria said—namely, that it might facilitate our work if we had before us the report submitted by the Secretary-General to the Council. I wonder whether members would like to have the report before we proceed, or if they want to continue the debate immediately.

41. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): In my intervention early this morning [1354th meeting] I drew the attention of the Council to the grave situation that had been created by the flagrant defiance by one of the parties of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council ordering a cease-fire. I said in that statement that the Secretary-General's report clearly established that Damascus had been bombed. Since then we have had more information from the area and the Secretary-General has given us several reports which amply confirm that the Damascus area, and perhaps the city of Damascus also, have been repeatedly bombed.

42. When we were discussing this question, all during this morning, some doubts were raised as to whether Damascus had been bombed. Some doubts were also raised as to whether Israel forces were moving into Syrian territory.

43. Now, to sum up very briefly what the reports have conveyed to us: First, there is no doubt whatsoever that the Damascus area has been bombed. Second, Kuneitra has been occupied by Israel forces. Third, Israel forces have driven deep into Syrian territory. Fourth, there has been some shelling, though direct evidence is not available, from the Syrian side.

44. But it is evident that what has happened in that area is that the Israel forces have occupied an extensive area in the northern part; and if we are to go by the reports in the Press coming from Israel, the objective that Israel wants to achieve in the area is very clear.

45. This morning I said that this created a very grave situation and that we should have to take swift action not only to assert the authority of this Council but also to ensure that such defiance and such loss of life should not be allowed to continue.

46. Having stated this, I would suggest that we should recess for a little while, study very carefully the written report of the Secretary-General, and meet again.

47. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic.

48. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): Hardly more than a few hours after we had a lengthy meeting of the Security Council, during which members of the Council reiterated their positions in firm support of the cease-fire order, and at the end of which the Council was made to understand that at long last its order for a cease-fire was about to enter into effect, hardly more than a few hours, as I say, after that meeting we are once more faced with the same ugly behaviour on the part of the Israelis.

49. Warning after warning was directed to and put before the Council that the Israelis are full of bad faith. Or are we to assume that they are depending heavily on outside support, the same support which was furnished readily and generously by two great Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, when the Israelis made a dastardly attack on my country? Apparently, the determination among the Israelis and their supporters, namely, the United States and the United Kingdom, is to continue a specific line by which they can achieve a definite task. That task, in their minds and in their hearts, is to face not only the Arab States but most definitely also the Security Council with a *fait accompli*. They want to achieve their own selfish unprincipled interests by committing aggression. That is their method in reaching their goals: unholy alliances, secretly concluded, have always been their motto in dealing with colonial affairs. They are repeating, together with their tool, Israel—their subservient tool—this same unjust, unfair and wicked policy. Colonialism followed that policy in Asia and applied it in Africa, and it is most scrupulously being adopted in our part of the world. These policies are doomed no matter how strong or how large the armadas and forces behind them. We state again, and indeed we shall continue to reiterate, our appeal that the Security Council should discharge its responsibilities on behalf of peace and justice.

50. The bombardment of Damascus by the Israelis is atrocious. It is still continuing after the cease-fire. The invasion of Syria continued after the cease-fire. This flagrant violation of the cease-fire should be condemned by the Security Council. It is time for this Council to act and to act quickly. It is to be regretted that through the tactics of the United States delegation the Security Council has been paralysed up to now.

51. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): It is hardly surprising that there are scarcely any speakers here from some delegations at this stage in our debate, now that we have heard the Secretary-General's report on the additional crimes committed by the Tel-Aviv authorities and gangs of international adventurers.

52. Since Israel launched its aggression against the Arab countries, some delegations here have demonstrated such anxiety—the sign of a guilty conscience—that they now cannot condemn the aggression and instead are seeking to excuse and encourage it.

53. Three days have gone by since the Security Council adopted its first cease-fire resolution [233 (1967)], which it was hoped would put an end to all military activities in the region and lead to the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops behind the position they won through their assault. This was done in order to halt the aggression, re-establish peace in that part of the world, put out the fires of war at their source and remove the threat to international peace and security they represent.

54. However, certain countries which are members of the Security Council and their delegations, most of all, of course, the United States and Israel delegations—the latter taking part in the Council's work as the representative of the aggressor nation—naturally did not consider the matter in that light. On the contrary, they have done everything to confuse the issue and present the situation and positions in a most unusual light. By their attitude they have encouraged further aggression for several days now, beyond the cease-fire deadline established not by the Israel authorities, but by the Security Council. They have thus aided and abetted the imperialist circles in the United States and the Israel adventurers who conspired to strike at the independent Arab countries, thereby establishing and entrenching an imperialist outpost in the Middle East personified by the State of Israel.

55. The extremist circles now governing Israel, which owes its existence to a United Nations decision, and certain imperialist circles in the United States were not pleased with the Arab nations' determined and firm resistance to Israel's perfidious attack. After scoring early victories which enabled it to attack vital Arab centres with unparalleled violence, Israel has continued to act like an international adventurer and has continued its aggression inside the Arab countries in defiance of Security Council resolutions and the unanimous desire of world opinion. The purpose of this continued aggression—which has recently been the subject of statements just about everywhere, in the Israel press, radio and television transmitted to the United States—was of course to overthrow the legitimate Governments of the progressive Arab countries if possible, and to establish régimes that would be submissive instruments in the hands of the imperialistic and adventurous circles which had seized power in Israel. The next step was to occupy Arab territory so as to use it later as an asset to back up the territorial claims already being voiced with considerable propaganda support almost all over the world, and particularly in the United States of America.

56. Indeed, it was no mere chance that all the statements made by Israel authorities—the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Representative from Tel-Aviv here, among others—were intended to create an atmosphere of doubt, for the aggression against the Arab countries could continue under this veil of doubt; occupation of the territory could continue; Damascus and other towns and villages in Syria and the other Arab countries could be bombed.

57. The world was truly shocked by the arrogance, infamy and treachery of those who launched this aggression to stake their lust for the property and territory of others.

58. The equivocation in which the representative from Tel-Aviv indulged this morning when he claimed he had no idea where the Israel troops were, that he did not know that those troops had occupied Kuneitra—excuse me, if I mispronounce the name—or that a particular bombardment or troop movement was going on somewhere or other, all that was of course designed to create this atmosphere of doubt so as to allow the aggression to rage until the very last moment, and even after the cease-fire.

59. That is a very serious crime. The Israel Minister of War did not ask for the cease-fire. The Security Council had been appealing for the cease-fire for three days. We had allowed two hours to find out whether the cease-fire was being observed. We were led to believe that it was, or at least an attempt was made to get us to believe it, whereas two days later, the bombings and attacks on Syria and the other Arab countries were still continuing.

60. Some of the Council members at this table complained that the information the Secretary-General had provided within his limited means was not enough as a basis for them to condemn the aggression. But now that the aggressor has occupied the territory they wanted him to occupy, the same persons can permit themselves to express some sort of regret. But what counted was to stop the aggressor. The aggression should have been prevented from continuing. But those individuals did nothing of the sort. Instead, they held up the Council's work. We are all aware that some delegations worked incessantly exerting tremendous pressure on other delegations, sowing trouble and doubt. They already had the information they needed. There can be no doubt, for example, that the United States delegation had detailed information on what was going on at the front. There can be no doubt that other well-informed delegations representing old empires or benefiting from their assistance knew what was happening in the Arab countries. Their ties there are much too strong for them not to have been informed, but they complained that they were not.

