



FIN. DIVISION

MAY 12 1967

UN/SA COLLECTION

# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

# 1358<sup>th</sup>

MEETING: 13 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

|   | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1358/Rev.1) . . . . .  | 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, 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           |

## 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-EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 13 June 1967, at 3 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/1358/Rev.1)

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. M. Kidron (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. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. R. A. Al-Rashid (Kuwait), Mr. M. Mestiri (Tunisia) and Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya) took the places reserved for them.*

2. The PRESIDENT: The meeting that had been tentatively scheduled for yesterday evening was postponed after consultations with the members of the Council. This morning I received a letter from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requesting me to convene a meeting of the Security Council this afternoon; that request has been circulated in document S/7979. Accordingly, I consulted my colleagues and convened the Council at this time.

3. I should also like to draw the attention of the members to the text of a revised draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union together with the request for this meeting. This revised text has been circulated in document S/7951/Rev.2. There have also been circulated since our last meeting three further addenda to the Secretary-General's reports; those addenda are contained in documents S/7930/Add.4, Add.5 and Add.6.

4. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, the

Security Council has been convened urgently today at the request of the Soviet Union in order to consider the 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"—this item, as you know, having been included in the Security Council's agenda a few days ago on a proposal by the Soviet Union.

5. In the very first hours of Israel's aggression against the Arab States the Soviet Union, as we hope members of the Council will remember, branded the Israel aggressors and vigorously demanded that their treacherous and criminal acts should be condemned, that military activities should cease immediately and that the Israel forces should withdraw behind the armistice lines. Unfortunately, however, the Security Council was not able to adopt a decision to that effect, which was dictated by the emergency that had arisen and which it should have adopted in accordance with the United Nations Charter as the body primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. This was due to the position taken by the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council, and by certain other members who were against approving a decision condemning the aggressor and demanding the immediate withdrawal of his troops to the positions occupied before the outbreak of hostilities. At that time, some hypocritical appeals were heard here to the effect that it was wrong to complicate matters, that it was essential to concentrate merely on the question of a cease-fire, and so forth. The Council knows now exactly why the accomplices of the aggressor took that stand. The reason was that they were attempting to enable Israel to gain time for seizing more territory and carrying out its unseemly and criminal plans and purposes.

6. This was the reason why for some time the Security Council was obliged to deal only with one of the aspects of the problem created by Israel's action in unleashing an aggressive war in the Near East—a war for which preparations in Tel-Aviv had been going on not for a day or a month but for years, an aggression which was inspired and directed from across the ocean.

7. The fact that the Security Council has been obliged to hold emergency meetings almost without interruption and to take repeated decisions on what is substantially one and the same question, coming back again and again to repeat its demands for an immediate cessation of military activities by Israel, is due to the fact that ruling circles in Tel-Aviv have ignored the Security Council's decisions and, in defiance of the Council's demands, have tried to continue and extend their aggression, seizing more and more territory in Arab countries.

8. On 5 June, as you know, Israel suddenly launched an air attack on airfields at Cairo, Damascus and other points in the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. Then, Israel's armed forces penetrated deep into the territory of neighbouring Arab States. When all the facts are put together, it is clear that Israel committed a previously-prepared and carefully worked out act of aggression against the United Arab Republic. At the same time, the forces of Israel's aggression flung all their might against

other Arab countries and occupied the city of Jerusalem and a considerable part of the territory of Jordan. And finally, even after the Security Council had adopted a decision calling for an immediate cease-fire and a cessation of military activities in the Near East, Israel, in defiance of the two Security Council resolutions adopted respectively on 6 and 7 June [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)], treacherously invaded the Syrian Arab Republic, bombed the area of Damascus and occupied part of the territory of this Arab country.

9. Even if one allows for the fact that there were unsolved problems between Israel and the Arab countries and that tension had existed in this part of the world, this does not in the very least justify the war which has been launched by extremist circles in Tel-Aviv against the Arab States. Without going into a detailed analysis of the military aspects of the events, it is clear that it was Israel which dealt the first sudden blow that enabled the aggressor to gain the initial successes on which he had been counting from the very outset.

10. We all remember well how in the period immediately prior to Israel's aggression an artificial atmosphere of psychosis was created; we remember how tension was whipped up and the ground was prepared for aggression, and what kind of accusations were heaped upon the Arab States. Subsequent events have shown that the United Arab Republic, Syria and the other Arab States did not have any aggressive intentions at all, that they were not preparing to attack and that it was Israel which was feverishly hastening its piratical attack on the Arab States.

11. Certain circles are trying to make out that it is difficult to conceive of such a small State as Israel as an aggressor against the Arab States, with their population of tens of millions. But this specious idea, which the representative of Tel-Aviv in particular has been trying to propagate in the Security Council, is beneath all criticism. The Israel army was nurtured and trained with the assistance of the Western imperialist powers. As Israel was preparing for its aggression against the Arab States, it was being carefully watched over and encouraged in every way, particularly by Washington.

12. The aggression by Israel was not an accident, or the result of a miscalculation, error or misunderstanding. No. It was carefully thought out imperialist provocation, and the time for putting it into effect was planned by all parties. This aggression was designed to bring about political changes in the Near East which would be advantageous to imperialism, particularly United States imperialism, and to alter the so-called "balance of forces" in this area. Its purpose was to attempt to undermine the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples, and to weaken the progressive régimes in the United Arab Republic, Syria and other Arab countries. Israel was acting as a tool in the hands of more powerful imperialist Powers. And its aggression is the result of a conspiracy between certain imperialist forces, headed by the United States of America, against the Arab States. It is well known that the peoples of the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries have during the past years won some great historic victories in the conquest of national independence and freedom.

Important social reforms have been carried out in these countries in the interests of the working masses of the people.