61. That was the situation when Israel was to be allowed to pursue its aggressive course. We were told that Kuneitra was not occupied. We will no doubt hear some representatives say: "Kuneitra was occupied between the time I said it was not and the effective cease-fire called for by our Minister for National Defence, Moshe Dayan." It is easy to pick a moment when it can be admitted that Kuneitra was occupied; but we know that it was occupied before then. We know that the Israelis were there, but they did not want to admit it because they were determined to sow doubt.

62. We shall be told that all those actions were launched in retaliation for artillery fire on various Israel villages. But those are only excuses. The victim of aggression cannot cease defending himself until the aggressor has ceased fire. The party who began the fighting is the one who must stop, and not the victim. Do you think that someone whose house has been broken into by an intruder intending to attack and rob him will not defend himself because the intruder is brandishing a pistol? Even if he did not have the

slightest chance, he would defend himself, because he is a courageous man. A courageous people is defending itself and we support those who defend themselves in the struggle for national independence and freedom. The Bulgarian nation and many other countries which fought for years and even centuries against foreign domination or against dictators to win their national independence are now the staunchest defenders of all peoples seeking to free themselves from colonial and imperialistic domination.

63. That is why we cannot allow such deeds to be committed by certain States, by certain imperialistic circles, whether they are provoking or actually directing those actions. That is also why the full sympathy of the Bulgarian people and other nations who have fought for their freedom is on the Arab side.

64. It will be no mere coincidence when we learn from press dispatches that the People's Republic of Bulgaria has broken off diplomatic relations with Israel. For what is the use of maintaining diplomatic relations with a State that has turned adventurer and become an outpost of imperialism? Nor is it any mere coincidence that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has just broken off diplomatic relations with Israel. And it will be no mere coincidence if other socialist countries announce that they are going to break off diplomatic relations with Israel or have already done so. We cannot, we must not allow an international adventurer to set itself up as an outpost of imperialism in the Arab world and lay the foundations for neo-colonialism in Africa and Asia.

65. Under these circumstances, we believe that the Security Council must take a decision as soon as possible, immediately, if possible. It must condemn the international pirates who have launched aggression against the Arab countries. It must also condemn the masterminds of that aggression, who are to be found all over and whose representative is in this room. The Council must take decisions and see to it that they are respected. It must decide that the occupation troops must immediately leave the countries they are occupying. It must take steps to ensure that all the agreements already concluded will be firmly respected and that peace will be preserved and maintained in the Near East and throughout the world.

66. The PRESIDENT: The Secretary-General has informed me that his report to the Council is being reproduced and will be distributed to members in less than half an hour.¹

67. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): It has been the consistent view of my Government from the very beginning of this conflict that the Security Council should have a single goal: to quench the flames of war in the Near East and to begin to move towards peace in the area. Throughout our deliberation on this subject we have attempted by all the means at our disposal to expedite the action of this Council and the action of the United Nations in this direction. This is our task; this is what we should be

devoting ourselves to with all of the resources at our command. Instead of that, much of the time of the Council is devoted to diatribes against my country about alleged involvement in this conflict. I have stated many times, and I again wish to state, that the United States is in no way involved in this conflict, but, on the contrary, has used its influence here and diplomatically in the interests of, first, avoiding the conflict, and then bringing it to an end. We have done more than make statements to the Council in this regard. We have offered to have impartial observers of the United Nations make a determination with respect to the charges that have been made. I have not heard from those who make the charges any willingness on their part to subscribe to this point of view. But what better proof can there be of lack of involvement than a willingness to have charges of this type, which are false and malicious, put to the test of impartial observation? In fact, I pointed out what was quite clear: that with respect to the canard that the Sixth Fleet was involved in this exercise there was another country with naval craft in the vicinity which could enlighten the Council about this situation. What I was referring to in that connexion is perfectly obvious. Here again tonight we have had another illustration of this, and all I can say again—and I will continue to say it—is that there is no involvement on the part of the United States, that we are quite willing to have the charges that were made investigated impartially, and that it does not serve the cause of peace to repeat these baseless charges.

68. We were the ones who proposed last night that we should receive reports, and we welcome very much the fact that that is now being done. We very much appreciate the straightforward way in which our distinguished Secretary-General has rendered these reports, in which he has pointed out the facts and pointed out the limitations, and has urged that further facts should be obtained so that this Council can act appropriately. We do, however, have some facts before us, and we have indicated a willingness throughout to act upon such facts, and to act in an even-handed and impartial way. Indeed, we have tried to make it very clear that it is the obligation of both Israel and Syria to comply strictly with the cease-fire order. This is not the final task of the Council, but it is the essential first task.

69. We have a very grave situation in the Middle East. To rebuild the fabric of peace in the area is going to be very difficult. We all know that. To quench the flames of war is very difficult. We ought first of all to have a cessation of all military activity, and end to the conflict. This is the first and primary task, although it is not the final task. We will have to go on to other matters which were mentioned in the resolution we have submitted to the Security Council [*S/7952/Rev.2*].

70. It does not help to have invective in this situation. Invective does not take the place of progress. I should like to make it very clear that it has not been my practice at any time in the United Nations to impugn the veracity or integrity of anyone representing his country at the United Nations. But when charges are made against the United States that have no foundation, it is the plain obligation of the representative of the United States to rebut those charges and to place before the Council the facts, or the means of verifying the facts.

¹ The report of the Secretary-General, dated 10 June 1967, was subsequently circulated as United Nations Press Release SG/SM/742.

71. There is another point that I mentioned earlier which I think is very clear, and that is that I respect the right of every member of this Council to represent his country. I do not imply that any member of the Council in appearing here represents anybody other than his country. When a remark is made that the representative of the United States speaks perhaps for some country other than his own, I take strong exception, and I think justifiably so. Such a remark should not be countenanced by an international organization. We speak for our countries, we state their policies, and we attempt to the best of our abilities to present the point of view of our countries to this Council. That is the responsibility of every member, and I respect any member who does that with all the energy and vigour at his command. That is all I meant by my statement this morning. I will not accept from anybody the concept that in speaking here I speak from any other basis than the interests of the United States of America whom I proudly represent before this Council. Any imputation to the contrary I will not tolerate, nor do I think any diplomatic body should tolerate it, because it is inconsistent with the attitude that we owe each other as colleagues at the United Nations.

72. Now the immediate question before us is a cease-fire order. That is the problem we have at hand, that is why we have been called into session twice today. Our concern is that that cease-fire must be recognized. Both Syria and Israel have given General Bull solemn assurances that they accept the cease-fire and will fully implement it. It is a source of encouragement to me from the Secretary-General's reports that incidents of violations, except those that occurred possibly within a few minutes after this agreement was made with General Bull, are not being repeated. I sincerely hope that this is so, and I await more detailed reports of the Secretary-General so that we can determine that hopefully now at least—and it should have been earlier—the cease-fire is in effect.

73. This morning I was prepared to submit a draft resolution, even on the basis of the fragmentary information we had, condemning any violation of the cease-fire by any source. It is interesting to me that while we are accused of being involved, which we are not, those who make that accusation never make reference to their condemnation of a violation of the cease-fire if it comes from any source other than those whose cause they advocate. We are advocating the cause of peace in the Security Council, and we are advocating the cause of respect for the cease-fire orders of the Council, and we take the position that the cease-fire orders must be complied with—I repeat, must be complied with.