13. Israel's aggression is directed against the national freedom and State independence of millions of Arabs from Kuwait, Damascus and Baghdad to Cairo, Algiers and Casablanca. There is not a shadow of doubt that behind Tel-Aviv there are at work the same imperialist forces which are trying to obstruct the free national development of the Arab States—and which have trained the Israel army, equipped it with up-to-date military equipment, lavishly supplied Tel-Aviv with the resources it needs and provided it with economic, moral and political assistance and support. It should be added, too, that behind the Israel extremists it is easy to discern the shadows not only of the Pentagon generals but also of the indefatigable militarists on the banks of the Rhine. Bonn's direct complicity in the affairs of the Israel extremists cannot be concealed behind any screen of neutrality. Not only did Bonn act as an instigator; not only did it sacrifice diplomatic relations with a number of Arab States for the sake of a closer partnership with Israel. It was also supplying arms and equipment to the Israel army and, at the height of the Near East crisis, it demonstratively sent a large consignment of gas masks to Israel. Thus, against a background of war-like enthusiasm, on a general basis of adventurism, rabid hatred for everything progressive, and hostility to the Arab peoples' efforts to consolidate their independence and social progress, extremist circles in Tel-Aviv were allying themselves not only with Washington, but also with the revanchists and militarists of Bonn.

14. In the pages of the *U.S. News and World Report* the United States General, Max S. Johnson, a former senior official for the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, has recently described the mood of leading United States military figures as follows:

“Growing hostility of Middle Eastern nations toward the United States and friendliness toward the Soviet Union has been, in my judgment, a strategic loss of great proportions.”

15. Further, Mr. President, the United States General in a moment of candour directly linked events in Viet-Nam with the situation in the Near East, and noted that this area lies at a “strategic crossroads” between Europe, Asia and Africa. Indeed, although in the geographical sense South-East Asia and the Gulf of Tonkin are a long way from the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean, hardly anyone will doubt that the United States aggression in Viet-Nam has inevitably had a disastrous effect on the general political situation in the world and has played a certain part, not by any means for the last time, in Israel's aggression against the Arab States.

16. The forces of colonialism cannot reconcile themselves to the idea that the resources of the Arabs must belong to the Arabs themselves and that the Arab countries themselves have a legal right to determine the course of their own development. Is it a mere coincidence that the active involvement of the forces of imperialism and the unleashing of Israel's aggression have occurred at the very time when

more and more Arab countries have begun to take steps to strengthen their national independence? It was not in any sense the Arab peoples or countries which were interested in fanning the flames of military conflict in the Near East. It was the forces of imperialism and the oil monopolies, of which Israel is an accomplice.

17. This is the situation, Mr. President, in which Israel launched its aggression against the Arab countries; and these are the true causes of the aggression, the real circumstances and facts which the Security Council must take into account.

18. The Soviet delegation has expressed its position of principle since the very beginning of the Security Council's discussions on the question of Israel's aggression, and it is now fully confirming this position. We have drawn the attention of members of the Council to the statements issued by the Soviet Government on 24 May and 5 June 1967, to the representations made by our Government to the Government of Israel and also to the statement issued by the Governments of the socialist countries, in which *inter alia* it was stressed that:

“If the Government of Israel does not cease its aggression and withdraw its forces behind the armistice line, the socialist States which have signed this statement will take all necessary steps to help the peoples of the Arab countries deliver a decisive rebuff to the aggressor, defend their lawful rights, extinguish the hotbed of war in the Near East and restore peace in this area.”

19. In view of the continued aggression by Israel against the Arab States, the Soviet Government warned Tel-Aviv that it would bear full responsibility for this treacherous act, this flagrant violation of a decision by the Security Council, and it decided to break off diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel. A number of other socialist countries also decided it was impossible to maintain further diplomatic relations with the Israel aggressor.

20. The Soviet Union has constantly supported the legitimate struggle of the United Arab Republic and other Arab States which have been defending the legitimate cause of strengthening their national independence and freedom and consolidating their sovereignty and progressive social reforms.

21. For decades the Soviet Union and other socialist States have been providing assistance of various kinds to the peoples of the Arab countries in their legitimate struggle against colonialism for national independence and the development of their peaceful economies. The Arab countries have received a great deal of assistance of all kinds from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

22. The United Nations, too, must make its voice heard in defence of the just cause of the Arab peoples, if it is to remain true to its Charter and to the decisions adopted in the United Nations in support of the people's national liberation movement. The Security Council as well must play its part in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

23. In this connexion the Soviet delegation wishes to stress that the Security Council's decisions calling for a

cessation of military activities constitute only the first step, only the minimum which could be achieved in circumstances in which a number of the Council's members were opposed to more radical and essential measures. These decisions were designed to stop the aggression and bloodshed, to avert any further dangerous deterioration in the situation and to prevent any extension of a military conflict which was fraught with danger for the cause of peace not only in the Near East.

24. But no one must have any illusions or misunderstandings as to the fact that all the decisions which the Council has taken hitherto represent only the first step on which it was possible to agree only for a short period, and only because it was necessary to protect the victims of aggression from the piratical hordes of Israel.

25. There is no doubt that in the situation now arising the stage in which the Security Council could confine itself to adopting a cease-fire resolution is already past. The Council can no longer spend its time repeating or reaffirming earlier resolutions which, it is quite clear, are completely inadequate. The Security Council must do its direct duty under the Charter of the United Nations in accordance with the exalted purposes and principles on which the existence and activities of our Organization are based.

26. Israel's act of aggression against the Arab States cannot remain unpunished. The forces of aggression have not only seized a considerable part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, but are also continuing to occupy the territory of Arab countries. The high-handed interventionists are gloating over their military victory and, judging from statements made by the official representatives of Tel-Aviv, they have not the slightest intention of withdrawing their forces behind the armistice lines.

27. Furthermore, we have already occasion to draw the Council's attention to the fact that a dangerous militaristic psychosis and hysteria has recently been prevailing in Tel-Aviv. Threats and ultimatums, almost unprecedented in their arrogance and cynicism, are being issued from that quarter. Plans are being made at full speed for expansion, for seizing more territory and reshaping the map of the Near East.