74. To that end, I submit the following draft resolution, which I shall now read, and ask to be distributed:

"The Security Council,

"Having heard the reports of the Secretary-General on the current situation,

"Gravely concerned at reports and complaints it has received of air attacks, shellings, ground activities and other violations of the cease-fire between Israel and Syria,

"1. Condemns any and all violations of the cease-fire;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to order a full investigation of all reports of violations and to report to the Security Council as soon as possible;

"3. Demands that the parties scrupulously respect its cease-fire appeals contained in resolutions 233 (1967), 234 (1967) and 235 (1967);

"4. Calls upon the Governments concerned to issue categorical instructions to all military forces to cease all firing and military activities as required by these resolutions." [S/7971.]

75. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General, who has asked to speak in order to submit to the Council some supplementary information he has received.

76. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have just received the following cable from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel:

"His Excellency U Thant,

"Secretary-General of the United Nations,

"United Nations Headquarters, New York

"Referring to your cable I wish to inform you that orders were issued in accordance with the cease-fire arrangement reached with the assistance of your representative, General Odd Bull, with effect from yesterday evening at 1830 hours local time. The cease-fire went effectively into force at the appointed hour and has continued without interruption. The Israel forces are adhering scrupulously to and maintaining fully the cease-fire arrangement.

*"(Signed) Abba EBAN
"Minister for Foreign Affairs"*

77. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of India, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

78. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): I formally move the suspension of the meeting for half an hour under rule 33, paragraph 1, of the provisional rules of procedure.

79. The PRESIDENT: A motion has been made under rule 33, paragraph 1, to suspend the meeting. According to rule 33: "Any motion for the suspension or for the simple adjournment of the meeting shall be decided without debate."

80. I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

81. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): Following up the Indian representative's request, the French delegation merely wished to ask the Secretary-General to give us, in addition to the reports already mentioned, the latest information he may have received during the past hour, so that we may each speak on the basis of the most recent information.

82. The PRESIDENT: The motion made by the representative of India is to suspend the meeting for half an hour. It is supplemented by a request by the representative of France that the Secretary-General supplement the information he has already submitted to the Council with further information which he might have received in the meantime.

83. I put to the vote the motion made by the representative of India to suspend the meeting for half an hour.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

The meeting was suspended at 10.55 p.m. and resumed at 12.40 a.m.

84. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): My delegation has studied the Secretary-General's report of 10 June and concludes that the situation is still very serious. The gravity of the developments reported prompts me to ask several questions.

85. The first concerns paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Secretary-General's report. Most of the incidents reported in that paragraph seem to have occurred shortly after the cease-fire went into effect. We should like to know whether such activities, which are very serious in themselves, have persisted. That is our first question.

86. My second question relates to paragraph 2, concerning artillery fire from east to west, from Syria to Israel. We should like more details about the fire and should like to know whether it is continuing.

87. Paragraph 4 mentions the occupation of Kuneitra. We should like to know at what time the occupation occurred and whether Kuneitra is actually the farthest Israel troops have advanced along this road, which on the map is the road to Damascus.

88. Paragraph 5 at the bottom of page 3 of the same report deals with the difficulties observers are encountering because of the fact that the armed forces of one party have penetrated deep into the territory of the other. We should like to know whether Syrian territory apart from the Kuneitra region has been entered, and if so, what is the extent of the penetration.

89. My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to General Bull and his colleagues, who are certainly doing all they can with the means at their disposal. As the Secretary-General and his colleagues are no doubt well aware, we are encountering transmission difficulties, and because of the slowness of transmission, our information is already relatively old.

90. This prompts me to ask two more questions. First, does General Bull have enough personnel in the area to carry out the inquiries the Secretary-General has asked him to undertake on behalf of the Security Council? If he needs more, can he count on assistance from the other Mixed Armistice Commissions now perhaps less burdened

than the one which formerly supervised the Syrian-Israel border?

91. I realize that all this is difficult and may take a lot of time; but in such a complex situation, we would consider it most important—and I think my colleagues would agree with me—to have a complete and up-to-date report on the questions I have mentioned and on others which might arise.

92. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the Secretary-General to reply to the questions raised by the representative of France.

93. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: In reply to the questions posed by the representative of France, I have the following observations.

94. With respect to his first question, relating to paragraph 1 on page 2 of my report to the Security Council, we have no further information from General Bull regarding the recurrence of bombing, as I have stated in my report.

95. The second question related to paragraph 2 on the same page, concerning firing from east to west, that is, firing from Syria to Israel. We have no further information from General Bull indicating that the firing was repeated or that there was a recurrence of firing.

96. With respect to the third question relating to paragraph 4 on the same page, all we know concerning the occupation of Kuneitra by Israel forces is contained in my report, namely that Israel claims that its forces occupied Kuneitra prior to the cease-fire. There was no other version from the other side.

97. I have to report to the Council also that there is no further report of any other air incident over Syria, or for that matter over Israel.

98. In continuation of my answer regarding paragraph 4 on page 2, I have to report that the United Nations military observers were not in Kuneitra when that town fell to the Israelis, so we have no means, at least for the moment, of checking whether Kuneitra fell to the Israelis prior to the cease-fire or after the cease-fire. The United Nations military observers are not in a position to report on this point, at least for the moment.

99. Regarding the question posed by the representative of France on the matter of incursions into Syria, we have no definite information from either the Chief of Staff of UNTSO or the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission. But according to general information that we have, based on the previous report, the incursion in some places is about twelve miles deep inside Syria.

100. Regarding the last question, pertaining to the sufficiency, or otherwise, of the staff of General Odd Bull, I will transmit this question immediately to General Bull. But as I indicated in my report to the Council yesterday [*see 1353rd meeting*], the efficiency and promptness in reporting of the United Nations military observers in the area

depend primarily on freedom of movement; and of course the security factor is also a very important consideration.

101. Concerning the possibility of redeployment of other members of the United Nations military group from other areas, I shall also immediately ask General Bull about his observations. For the moment, however, my feeling is that freedom of movement and the security factor are more important for his purpose of carrying out his present responsibilities than is the enlargement of the force. Then too, I wish to report to the Council that General Odd Bull has not so far asked for additional staff.

102. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General for his reply.

103. The representative of France has an additional question to ask. I shall therefore ask the next and only speaker among the members of the Council whose names are inscribed on my list whether he would yield to the representative of France so that the representative may ask a supplementary question. I would ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether he will allow me to let the representative of France ask his supplementary question of the Secretary-General.

104. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We shall be very pleased to yield the floor to our colleague from France so that he can ask any questions he considers necessary in order to clarify a point which is of interest not only to him but also, I hope, to all other members of the Council.

105. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (*translated from French*): I wish to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for having generously allowed me to speak before him. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General for having kindly replied so thoroughly to various questions my delegation had regarding the current developments in Syria.

106. From paragraph 2 on page 3 of the Secretary-General's report, which is concerned with the importance of establishing or re-establishing the Kuneitra control centre, it seems that, for the reasons indicated there, it has not been possible to re-establish the centre.

107. In order to facilitate the work of General Bull's observation team, I wonder whether another attempt might not be made to make the centre operational. That was the last question I wished to ask.

108. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have been in constant touch with General Odd Bull, even today, in fact, and this is one of the issues I raised with him. I am expecting a reply from him, perhaps by tomorrow.

109. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We should like to make a few comments in connexion with the statements which have been made during the Council's present meeting.

110. As we have all heard, the United States representative—who has just spoken—has repeated once again, in an exceedingly pedantic and stereotyped fashion, a very

flowery discourse concerning the "benevolent" policy of Washington which he sees, at least in his liberal imagination, as crowned with the halo of a noble champion, as it were, of "peace throughout the world". He did this, of course, without any reproach and, as we see, without any reference to the monstrous aggression in the Near East or the barbarous war waged by United States imperialism in Viet-Nam. Donning this mythological cloak, the United States diplomat delivered himself of his splendid monologue, obviously appealing to the television screen with its very specific audience. It is remarkable, in this connexion, to see how carefully the speaker completely avoided the question of the bombing of Damascus and the piratical seizure by Israel interventionists of a considerable part of Syrian territory, including the town of Kuneitra.

111. And yet it is precisely this which is the main topic for consideration by the Security Council today. But the United States representative then attempted to reduce the whole matter to the need for obtaining "missing" or "additional" information and further "clarifications" and everything else which he would like to have but which does not in fact really exist; and at the same time he was obviously feeling embarrassed at the indisputable facts of Tel-Aviv's gross violation of the Security Council's decision calling for the cease-fire and at the shameful treatment accorded to the victim of aggression.

112. We now have before us the report of the Secretary-General which, *inter alia*, makes it absolutely clear that the facts regarding the bombing of Damascus and the forcible seizure of Syrian territory, including the town of Kuneitra, by Israel invaders are perfectly true.

113. Or, perhaps, the Washington diplomat would question the impartiality and objectivity of the Secretary-General's report in this case? This prompts us to ask the representative of the United States at this table whether he condemns the bombing of Damascus, whether he condemns the fact that the representative of Israel has cynically tried to mislead the Security Council by denying the capture of Kuneitra at the very time when this town was already in the hands of Israel troops.

114. We are prepared to yield the floor to the distinguished judge, and will resume our statement later, if the speaker so wishes.

115. The PRESIDENT: Has the representative of the Soviet Union finished his statement?

116. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We are glad to give our United States colleague an opportunity of telling the truth in answer to our question.

117. The PRESIDENT. And the representative of the Soviet Union desires to continue his statement after the reply?

118. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Yes.

119. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I am prepared, as the draft resolution [S/7971] which I have

submitted shows, to condemn all violations of the cease-fire confirmed by the Secretary-General in his report.

120. I should like to ask a question of the representative of the Soviet Union. Is he prepared to condemn all the violations of the cease-fire confirmed by the Secretary-General in his report?

121. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We have just had further proof that the United States representative has no desire whatsoever to tell the truth. As before, as always, he is swerving very dangerously on sharp corners, and, instead of giving an answer, he has thought of nothing better than to ask a question himself. I shall of course reply to his question; but before that, in view of the order in which the questions were asked, I should like him to give an answer on the substance of my question. I do not want to listen to any more manoeuvres and stunts.

122. And now I should like to continue my statement. The representative of the United States has spoken of the need to observe the cease-fire and to ensure the implementation of the decision calling for the cessation of military activities. He has even hastily introduced a draft resolution on this subject for consideration by the Security Council. But it is obvious that the United States representative has suddenly forgotten what cease-fire is involved, and on what lines—and I should like to point out that it is not without an ulterior motive that he has done this. What is involved, in fact, is the consolidation of Israel's seizure of a considerable part of the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic. This is the crux of the matter; this, as the Russians say, is where the dog is buried. Is it not obvious that our United States colleague is attempting to help the Israel aggressor to strengthen his hold on new positions which, as we pointed out in our earlier statement, are now described as "vital boundaries". And here no excuses will help Mr. Goldberg disguise the truth.

123. Israel did not cease military activities when the Security Council asked it to. The armed hordes of the Tel-Aviv interventionists continued to trample on the soil of Arab peoples and continued to violate the national sanctuaries of the Arab East. But when did Tel-Aviv think fit to make a statement about the cessation of military activities? This occurred much later, after the basic strategic objectives of the Israel adventurers had been achieved. And here we should like to clarify our position in regard to the draft resolution, submitted by the Washington diplomats. In this draft resolution [S/7971], an attempt is in fact being made to justify the crime which has been committed. Do our United States colleagues really believe that the Security Council is naive or is weakening its vigilance? Do they really rate the members of the Security Council so low as to believe that a piece of paper like this, which they have palmed off on us all before this responsible meeting, will receive understanding and support?

124. This is the position from which we approach the United States draft resolution which has one single dishonest purpose—namely, to serve the interests of the Israel aggressor, to help him, as one might say, to legalize his forcible occupation of the territory of Arab countries. We

hope that the United States representative will refrain from further subterfuges, and will not go on saying that this is not a camel but a horse with a hump. It is doubtful, of course, whether the United States representative has enough courage and fortitude to condemn openly in this important body and before the eyes of the whole world, the shameful aggression committed by Israel's rulers, to condemn their violation of the Security Council's decision and to give a proper assessment of the treachery of the Israel adventurers.

125. We shall not try to persuade the distinguished judge. It is enough that he has shown the untenability of his position by remaining silent. But we cannot be silent. Nobody has a right to keep silent, and particularly not the members of the Security Council, who have a special responsibility for the fate of the world and of mankind. We hope that the members of the Council will say the decisive word by indignantly condemning the criminal aggression and severely censuring the Tel-Aviv adventurers.

126. We hope that the Security Council will express its views on the monstrous aggression clearly and unequivocally and will take steps to curb the high-handed interventionists and put a stop once and for all to their adventurist campaigns against neighbouring Arab peoples.

127. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, to whom I now give the floor.

128. The representative of the Soviet Union has asked for the floor on a point of order.

129. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, with all due respect to you and to the members of the Security Council, do you not think it would be more appropriate, at this late hour, to give the floor to other representatives at this table who have more right to speak as the victims of aggression?

130. As for the representative of Tel-Aviv, it is hardly necessary for me to say that he has lied enough here in the Council, and we would not be missing a great deal if he were to refrain from making any further statements and from telling any more demonstrable lies.

131. The PRESIDENT: I have to call on the speakers in the order in which they are inscribed on my list. I have only the representatives of Israel and Jordan on my list, so I have to call on the representative of Israel now..

132. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

133. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, in all humility—as it is customary to say on these occasions—I should have expected you, as President, to show more understanding and to make a greater effort to face the stark reality of the situation which has been created by those to whom you now wish to give the floor.

134. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

135. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): My point of order is a very simple one. It is not, I think, within the rules of this Council for any member of this Council to challenge the good faith of the President in applying the rules as even-handedly as he has. I think that is impermissible under the rules of this Council.

136. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on a point of order.

137. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I thought that you and I were having a dialogue primarily as between colleagues; and if you have an opinion of this matter then, of course, you are entitled to state it, just like any other member of the Security Council, without any prompting and without the voice of America which we have heard enough already.

138. As for procedure, I should like to ask our United States colleague whether it is honest to lie here in the Security Council. And is it honest to go on trying to deceive the members of the Council and to maintain that the Israel invaders have not seized the land and cities of other peoples?