28. Once again we hear a resurgence of the notorious geo-political theories of *lebensraum* and the establishment of a "new order" and "vital frontiers" in the Near East. The peoples are familiar with ultimatums and wild theories of this kind, and with these ideas about a new order and a revision of the political map. It was the fascist occupationists who adopted slogans about reshaping the map of Europe and the whole world, and who were trying to establish a so-called "new order" by military force until the back of the fascist beast was broken by the combined forces of the Soviet Union and other peoples.

29. It is monstrous that these plans and methods of the fascist marauders, which were condemned by the International Tribunal, are now being revived by a Government claiming to represent the people which suffered so grievously and shed so much blood as a result of the barbarities of the fascist butchers.

30. This is the bitter truth, but it is the truth which must be brought home to those who are trying to whitewash and justify Israel's aggression against the Arab States.

31. Information being received indicates that the indigenous Arab population is being forcibly ejected from Gaza, Jerusalem and other areas. An occupation administration is being set up in the territories seized by Israel forces, and military governors are being appointed for towns and provinces. Everything indicates that the practices now being applied are the same as those which the Hitlerite occupationists used in the territories of countries that were victims of aggression during the Second World War.

32. Yesterday Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel stated:

"Be under no illusion that the State of Israel is prepared to return to the situation that reigned up to a week ago. We are entitled to determine what are the true and vital interests of our country and how they shall be secured. The position that existed until now shall never again return."

33. Exactly the same views are being expressed by General Moshe Dayan who stated the other day that "if they (that is, the Arab countries) don't want to talk to us, to sit down with us, then we shall stay where we are". He continued: "I don't think that we should in any way give back the Gaza Strip to Egypt or the western part of Jordan to King Hussein."

34. Does this not reveal the true face of the aggressor and his expansionist plans which were being carefully prepared long before the actual events and were put into effect when the forces of intervention decided that the most appropriate time had come? Perhaps people in Tel Aviv are waiting for a special invitation; perhaps they think that the peoples of the world and the United Nations will reconcile themselves to the seizure and occupation of territory belonging to other States. Perhaps they are expecting the Arab countries, the Soviet Union, the socialist States and other freedom-loving peoples to allow them to enjoy the fruits of their arrogant and treacherous aggression, and to give them an opportunity to dictate their own terms from a position of strength, from the position of occupiers who are trying to annex the territory of Arab countries by force.

35. Those who have illusions of that kind are deeply mistaken. The Tel-Aviv Government, of all Governments, should not have any misunderstandings or illusions: for the piratical acts which Israel has perpetrated, it will have to pay the full penalty.

36. It is perfectly clear that the Israel aggressors are not in the least original either in their actions or in their methods of pursuing their expansionist aggressive policy. Like the Nazi *führer* clique, they are trying to put the blame on the victim of aggression; they are spreading slander and trying to deceive the peoples of the world. They are copying those who are helping and encouraging them. Surely everyone knows that Washington, which has nurtured the Israel aggressor with its aid and dollar generosity, has itself for many years been pursuing a notorious policy from a position of strength against other States. Surely everyone

knows who in recent times has been seizing the territory of other countries by force, bombing the capitals of other States, waging a barbaric war, and then trying to dictate its own terms.

37. We see that the same adventurist policy is being repeated in the Near East as well. It is clear that the same criminal hand is at work and the same imperialist methods are being used in the Near East, in South-East Asia and in Latin America. We know that a few days ago napalm was dropped on the soil of Arab countries too, and that on this soil, foul crimes have been perpetrated, and are still being perpetrated to this day against the peace-loving Arab population. All this is a link in the single conspiracy of the imperialist forces against freedom-loving peoples which are defending their sovereignty and freedom and have risen in a sacred struggle against the colonial oppressors for the noble cause of national liberation.

38. The Security Council has a duty, a direct duty, without any delay or any procrastination, to take the most effective and active measures against the aggressor, to condemn the aggressor and secure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel's armed forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as a result of an aggression. And we should like to point out that the Security Council in resolution 236 (1967) which was approved on 12 June, has already taken the first step in the direction of condemning Israel's actions. It is quite obvious that this decision condemning any and all violations of the cease-fire refers wholly and fully to Israel, inasmuch as it is only Israel which is continuing its aggressive acts in defiance of the Security Council's decisions. This understanding of the Security Council's resolution is clear beyond any doubt from the fact that the preamble to the resolution contains a reference to reports by the Secretary-General indicating that, in spite of the Security Council's resolution and demands for a cessation of military activities, Israel is continuing to penetrate deep into Syrian territory and has even bombed Damascus, the capital of the Syrian Arab Republic.

39. It is clear that the Security Council cannot stop at this. What it needed is a firm, vigorous and direct condemnation of all the actions of Israel which has unleashed a criminal aggression against the Arab countries.

40. It is well known that some representatives in the Security Council are trying to make out that certain circumstances are not altogether clear, and that things must be elucidated, clarified, investigated, studied, and so on and so forth. We categorically reject these unfounded assertions.

41. We would like to ask, Mr. President, what further evidence is required for adopting a decisive condemnation of the Israel aggressors. Today, at this moment as we are sitting in the Security Council chamber, Israel interventionists are occupying parts of Arab States totalling four times as much as the territory of Israel itself. Is there anyone who doubts this? Do not the war criminals sitting in Tel-Aviv admit themselves that they intend to continue the occupation of these territories? Do we need any more reports, investigations, studies and so forth to confirm the

fact of Israel's aggression and occupation of the territory of neighbouring States?

42. Some people at this table may perhaps believe that the aggressor has a right to keep the territories he has seized and to flout the rights of other peoples. But we should like to ask how it would be appropriate to describe the piratical acts of any State which, for instance, seized a part of the territory of Argentina or Brazil, Denmark or Canada, and then said that it would not withdraw from the territories it had seized until the Governments of those countries had complied with the demands of the aggressor and gone down on their knees before him. It is this which is the crux of the matter at the present time. And we believe that members of the Security Council must approach the solution to this problem with a full sense of responsibility and with all seriousness, having full regard to the consequences which might arise from a failure in this case to observe the most important principles of international law and the vital provisions of the United Nations Charter.

43. The fact that Israel's armies are continuing to occupy parts of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan must be condemned by the Security Council in the strongest terms.

44. It is for this reason that the Soviet delegation is now once again drawing the attention of the Security Council to the item which has been included in the Council's agenda at the request of the Soviet Government, and which is entitled "Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israel forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan which they have seized as the result of an aggression".

45. We should like to draw the Council's attention once again to the draft resolution which the Soviet delegation submitted in the Security Council on 8 June 1967 [S/7951/Rev.1]. We have taken into account the changes which have occurred in the situation in the Near East in the past few days, and we are now submitting a revised text of the draft resolution for consideration by the Security Council. This text reads:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting that Israel, in defiance of the Security Council's resolutions on the cessation of military activities and a cease-fire [resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June 1967, 234 (1967) of 7 June 1967 and 235 (1967) of 9 June 1967] has seized additional territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria,*

*"Noting that although military activities have now ceased, Israel is still occupying the territory of those countries, thus failing to halt its aggression and defying the United Nations and all peace-loving States,*

*"Considering unacceptable and unlawful Israel's territorial claims on Arab States,*

*"1. Vigorously condemns Israel's aggressive activities and continued occupation of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, regarding this as*

an act of aggression and the grossest violation of the United Nations Charter and generally recognized principles of international law;

"2. *Demands* that Israel should immediately and unconditionally remove all its troops from the territory of those States and withdraw them behind the armistice lines and should respect the status of the demilitarized zones, as prescribed in the General Armistice Agreements." [S/7951/Rev.2.]

46. The Soviet delegation positively insists that the Security Council should adopt this proposal, and not postpone a decision on the matter any longer. Its importance, urgency and immediacy are not open to the slightest doubt, and we must act decisively to fulfil the obligations imposed on every member of the United Nations and on every member of the Security Council by the United Nations Charter. It is well known that some people are trying to make out that the question of the withdrawal of Israel forces from the territory they have seized should be linked with certain other conditions, with a settlement of the general situation in the Near East, and so on and so forth. The Soviet delegation, Mr. President, categorically rejects attempts of this kind.

47. At the Security Council's meeting on 24 May the United States representative, Ambassador Goldberg, said that: "The United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all"—and I emphasize "all"—"the nations in the area." [1342nd meeting, para. 10.] We should like to ask whether this statement by the representative of the United States of America is still valid. If so, is the United States prepared to confirm that it opposes the territorial claims of Tel-Aviv?

48. The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to put a direct question to the representative of the United States of America and other western delegations: do they agree that the Israel forces should be removed immediately and unconditionally from the territory they have seized, and should be withdrawn behind the armistice lines? Are they prepared to recognize that the continued occupation of Arab land by Israel's armed forces is illegal, criminal and contrary to the United Nations Charter and the elementary principles of contemporary international law?

49. The distinguished representatives of India and Mali have in their statements already stressed the need to adopt a decision calling for the withdrawal of the armed forces of both sides behind the armistice lines, and only then to discuss other problems relating to the so-called underlying causes.

50. The position adopted by India in the Council is based on the well-known principle of international law that the aggressor must not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of his crime. A number of delegations, and particularly the Nigerian delegation, have drawn attention to the fact that there has been an attempt here in the Security Council to put some new terminology into circulation, and to foist upon the Security Council some new ideas about cease-fire lines. We must protest against any attempts to invent any new lines or new positions which would consolidate and justify Israel's aggression.

51. The Security Council's very first duty under the United Nations Charter, apart from condemning the aggressor, is to adopt a decision calling for the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan immediately and unconditionally—I repeat, Mr. President, immediately and unconditionally. Israel's forces must be withdrawn in their entirety behind the armistice line, and moved back out of the respective demilitarized zones.

52. The Soviet delegation, Mr. President, would like to express its confidence that the Security Council will do its duty, and we appeal to members of the Council to adopt a decision without delay to protect the Arab States, a decision which would put an end to the aggression and restore the legitimate rights of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan and the other Arab States.

53. We should like our draft resolution to be put to the vote as soon as possible, today, at this meeting of the Council.

54. If the Security Council does not take immediate measures, then a grave responsibility will rest with those States which have not done their duty as members of the Security Council. In that case, it will be necessary to seek other ways of ensuring that the United Nations does its duty in accordance with its Charter.

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

56. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): We have already brought to the attention of the Security Council the continued expulsion of Jordanians from their homes and farms, their towns and cities. The Israel invaders were and still are carrying out a well-calculated plan to expel more Arabs with a view to repeating the pattern they had embarked upon in 1948. That plan included thousands of UNRWA refugees within the west bank of Jordan. *The New York Times* reports that 100,000 Jordanians have been expelled. It is reported that in some places Israel loudspeakers warned the Jordanian inhabitants in the invaded area, saying "You have two hours to leave; after that, we cannot guarantee your safety."

57. According to *The New York Times* of today, the flight of refugees to the eastern bank of Jordan continues. In an article published in *The New York Times* of today, written by Terence Smith, it is stated:

"The flight of refugees to the eastern bank was still going on today. At a point on the Jordan, a few miles south of here, hundreds were fording the shallow river on foot.

"On the road leading out of Jericho to the Jordan, there was evidence that not all the refugees heading for the eastern bank made it. The bodies of at least a dozen men and women were lying next to a barbed wire fence about fifteen yards back from the road.

"According to Shihaden Dajani, the director of the nearby Boys Town farm, the refugees were hit by Israel fighters.

“They came over in flights of 40 planes each’, he said, ‘they came in low, shooting their machine gun bullets all along the road.’”

The article continues:

“Mr. Dajani reported that Israel soldiers had broken into twenty-five houses on the 3,000-acre Boys Town farm.

“They took nearby everything we had,’ he said. ‘They took radios, clocks, television sets, everything but the mattresses.’”