139. Once again we see who is taking which side, who is for the truth and who is for wrongdoing and who is trying unrestrainedly to protect the criminals.

140. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have heard the point of order raised by the representative of the USSR. In accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, the Council decided to invite certain Member countries of the United Nations to participate without vote in the Council's discussion of this matter. According to the provisional rules of procedure, I have to call on the speakers in the order in which they ask for the floor. Therefore, in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and established practices of this Council, I now call on the representative of Israel.

141. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): The representative of the Soviet Union chose to address this Council in a tone and style so well known from a very dark chapter in Soviet history. He has spoken as though he were prosecuting at one of the Moscow trials in the sombre years of the 1930's . . .

142. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bulgaria on a point of order.

143. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): We are not here today to listen to digressions; we are here to consider the aggression Israel has committed. If the Israel representative wishes to address the Security Council, he must reply as the party accused of aggression and he must not try to distract the Council with irrelevant matters, particularly by mentioning a country which, at the cost of many lives, helped to save mankind from Hitlerian aggression, to which it nearly fell victim.

144. I therefore ask you, Mr. President, not to allow the representative of that aggressive nation to try to distract the Council from its work.

145. The PRESIDENT: A point of order has been raised by the representative of Bulgaria, who has asked that the representative of Israel concentrate on the question which the Council is discussing at present.

146. When we started our discussion on this question, I asked all members of the Council, to concentrate, as far as possible, on the issues before us, and, as far as possible, to avoid any remarks of a personal character. I think great flexibility has been permitted in the speeches that have been made, containing accusations against other countries. I have left it to the representatives to reply for themselves, and I have not so far found that they have gone beyond what is permissible from the point of view of the Chair. But I believe that we would all be interested in continuing our discussion in dignity and that we all should concentrate, as far as possible, on the issues which we are discussing.

147. I call on the representative of Israel.

148. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I am not here as the accused party; I am not here in the dock, and the representative of Bulgaria has not been appointed as a prosecutor. I am here as the representative of an independent country. This country has been vilified; invective of the most malicious source has been thrown at my country; personal abuse has been heaped against its representative. I would ask the patience of the representative of Bulgaria to listen carefully to what I have to say in response to what has been said to me and to my country. I am fully convinced that the manner in which these addresses were made by the representative of the Soviet Union and by the representative of Bulgaria very much remind us of that very sombre chapter of the Moscow trials . . .

149. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I asked you to call him to order.

150. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, and I repeat my general appeal to all speakers, to concentrate on the issues we are discussing.

151. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): These representatives have tried to intimidate not only their opponents but also those who hear their words; they have tried to wear us out in long night meetings. They threaten and blacken, with scrupulous disregard for the facts, which they select and twist to suit their own ulterior motives.

152. But this is not a trial; this is the highest organ of the United Nations, where representatives of independent Governments represent their countries. And no attempt to brow-beat, on the part of Mr. Fedorenko and his assistant prosecutor, will deter me from defending the interests and the honour of my country and of my people. We thought that the representative of the Soviet Union had reached, yesterday, a record-low in vilification when he dared to refer in one breath to Israel and to the Nazi monsters, whose names I do not need to mention in the Security Council. For a representative of a country which itself has suffered under the Nazi yoke, and has made such terrible sacrifices to throw it off, to use that kind of language regarding a people which suffered just as much from the Hitlerite oppression is absolutely shameful. I leave it to world opinion to pass judgement on this outrage.

153. The representative of the Soviet Union accuses Israel, with its population of some 2.5 million people, of aggression against the Arab world, with its more than 60 million people. He should better remember his own history, when a people of 200 million in 1940 invaded the territory of a small and valiant people of 3 million. He blindly refuses to admit that these same Arab States have for twenty years been threatening to annihilate Israel and to apply to its people the "final solution" which eluded Hitler. He chooses to forget that these have not been paper threats, but have been backed up by an uninterrupted chain of terrorist and belligerent acts, which passed their danger level this last May, when massive Arab armies concentrated all around our frontiers and established a joint command which openly avowed aggressive intent against my country. They opened the hostilities. Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, one after the other, moved against Israel. They were repelled, and were driven back into their territory.

154. The Soviet Union, instead of supporting efforts for a peaceful settlement in accordance with its own principle of international relations, has fanned, and is continuing to fan, the passions of Arab violence and the flames of hatred and extremism. This has contributed in no small way to the present calamities of the Arab world. Those who are really and truly concerned for the peace and welfare of all the peoples of the Near East should do everything to quench the passions, and not to inflame them.

155. Before the recess, the Secretary-General read a telegram which he had received from the Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Abba Eban, stating that Israel forces are maintaining fully the cease-fire arrangement. I can add now that since that telegram was dispatched, I have received information that the cease-fire is being respected and that the front is quiet, and that no hostile activity is taking place.

156. Again the allegation has been made that Israel aircraft have been bombing Damascus. I deny that. I deny it as I denied yesterday that Israel aircraft had attacked Cairo. I note that the Arab spokesmen do not revert to that allegation any more. All that the Secretary-General's report states with regard to Damascus this afternoon is that the bombing took place from an unidentified aircraft at an unidentified place on an unidentified object in an area seven to ten kilometres south of the city. No court in the world would look at such evidence. No Israel aircraft were at that time in that area.

157. When I spoke this morning, Israel forces were not in Kuneitra. They entered the town before the cease-fire came into effect.

158. With regard to the Israel paratroops mentioned in General Bull's report [*see para. 23 above*], I wish to draw the Council's attention to the fact that this information was transmitted only by the Syrian authorities. However, the report submitted by the Secretary-General confirms that Syrian gun positions opened fire on Israel after the cease-fire had gone into effect. It is remarkable that this confirmed information did not give rise to anxiety and comment on the part of certain members of the Council.

159. The Arab States, and Syria foremost among them, are responsible for the tension and hostility which have occurred. For nearly twenty years they have persisted in the maintenance of a state of war. They wish to practise a war of limited liability: to be free to attack and to be immune from the risks of a determined defence. But that is an untenable proposition. There cannot be half peace and half war: war on Israel and peace for the Arabs.

160. What we want is total peace, peace for both the Arab States and Israel equally.

161. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan.

162. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): The question before the Council has received most unfair treatment so far. Yesterday we heard much legal phraseology from legal brains. We heard terms used such as final evidence, conclusive, definite, clear, established, hearsay, permissible, not permissible, judgement, decision and what-not. Every single term was introduced to drag out the question further and to leave the aggression without taking a decision of condemnation.

163. I thought I was in a court. I was tempted to bring a charge of war crimes to be examined by this tribunal, particularly since the crime committed by Israel is the very same crime committed by Nazi Germany. In fact the very same crime was presented by the United States and by the permanent members who are in the Security Council now as a charge during the Nürnberg trials. I thought I was in a tribunal, listening to all that legal phraseology. Then I was reminded by the same Mr. Rafael who has been presented to the Council earlier as a terrorist—he worked as a terrorist in the underground movement; he was a member of the Haganah in Palestine. It was this same terrorist who this morning has reminded the Council—when he said that nothing in the United Nations Charter provides for prosecution and judges—that this is not a tribunal, that "You cannot try me or accuse me or treat me as an accused".

164. I was hoping that the Council would take immediate action. The crime is clear. The admission has been made. The Israel Ambassador in London did not deny that Israel had started invading, killing, murdering and bombing. The National Broadcasting Corporation stated on 8 June that the Israel Ambassador in London had confirmed that his country fired the first shot in the war in the Middle East. That statement was in a speech delivered before an all-party meeting of Members of Parliament in London. Here we are witnessing a clear attempt at distortion.

165. Now that the crime has been committed, a Zionist peace campaign is being waged. Pages of newspapers have been used to mislead American public opinion. These pages speak about peace. One of them states: "Israel wants peace". They have the word "peace" spelled wrongly; it should be "piece". They do want piece and piece and piece. One piece was the part invaded in Jordan and which was occupied. That is piece number one. Piece number two is Gaza. Piece number three is part of Syria. Now they are singing the song of peace for the good-hearted American people.

166. Now that the crime has been committed they are trying to mislead American public opinion by singing for them the song of peace, trying to cover up the crime. On the other hand, here in the Security Council, instead of its taking immediate action we are having a discussion about law, legality and illegality. That discussion took place yesterday. Today, when the facts have become very clear as presented by our Secretary-General, we see a different approach. We find the United States coming to the Security Council to say that: "It would not render a judgement on the basis of allegations by one of the parties."² The United States will not render a judgement on the basis of allegations by one of the parties. These are not allegations now, they are facts that have been established. But I do not doubt that the Council has not forgotten that in October 1966 the United States—Ambassador Goldberg to be exact—submitted to the Council a draft resolution condemning a State on the basis of a one-sided investigation report.

167. When we received more convincing evidence, the United States approach was that it was not clear whether this was based on specific information. Thus, information coming from the machinery in the area was not enough.

168. More evidence was presented by the Secretary-General, and then we heard that Israel had denied those charges and that the Security Council should have more impartial information. Israel denials are not new to the United States. Israel denied that the United States ship that was off the shores of Sinai which was attacked by the Israelis, was carrying the United States flag. The United States Government, or United States information media—offhand I do not know exactly which—said that the ship was carrying the United States flag. The Israelis denied that in the morning, only to have it confirmed in the afternoon by both authorities.

169. We heard the Secretary-General say that the United Nations did not have information whether or not the occupation of Kuneitra took place before the cease-fire. I think the answer to that is very simple. Early yesterday morning, after the cease-fire resolution [235 (1967)] was adopted, Mr. Rafael denied it categorically; and he repeated this two or three times. He said:

"We have already heard a report from the Secretary-General that the Israel representative in Jerusalem has denied these allegations. I denied a similar charge before the Council adjourned last evening [1353rd meeting]. I categorically deny it again now." [1354th meeting, para. 51.]

He denied that it took place after the cease-fire, and later on both confirmed that it did take place. When you compare both, the admission of the Israel authorities in the area and the denial of the representative who spoke here on instructions from his Government, it becomes clear, it does not need any further evidence, that the crime was committed after the cease-fire resolution, after the action decided upon by the Security Council; it was taken in defiance of the Security Council.

170. I can dwell on many lies of Mr. Rafael, but I do not think I should waste the time of the Council. You have heard a great deal about them. They were very ably exposed by my colleague, Professor Fedorenko; they were exposed very ably by my colleague, Ambassador Tarabanov; and they are explained very ably by the documents which rebut the claims and the denials made by Mr. Rafael.

171. That being the case, I sincerely and honestly believe that it does not befit the great prestige of this important body to keep the victims waiting, the victims who look up to this great body, and to continue manoeuvring—and I am referring to those who are championing the manoeuvring—to hide the crime, to avoid a clear-cut condemnation of the criminal in favour of the victim.

172. The lack of action on the part of the Security Council is contributing to the deterioration of the situation in the area. Yesterday morning I read out information [1355th meeting] about the exodus, about the thousands of people who have been displaced, expelled, intimidated and forced to leave their homes. I read out and described the human tragedy which is now being witnessed by the Security Council, by the members responsible for international peace and security, harmony and human rights. I have just received further information. It reads: "The Jordanian Red Crescent today accused Israel of ousting Jordanian inhabitants on the west bank of the Jordan River from their homes and driving them to the truce line." That means to the cease-fire line recommended by the Security Council. When they make people cross, are they not defying the Council's cease-fire decision? When they push the people out, are they not ignoring the Council's authority, its very prestige in the world and in the Arab world? The message states further: "This act completely violates the provisions of international law." Here my Government is posing a question to the jurist, to those who speak law when it suits their purpose. This is an addition to the crime that you are witnessing, Mr. President, you and the Security Council.

173. Jordan still hopes that the Security Council will overcome pressure and will overcome everything which stands in the way of reaching a just decision, a decision which reflects the reality of what has happened. I hope that the Security Council will, without any further delay, adopt a decision condemning the criminal and safeguarding the rights of the victims.

174. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Syria, to whom I now give the floor.

175. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The statement that was made by Mr. Rafael tonight is very significant. It is significant in its briefness, because it was as brief as the invasion constituting the crime was large. But certainly the brevity of the statement of Mr. Rafael is also significant in other respects, because if he had continued to say more things, more lies would have been disclosed. It is also significant in a third respect, because from the way he delivered his statement and from the way he left the Council chamber after he delivered it, it betrayed the criminal who has lost his nerve and cannot face up to his crimes. The members of

² See United Nations Press Release SC/2908, dated 10 June 1967, take 6.

the Council have already listened to the exposure of lies perpetrated by the representative of the Tel-Aviv authorities. Now we have the record before us here.

176. The representative of the Tel-Aviv authorities started by saying that he does not want to twist facts. But if there is anyone here who has twisted facts, it is the representative of the Tel-Aviv authorities. Here I have the verbatim record of the 1353rd meeting of 9 June 1967. To our accusation that the area of Damascus was being bombarded and that Israel planes were overflying Syrian territory, Mr. Rafael answered as follows:

"I want to repeat again that no Israel aircraft has bombed or is bombing Damascus. I also want to deny categorically that any Israel forces are advancing towards Damascus. The Israel operations which were begun today were intended, as I stated in the Council this afternoon [1352nd meeting] and as I informed the President of the Security Council in the early hours of the morning, to silence those Syrian gun positions which were shelling Israel villages. That is what the Israel forces have undertaken." [1353rd meeting, para. 87.]

This thesis was repeated time and again, even in the statement given tonight by Mr. Rafael, that what the Israel forces had undertaken was to silence the Syrian guns.

177. Then came the question of the occupation of Kuneitra. Here I quote from the verbatim record of the 1354th meeting:

"We contacted you, Mr. President, at 2 o'clock this morning, because we had had a telephone call from Damascus in which we were informed that Israel had moved its forces and occupied Kuneitra, about thirty-five miles from the capital city of Damascus. As I address the Council now, a fierce battle is raging between the Syrian forces and the criminal hordes coming from Tel-Aviv who are attempting to reach Damascus as soon as possible. In fact, their plan was to occupy Damascus before we could start our meeting today." [1354th meeting, para. 27.]

178. Again, Mr. Rafael denied this accusation. Here are his own words, from the same record:

"Now the Council has been hurriedly called for a dramatic meeting at this early hour on the ground that Israel forces have occupied Kuneitra and are advancing on Damascus. We have already heard a report from the Secretary-General that the Israel representative in Jerusalem has denied these allegations. I denied a similar charge before the Council adjourned last evening [1353rd meeting]. I categorically deny it again now.