“Mr. Dajani said he had complained to the military governor about the looting and had received assurances that it would stop.

“‘It didn’t work,’ he said. ‘They looted my house three times. I lost what jewellery I had and our cameras.’”

58. This Boys Town is an institution established for the orphans of the victims of 1947. It was established by a great humanitarian Palestinian. This institution was established with the support of humanitarian Arab, American and European charitable institutions. I wonder what these organizations, which had the humanitarian heart to help the helpless and the orphans of the refugees, would say now, when they find that even this institution is not safe from the attack and cruelty of the Israelis.

59. So far, no decision has been taken by the Security Council to put an end to this act of lawlessness. We cannot understand why a human problem of this kind, which embodies elementary human rights, should be left for so long without an effective remedy. We are grateful to U Thant, our Secretary-General, for all the constructive efforts he has made in this connexion, and we hope that he will find it possible to present a report to the Council on this important and most urgent matter.

60. The Israelis are committing acts of genocide. The methods used, the force employed and the inhuman manner, described in *The New York Times* today, in which our people were expelled from their farms, homes, towns and cities, constitute a crime of genocide. I think the Council may want to have a full report, with sufficient factual information about the security and welfare of the people now living in the illegally occupied area. We also need more information about the exodus of those who have been expelled.

61. Another question which is most serious and important is the question of the condemnation of the invaders and the demand for their immediate withdrawal. Any delay in taking a decision condemning the aggressor and demanding immediate withdrawal would reflect on the prestige and dignity of and, indeed, the respect for this great body, the United Nations. Ambassador Keita, of Mali, very rightly reminded the Council of this in his last intervention. The cease-fire should be followed immediately and without any further delay by an unconditional withdrawal. It is incompatible with the principles of this world body to permit any delay and to inject any foreign substance. Otherwise this

may be interpreted as an encouragement to aggression. The aggressor would enjoy the fruits of his aggression and the use of force would become a substitute for the principles of the Charter.

62. The draft resolution of 9 June 1967 [S/7952/Rev.2] submitted by the United States does not safeguard the principles I have just mentioned. It is not acceptable to my delegation. It brings in questions which are not before the Council. It complicates the question of the need for condemnation and unconditional and immediate withdrawal.

63. In many of his interventions, the representative of the United States, Ambassador Goldberg, advised the members of the Council not to make inflammatory statements. This suggestion is intended, if we understand it correctly, to cultivate peace, but since the behaviour of the Zionists within the United States is directly connected with the question of peace, it would be greatly appreciated and greatly helpful at this important stage if the United States representative would condemn Zionist practices in the United States which, even in this delicate situation, are playing a most destructive role. In raising this important question, we feel we are acting within our Charter rights.

64. My delegation disagrees with the contention that the practices of the Zionists in the United States are guaranteed by the United States Constitution and covered by the freedom of speech and freedom of expression clause. This freedom does not cover acts and deeds against public policy. Freedom is not identical with irresponsibility. The Zionists have gone to the extent of threatening the lives of Arab ambassadors who are fulfilling their duties in this important body. One wonders whether this also comes under freedom of expression or freedom of speech.

65. This wholly un-American activity of the Zionist groups within the United States violates United States tradition. It was for this reason that I spoke about a curtain between us and the people of the United States, imposed by Zionism. It is this curtain which makes many Americans unaware of the Palestine tragedy. Can you imagine, Mr. President, that according to a poll published in Princeton, New Jersey, and in the *Washington Post* of 12 June—that is, yesterday—a poll which reflected the nationwide reaction to the Israel-Arab war, less than half of one per cent of the American people want the United States Government to support the Arab nations and—and this is very important for the United Nations and the Security Council to know—only 11 per cent want the United States Government to work through the United Nations.

66. United States public opinion would have been different had the people known that the whole people of Palestine were displaced and uprooted to make room for Jewish foreign immigrants and that, as a result, we have more than 1.5 million refugees. It is the Zionist campaign of distortion in the United States which has brought about this unawareness of our just cause.

67. The Zionist campaign, which is still continuing, has gone so far as to attack a man who is the symbol of decency and objectivity. The Zionist campaign in pages of

advertisements published by the Zionist districts in all parts of America, has tried to undermine the effectiveness and authority of the United Nations by making charges against U Thant, saying that he did not obtain, either from the Security Council or the Assembly, an order to withdraw the United Nations Emergency Force, something which all Security Council members, including the great Powers, have agreed was legally within his right and authority.

68. Statements of Mr. Eshkol and Mr. Dayan, published on Sunday and this morning in *The New York Times*, in which they attack the United Nations, show a clear co-ordination between the behaviour of Zionism in Israel and the behaviour of their agencies, the pressure groups in the United States of America.

69. I have already brought before you the tragedy of the exodus of those who were expelled from the land in which they had lived from time immemorial. I have asked for effective measures to protect and ensure the safety of others still living in the invaded area.

70. We were asked not to make inflammatory statements. Ambassador Goldberg said that what is needed here is not hot words. Thus we are expected to be silent while our people are being slaughtered in the invaded area. We are asked not to call a crime a crime; we are advised to avoid explaining the terrible acts of genocide committed against our people. Maybe we are expected to confine our reaction to meditation, to make our voices heard in churches and mosques, but not to seek remedy in the Security Council.

71. We agree that hot words alone are not the meaningful answer to hot deeds. We may not have other means at present, but we can only hope that through honest and sincere words we can open a closed door, and that we can lift the dark curtain so that truth be not a stranger in the land of Jefferson and Washington.

72. How can we, the delegation of Jordan, a small Member of the United Nations, find mild and soft language to describe the American napalm bombs used by the Israelis against our people and our heroic small army, which fought without adequate machinery, without air cover, but with every sacrifice, with all courage, with manliness and determination? And with this and many other Israel atrocities, how can we find an excuse for American politicians who, for cheap political gains, exploit the suffering and the losses inflicted upon us and the acts of genocide committed against our people?