"I have just received a report that while the Israel forces are in the process of establishing and implementing the cease-fire, the vicious shelling of Israel villages is still going on. There is no foundation whatsoever for the allegation that Israel is planning to take Damascus. The only Israel activity is against the artillery emplacements which are brutally attacking Israel villages." [Ibid., paras. 51 and 52.]

Again the same thesis has been maintained, that all this operation, all this invasion of Syria, the penetration into Syrian territory of twelve miles, as recognized by the Secretary-General, is only to "silence the guns" on the armistice demarcation line.

179. Regrettably, I must speak here again about how some of the members of the Council approached this question when I was telling the Council that the Israel army was invading Syria and killing people in Syria.

180. The representative of the United States—and here I hasten to say that I am not injecting any personal remarks; I have maintained that the policy of the United States Government of protecting, strengthening and defending Israel goes back to the very creation of Israel—the representative of the United States said this, which I shall read from the verbatim record:

"The Secretary-General has made his report to the Council. He has stated, quite appropriately, what his representative in Jerusalem, General Bull, has been told by representatives of the Governments involved.

"What does it add up to essentially? The senior delegate from Syria has made the allegation that Kuneitra has been taken; the Israel representative has denied that this is so; the Secretary-General—I have made notes and I can be corrected if I am wrong—has asked observers to go to those places mentioned in the Syrian Foreign Minister's complaint: Massadeh, Kuneitra, and some vantage points; and the Secretary-General says that no first-hand information has yet been received, and as a result, he is still awaiting a reply.

"I, as a member of the Council, am also awaiting a reply from an impartial observer of what is going on. We do not have it; nor do I have a prepared speech . . .

"This Council can deal only on the basis of evidence, not on the basis of allegations; and we, in fairness to our responsibilities, which are very great, must await the first-hand information which the Secretary-General, quite appropriately, has asked for." [Ibid., paras. 60-63.]

181. Now, it certainly is the legitimate right of every member of the Council to ask for the testimony of an impartial observer. I have done so myself. But to refer to our accusation that Kuneitra has been occupied as an allegation is certainly not appropriate, to say the least. Luckily, however, we have received the reports of UNTSO and of its Chief of Staff, General Odd Bull. What did they confirm? They confirmed that Kuneitra had been occupied, and that the denials made by the representative of the Tel-Aviv authorities up to our meeting of this very morning were nothing but lies, to say the least.

182. The Secretary-General has read to the Council a cable [see para. 76 above] addressed to him by Mr. Abba Eban, which was distributed to us prior to our resuming our meeting; it states:

"Referring to your cable I wish to inform you that orders were issued in accordance with the cease-fire

arrangement reached with the assistance of your representative, General Odd Bull, with effect from yesterday evening at 1830 hours local time. The cease-fire went effectively into force at the appointed hour and has continued without interruption. The Israel forces are adhering scrupulously to and maintaining fully the cease-fire arrangement."

Here we have another document, then, which is denied by the report of the Secretary-General; for according to the agreement, the cease-fire order was supposed to become effective at 1630 hours GMT, and the cable of Mr. Abba Eban says that they have abided by the cease-fire.

183. But here we have in the report of the Secretary-General (paragraph 1 on page 2) that at 1647 hours GMT, namely, seventeen minutes after the cease-fire had gone into effect, air bombing of Damascus was taking place and that it had commenced at 1639 hours GMT. Secondly, paratroopers were being dropped by Israel helicopters at 1953 hours GMT, that is to say, two hours and more after the cease-fire had taken effect. So, what are we to believe: Mr. Eban's letter, which claims that they are abiding by the cease-fire, or the report of General Odd Bull?

184. Furthermore, when the letter of Mr. Eban states that his forces have been ordered to abide by the cease-fire, does it not mean in effect that they have violated the cease-fire? This by itself is a confession of guilt. Therefore, it has been established beyond any shadow of doubt that the denials perpetrated up to this morning by the Israel representative that Kuneitra was not occupied, that there was no bombing of Damascus, were fabrications, and now we have another specimen of a great lie perpetrated by the so-to-speak Foreign Minister of Israel when he says that the Israel forces have abided by the cease-fire.

185. It would take me a long time to go on uncovering these cheap manoeuvres. A draft resolution has been submitted to us by the United States delegation [*S/7971*]. I could not think of a better analysis of the motives of that draft resolution than the one made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The encouragement to Israel aggression now is not concealed; it is stated in draft resolutions. That is why I regret to say that this draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation constitutes nothing more than a confirmation of the occupation by Israel invading hordes of Syrian territory.

186. Let us not forget that the so-called justification of military action by the Israel authorities was to silence the Syrian guns along the armistice demarcation line. But does the military operation which led to penetrating and occupying such a vast area of Syria constitute an answer to the Syrian guns on the armistice demarcation line?

187. It is my duty to tell the Council that this invasion that we are facing, which is the third invasion in the last six or seven days committed by the Israelis, is gaining in proportions and will have far greater repercussions than the Council or the members are expecting here. For the Arab countries in legitimate exercise of their right of self-defence have shut their pipelines and cut off most of the oil which used to meet the Western European and the American

overseas requirements. In this connexion I must say that the Israel invasion which was perpetrated as of the beginning of this month, was actually planned and carefully studied and executed as a result of the quarrel that took place between the Syrian Government and the Iraq Petroleum Company in December 1966. For at that time the Syrian Government told the countries that have oil interests in the Arab world that they had been cheating a small country, Syria. The Syrian Government also declared that Arab oil should belong to the Arab nation. The new decision I referred to was taken in view of the support given to Israel by the United States, United Kingdom and other Western countries.

188. This morning I spoke of the tremendous help extended to Israel by the United States. Now, I should like to speak of the effect of this legitimate Arab measure of self-defence on the American economy. An article which appears in *The New York Times* issue for tomorrow, and which came out this evening under the heading "An oil emergency declared by U.S.", reads as follows:

"The Government declared an oil emergency today because of the Middle East crisis . . . The closing of the Suez Canal and the shutdown of pipelines that terminate in Lebanon and Syria cut off most of the oil from Arab countries which feed supplies to Western Europe."

The article goes on to analyse in figures what this loss means to the Western economy. But as the shutting of the Suez Canal was mentioned, I must state that that was part of the destruction carried out by the Israel criminals against this international artery. No voices of protest were heard either from the United States Government or from the United Kingdom Government.

189. When we warned in our various interventions and speeches against the indiscriminate backing which Israel received from the Government of this country, nobody attached any importance to what we said. We called attention to the fact that the entire policy pursued by the United States Government vis-à-vis the Arabs, in favour of the Zionists, would have disastrous effects on Arab-American relations. We declared time and again that we had no quarrel with the people of this country and that our quarrel was with the pressure groups whose acts are leading and have been leading towards these disastrous results. But now the American Government has started to feel the effect of these measures, and this effect is but the beginning of our reaction and the rest will follow. No oil will be supplied to the United States and its followers, and other American interests will also be hurt. Let us be frank, the United States Government because of its policies during the last twenty years is considered by the Arabs as the main Power responsible for the tragedy of the Palestine people and for what has now taken place in the three Arab countries: the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria.