73. How can a stand like that taken by Senator Robert F. Kennedy be looked upon but with dismay and disappointment—all the more so when such an attitude comes from an American with great future ambitions. If Senator Robert F. Kennedy permits himself in this critical situation to exploit our tragedy for personal gains, and permits himself to intervene in the domestic affairs of thirteen sovereign Arab States, are we to blame for taking a stand to expose those who neither told the truth nor had the dignity to remain silent?

74. The American people gained great prestige in the world community because of the heroic and courageous

attitude of the late John F. Kennedy. It was the late President Kennedy who said: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty." And it is Robert F. Kennedy who now, a few days after the Israel crime against liberty, instead of adopting a stand dictated by the American sense of fairness, instead of pointing his finger at the irresponsible behaviour of the Israel leaders, in an obvious attempt to accommodate the so-called Jewish vote in the forthcoming election year, comes to speak about our leaders, calling them "irresponsible leaders [who] have turned their people's frustration outward".

75. Jordan has been considered a friend of the United States. But I regret to say that Jordan was betrayed by its so-called friends. We were assured that the territorial integrity of all nations in the Middle East would be protected. We were told that the movement of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean was intended to put that policy into effect, to stop the aggression from whichever side it came. But when Jordan was invaded and a substantial part of its territory was illegally occupied, the Sixth Fleet kept silent. One cannot but wonder whether the Sixth Fleet was there to protect Jordan or to facilitate the task of the invaders. The fact that the Israelis committed the aggression was very clear. The American ship, *Liberty*, which was attacked by the Israelis, was not sitting idly in the Mediterranean.

76. This is what *Newsweek* had to say about the ship, *Liberty*. I am quoting from *Newsweek* of 19 June 1967, of this week:

"First of all, the *Liberty* was no ordinary vessel but an intelligence-gathering ship on a 'ferret' mission. It carried elaborate gear to locate both Israel and Egyptian radio and radar and to monitor and tap all military messages sent from command posts to the battlefield. Although Israel's apologies were officially accepted, some high Washington officials believe the Israelis knew the *Liberty*'s capabilities and suspect that the attack might not have been accidental. One top-level theory holds that someone in the Israel armed forces ordered the *Liberty* sunk . . . ."

I am referring to the *Liberty*, the ship that was attacked by the Israelis where thirty-three Americans were killed and seventy-five were injured. I repeat, this is what the article has to say:

"One top-level theory holds that someone in the Israel armed forces ordered the *Liberty* sunk because he suspected it had taken down messages showing that Israel started the fighting. (A Pentagon official has already tried to shoot down the Israel claim of 'pilot error'.) Not everyone in Washington is buying this theory, but some top Administration officials will not be satisfied until fuller and more convincing explanations of the attack on a clearly marked ship in international waters are forthcoming."

77. Surely the present attitude of the United States vis-à-vis an immediate withdrawal will give us an answer. We

are the friends of the United States people, but friendship is a two-way street; so is interest. If the United States Government is going to ignore the legitimate rights of the Arabs, if the United States Government intends to have expediency as its guiding principle, then this will pose a challenge to every Arab.

78. The Arab people and their Governments are learning today, more than ever, that their strength does not stem from those who, on the one hand, claim to be their friends and, on the other, use two criteria for justice and practice. Our people are now realizing more than ever that their strength is in their unity and that their struggle should start at home, so that they can get rid of all forces and influences which stand in the way of Arab liberation.

79. Those States which betrayed their own assurances to the Arabs are giving a lesson to the Arab masses, who are now more than ever convinced that they can never trust forces of domination and exploitation. We received and we keep receiving empty words here in the Security Council and outside the Security Council. But these utterances cannot today fool those who are the victims of a vicious conspiracy undertaken by many forces.

80. We come to the Security Council seeking remedy. The same forces that betrayed us in our just cause helped in bringing about this tragedy. They are now working inside the Security Council, and behind closed doors, outside the Council, to frustrate our efforts and the efforts of the Council for immediate action. Some of those forces of evil are not serving the interest of their people. They are serving the interests of the Zionist minority, against the interests of the majority.

81. We may not be able to check these forces now, but we have the means to expose them and their intrigues to our public opinion for it to make an accurate judgement. Then our people will have to play their part in fighting these forces of evil and their interests, wherever they find them. Our people, with their unshakable determination, will have to revolt against these forces and start their struggle from within.

82. The answer to this challenge posed by Zionism and imperialism is a united Arab effort to check Zionist expansionism.

83. In conclusion, let me make it very clear that Jordan is not happy about the part so far played by the United States and some other Powers here in the Security Council vis-à-vis our cause. If this United States policy continues, some politicians in America may win Zionist and so-called Jewish votes in the United States, but the American people, as a result, will definitely—and I repeat, definitely—lose all their interests and friends in the Arab East.

84. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The United States has introduced a draft resolution [S/7952/Rev.2] which we believe holds the hope of a lasting peace in the Near East. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has submitted a revised draft resolution [S/7951/Rev.2], which its representative has talked about today. I propose, in the interests of furthering the debate

and consideration by the Council today, to discuss both draft resolutions, not in the spirit of invective, which, regrettably, has characterized our debates of the past several days, but on the merits, because of the grave seriousness of the problem and because of the necessity for this Council to arrive at a sober and considered judgement of what its responsibilities are in the area.

85. Throughout the nineteen years since the admission of Israel to the United Nations, the United States has supported many attempts to resolve the underlying causes of tension and instability between the Arab States and Israel. We have sought to assure acceptance of the political independence and territorial integrity of all States in the area: Arab States and Israel alike, all Members of the United Nations, all Members entitled to the protection of the Charter. We have also sought an end to acts of force, of whatever kind, acts which also are hostile to the spirit and intent of the Charter. We have sought an equitable and humanitarian solution of the problem of the Palestinian refugees. We have supported plans for the development of the resources of the Jordan River in a way which will help all States and do harm to none. We have pressed for recognition of the rights of all nations, including Israel, to free and innocent passage of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba. Above all, we have sought the conversion of the Armistice of 1949 into a permanent peace as contemplated in the General Armistice Agreements themselves.

86. We have not changed our views or policies about the entire situation because of the unfortunate events which have occurred recently. Virtually all our efforts, as we know, have been unsuccessful. The Near East has lived for nineteen years in a state of tension which now, for the third time, has erupted into war. The even-handed efforts of the United States to prevent and end the present violence and the past violence are spread on the records of the United Nations and of international diplomacy for all to read.

87. The depth of our commitment was made manifest in 1956 at the time of the Suez crisis. And more recently it was made evident again, in the even-handed approach of the United States towards border incidents in 1966. We supported a call in the Security Council, also supported by the great majority of the members, on the Syrian Government to restrain terrorist raids launched from its territory. Then, in November 1966, we joined in the unanimous censure of Israel for its retaliatory raid against As Samu in Jordan.

88. I need scarcely recall to this Council that it was a Soviet veto which prevented the milder action of the Council directed against Syria from being adopted. It may also be instructive to recall one aspect of the course of events in the past month leading directly to the outbreak of the fighting, an aspect which has not been fully or adequately discussed in the Council but which I am compelled to discuss by reason of some remarks by the representative of the Soviet Union today.

89. In early May of this year reports were circulated in Syria and the United Arab Republic of a supposed Israel military build-up on the borders of Syria, allegedly backed by the United States and aimed at the overthrow of the

Syrian Government. President Nasser of the United Arab Republic recently revealed one source from which his Government had heard this inflammatory rumour, namely Moscow. Yet Secretary-General U Thant, on 19 May, stated that United Nations observers had found no evidence to support the charges of an alleged Israel military build-up in the area. And indeed, he could not have reported any complicity on the part of the United States, for such complicity was non-existent.

90. Let me remind the Council too that while these inflammatory charges, inspired by Moscow, were inflaming the situation in the Near East, the Soviet representative's only answers to my country's call for urgent action by the Council was a complaint that we were dramatizing the situation. He should know better than anyone what dramatizing means. This totally false accusation of a United States-Israel plot helped substantially to inflame the crisis in which Israel and Egypt confronted each other for the first time in ten years across borders no longer patrolled by the United Nations.

91. On 17 May, as the world well remembers, President Nasser, citing the supposed danger of an Israel invasion of Syria, requested the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force. And when UNEF vacated Sharm el Sheikh, the United Arab Republic immediately reimposed its blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, after ten years of free and peaceful navigation of that Gulf.

92. These are the facts. The whole world community knows them. We in the Council above all others are fully conversant with them.

93. Throughout this period, the United States of America, in the Security Council, as the Council's records disclose, and in all its diplomatic activities, urged the utmost restraint on all parties. We exerted every effort to prevent an outbreak of hostilities and to assure that vital international maritime rights in the Gulf of Aqaba would be respected. Unfortunately, our urgent efforts to convene the Security Council and to get the Security Council to act before an outbreak of hostilities were stalled by other Powers which chose to ridicule the seriousness of the situation and failed to support our urgent efforts to find a peaceful solution. As a result, largely through Soviet obstruction, the Security Council, between its first meeting on 24 May 1967 and the outbreak of the fighting on 5 June 1967, was unable to adopt a single resolution or take any effective action to prevent an outbreak. Throughout this time the whole area remained a tinderbox. Armies were mobilized and poised for war, and inexorably war came.

94. At the very outbreak of the fighting, the United States immediately sought a cease-fire and supported efforts made by our distinguished President and others in the same direction. The record of the meetings of the Security Council shows clearly who obstructed the cease-fire, the first, indispensable step for bringing the conflict to an end, and why it took two days to adopt a simple cease-fire resolution [233 (1967)] which should have been adopted immediately and without debate. The record also shows that, regardless of the sponsor thereof, the United States speedily supported the second cease-fire resolution

[234 (1967)], which was proposed by the Soviet Union; and that after that, precious time was again wasted in protracted debate and negotiations before a third cease-fire resolution [235 (1967)], applying to the situation in Syria, could be adopted. This was true even though here also the United States was ready to act immediately and had in fact sought to anticipate the situation the previous day by supporting a resolution condemning any violation of the cease-fire, and indeed proposing to sponsor such a resolution.

95. Now fortunately, and belatedly, the cease-fire is in effect. But we cannot rest there. The cease-fire, as we have repeatedly said, is no more than the first essential step in the Council's duty. Our Charter responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security. The guns are mercifully silent in the Near East today, but that region is still a long, long way from true peace or true security. The question now facing the Security Council, therefore, is simply this: What is the next step we must take towards peace and security for the nations of the Near East? Where do we go from here? The question is not where we further debate or exchange recriminations or invective; the question is: Where do we go from here?

96. There are two answers to this question before the Council: that of the Soviet Union in its draft resolution and that of the United States. Before stating the case for my Government's proposal, I should like to comment briefly on that of the Soviet Union.

97. The Soviet proposal could be stated in simple terms as follows: Condemn Israel for its aggression; and Israel, withdraw your troops and let everything go back to exactly where it was before the fighting began on 5 June. In other words, the film is to be run backwards through the machine to that point in the early morning of 5 June when hostilities had not broken out.

98. But what would the situation then be? Once again opposing forces are to stand in direct confrontation, poised for combat. Once again there is to be no international machinery to keep them apart. Once again Aqaba is to be blockaded to the free and innocent passage of all maritime nations. Once again nothing is to be done to resolve the deep-lying grievances on both sides that have fed the fires of conflict in the Near East for twenty years. And significantly, once again there is no bar to an arms race in the area, the arms race which has so substantially contributed to the tension in that region.

99. If ever there was a prescription for renewed hostilities, the Soviet draft resolution is that prescription. I do hope that the Soviet Union does not contemplate with equanimity the prospect of a fourth round in the Arab-Israel struggle. This is precisely what the Council should concert its efforts to avoid.