190. It is regarded as the party most directly responsible for the slaughter of the Arab population carried out by the Israel hordes within the Arab lands. The influence and prestige of the United States in the Arab countries has deteriorated to its lowest ebb. The same paper from which I quoted the article on the oil also has a map of the new

Israel showing the areas that have been conquered by the Israel invaders; the previous armistice lines do not count any more. The representative of the Soviet Union has already quoted the exact words of the Israel Cabinet Ministers denouncing the armistice lines.

191. But if the Israelis and their supporters are drunk as a result of their so-called victories, let me state that we are not facing Israel alone. Our army, small as it is, has defended itself in the most gallant manner, as did the Jordanians, and the United Arab Republic forces before it, against powerful forces equipped with the latest armaments supplied to Israel by the United States and other Western Powers. There is nothing to be proud of in these conquests.

192. Suppose that today the white minority in Southern Rhodesia were to conquer Africa, or that the Government of South Africa were to start a conquest of the whole continent of Africa. It could do so in less than 48 or 64 hours, or 100 hours. But is this heroism? I am mentioning this to warn that the conquest we have faced—and our countries have seen such conquests by hungry hosts and hordes—is not by Israel alone, but ultimately and definitely by the forces that are behind Israel. The repercussions of this invasion will be reflected not only on Syria but on all the small countries of the world, where imperialism, having retreated, is trying to find a way to recuperate and to conquer again.

193. In our own land, this reconquest by the imperialist Power has been effected through this criminal party that is referred to as Israel. In fact, a mere study of the records of the meetings that we have held here the last three or four days will prove beyond any doubt that this aggression against the United Arab Republic, against Jordan, against Syria, is nothing but an imperialist onslaught on the Arab lands and ultimately on the lands of the Third World in Asia and Africa. I say this in full cognizance of the cause, because our problem is not only the problem of Syria but the problem of the forces of liberation throughout the world.

194. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): It is 2.30 in the morning and I do not intend to take the time of the Council to review all that has happened in the last several days. I have a very brief comment to make. My friend, Ambassador Fedorenko, complains that I have been silent. He speaks so frequently and at such length that it is quite difficult to get a word in.

195. I have a very brief word to say. In answer to a question of his, I specifically said that the United States will join in a condemnation of any violation of the cease-fire that is confirmed in reports from the Secretary-General. I, in turn, asked the question whether the Soviet Union would do so. I did not hear an answer to that question.

196. We have submitted our draft resolution for the purpose of condemning any confirmed violations of the cease-fire. If the draft resolution does not say that explicitly—and I think it does—then we should be very glad to agree to appropriate amendments to it. That is the intention of the draft resolution, and that is why we have submitted it.

197. As for the rest of the polemics, they have been resorted to so often by the Soviet Union representative that I shall confine myself to referring to my previous replies. In view of the lateness of the hour, I shall merely incorporate those replies by reference.

198. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, you called this meeting of the Council at the request of the representative of the Soviet Union whose letter of 10 June states:

“In view of the continuation of military activities by Israel”—as the Secretary-General has verified—“despite the adoption of the cease-fire resolutions by the Security Council, I have the honour to request an immediate meeting of the Security Council on 10 June 1967 to consider the question of the flagrant violation by Israel of the Security Council’s decisions calling for the cessation of military activities.” [S/7970.]

199. After lengthy discussions, the Council has not taken a decision condemning the cease-fire violation, not to mention the aggression itself. We have witnessed the diversionary tactics of the Israel representative, who once again has uttered what must be considered pure lies, as the Secretary-General’s report has proved. How can the representative of Israel dare to be so arrogant? How can he dare not only to mislead the Security Council for purely propaganda purposes but also, at times, to hurl insulting epithets at members of the Council?

200. At one point, the United States representative criticized—and he raised his voice to do so—what he described as “name-calling”. But later on, he did not react.

201. I repeat, how can the representative of Israel dare to be so arrogant? His is the arrogance of the criminal certain that he has accomplices among the judges who are about to try him and who will obstruct justice in order to prevent a conviction. A criminal’s arrogance is unlimited when he knows there is no power or justice to condemn him and when, among the judges (and what judges! the very parties who instigated the crime) are his accomplices (and what accomplices! accomplices strong enough to block any Security Council decision and to hinder justice itself).

202. What have we here? Instead of a condemnation, we have a draft resolution which places the victim and the criminal on an equal footing. However, we know who the criminal is; and Mr. Rafael, the Israel representative, knows too. No amendments can possibly salvage such draft resolutions, or turn them to any good. We cannot consider such draft resolutions, which are meant to whitewash the criminal; we might even call it a crime to submit them to the Security Council, for this shows us how far some parties would like to push the Security Council. That is why the criminals are so arrogant when they address the Security Council.

203. The PRESIDENT: I should like to ask the Secretary-General to submit the supplementary information which he has received.

204. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have just received two reports from General Odd Bull. The first one was

dispatched at 0305 hours GMT from Jerusalem, and was referred to in my report to the Council dated 11 June.³ It reads as follows:

“(a) Details of the bombing incident, which has been reported earlier, as provided by Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, are as follows: “Two aircraft identified as Delta-wing too high to observe marking. Bombs were definitely dropped. Heavy anti-aircraft put up as result. Impact south of Damascus estimated seven to ten kilometres. Estimated ten to fifteen heavy explosions heard. No smoke or dust observed due to intervening buildings. Absolutely not sonic boom. These aircraft observed by experienced air force United Nations military observers and were assessed as bombers and not photo-reconnaissance aircraft, due to flight angle of sun. Senior Syrian delegate reported that there were six aircraft in group although only two were observed by United Nations military observers.”

“(b) No other breaches of cease-fire observed.

“(c) Mr. Sasson”—of the Israel Foreign Office—“categorically and repeatedly denied bombing by Israel aircraft. He stated that such allegation should not be permitted to distort picture of calm prevailing after cease-fire time.

“(d) Steps taken to achieve observance of cease-fire on either side have been reported. Additional information is as follows: (i) United Nations military observers from Damascus deployed and remained overnight at Sasa, where teams of two will deploy at first light on 11 June

toward Kuneitra. (ii) Simultaneously, team from Tiberias will deploy eastward to Kuneitra, which is invested by Israel forces”—that is, occupied by Israel forces—“and re-establish Kuneitra control centre.”

That is the end of the first report.

205. The second report from General Bull was dispatched at 0447 hours GMT and reads as follows:

“Message reporting details of observed cease-fire breaches: (a) Deployment of United Nations military observer team from Tiberias to Kuneitra has been delayed pending the decision of Israel Minister of Defence regarding this movement. Decision expected approximately 0800 hours GMT, 11 June. (b) United Nations military observer team which remained overnight at Sasa moved toward Kuneitra at daylight and at 0330 hours GMT reported to Damascus to have passed village of Fania. No further information available.”

That is the end of the second report.

206. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General for his report. I have no more speakers on my list, so I would suggest that the Council adjourn now, and I will call the next meeting after consultations with all the members and on the understanding that all members will hold themselves available for an urgent meeting in case of an emergency. If there is no objection to that procedure, I shall take it that it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose on Sunday, 11 June, at 2.40 a.m.

³ The report of the Secretary-General, dated 11 June 1967, was circulated as United Nations Press Release SG/SM/744.