100. Let us recall that the General Armistice Agreements of 1949<sup>1</sup> state that their purpose is: "to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace"—I repeat "permanent peace"—"in Palestine".

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement Nos. 1 to 4.*

01. We all know that there has been no transition and that there is no permanent peace in that area at all. On the contrary, there is war. A bandage was applied to the wound eighteen years ago, but the wound has never been allowed to heal. It is still an open and festering wound today. All the eighteen years of the armistice régime have witnessed virtually no progress on any of the basic issues from which the conflict arose. As long as those issues are unresolved, they will continue to envenom the political life of the Near East.

02. The Soviet proposal does not encompass a genuine approach to their solution. It cannot lead toward peace. It is rather a big step backward towards another war. What the Near East needs today are new steps toward real peace, not just a cease-fire, which is what we have today; not just a fragile and perilous armistice, which is what we have had for eighteen years; not just withdrawal which is necessary but insufficient. Real peace must be our aim, and in that conviction my delegation submitted on 9 June, even before the cease-fire became fully effective, a draft resolution from which I shall now read the most important provision:

*"The Security Council,*

*" . . .*

*"2 Calls for discussions promptly thereafter"—that is, after the cease-fire—"among the parties concerned, using such third-party or United Nations assistance as they may wish, looking toward the establishment of viable arrangements encompassing the withdrawal and disengagement of armed personnel, the renunciation of force regardless of its nature, the maintenance of vital international rights and the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East." [S/7952/Rev.2.]*

03. Our objective in making this proposal is to encourage a decision by the warring parties to live together in peace and to ensure international assistance to this end. It is necessary to begin to move, not some day but now, promptly, while the memory of these tragic events is still vivid in our minds, towards a full settlement of all outstanding questions—I again repeat "all outstanding questions"—between the parties such as the resolutions the United Nations has contemplated for nearly twenty years.

04. There are legitimate grievances on all sides of this bitter conflict, and a full settlement should deal equitably with all legitimate grievances and all outstanding questions from whatever side they are raised. In short, a new foundation for peace must be built in the Middle East.

05. Doubtless, agreements between the parties on these profoundly contentious matters will take a long time, but the United Nations, speaking through this Council, has an urgent obligation to facilitate them and to help build an atmosphere in which fruitful discussions will be possible. That is the purpose of the draft resolution we have submitted.

06. The Security Council is now faced with a clear-cut issue. We can either attack the causes of the disease which has plagued the Near East with war three times in a

generation or we can go back to the treatment of symptoms which has proved such a dismal failure in the past. In this we should adopt a simple, pragmatic rule taught by all our medical advisers: "You cannot cure cancer with a band-aid."

107. In this grave situation fraught with so many differences of opinions and attitudes, the tendency is to say that it defies solution. But we cannot accept that type of counsel. Let us rather state that no one can say that solutions are impossible. The sad fact is that for many years they have not been tried really seriously, and now, at the end of this tragic week of war, let us remember the death and suffering that all the parties have borne and let us open the way to solutions that will be sufficiently enduring and sufficiently just to be an acceptable monument to their sacrifice and to the pledge that is contained in the United Nations Charter.

108. In dealing with this subject and since we are here in New York, we are constantly reminded by various spokesmen, including my good friend, the representative of Jordan, Mr. El-Farra, of American public opinion. And again I should like to make something very explicit. I do not apologize in any sense for the expression by any American group of their point of view about this problem, whether it is the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations headed by Dr. Mehdi, who met with me, or by the head of any Zionist organization. Our Constitution, and we are very proud of it, permits free expression of opinion by our citizens. The other day we witnessed a vivid demonstration of the character of the United States Constitution. The Action Committee on American-Arab Relations held a peaceful demonstration in front of the White House and so did various Zionist and Jewish groups. Both demonstrations were permitted; both took place peacefully under our Constitution; both are permissible under our system of government. We are proud of that, and we do not apologize in any way for it. We do not apologize in any way for what any person says in our country about any matter of public opinion.

109. I would say for Mr. El-Farra's information that very often public opinion expressed in the United States is not public opinion which is exactly complimentary to our Government. Yet, whether it is complimentary or not, it is the entire basis of our society that our citizens should have the right to express themselves freely on all issues. The right of comment and the right of dissent, our Supreme Court has said, is a right of American citizens both in time of peace and in time of war and is our most precious heritage.

110. I should also like to say again in this Council that I do not think that it is appropriate—and I shall say this again and again—or that it serves the purposes of debate to refer to comments made by various citizens or individuals or public officials. It is legitimate—I have said this and I repeat it—to comment upon the foreign policy of our Government, the declarations made by the President, the Secretary of State, myself and others who have responsibility for enunciating the foreign policy of our Government.

111. When other officials of the United States Government in the legislative branch—and I shall be very precise:

Senator Kennedy—or Governor Rockefeller or anybody else—express themselves, they are also exercising their rights as public officials and American citizens. I do not think that the time of the Council ought to be spent in debating the views of our citizens and officials, or in entering into our domestic affairs. What is more relevant, if I may say so with due respect, is the position that is stated in this Council on behalf of the United States Government.

112. Reference has been made to the attack on our ship, *Liberty*. I stated in the Council in the strongest terms the protest of our Government against that attack, and we have renewed that protest in the strongest terms to the Israel authorities. We regard that attack to be an unjustified attack. I have welcomed expressions made by some, but not all, of the members of the Council of regret at the lives we have lost in this conflict, just as I have expressed regret about all other lives lost in this conflict, including the lives of the combatants themselves. Surely we must express regret about all bloodshed and loss of life in this conflict.

113. I should like also to address myself to some other comments that have been made. We do have in the aftermath of the fighting an urgent responsibility to see that the Council takes all action within its power to protect those already victimized by this war. There are solemn obligations which we must recall concerning the treatment of the victims of war under the 1949 Geneva Conventions,<sup>2</sup> in particular the obligations concerning civilian populations, as the representative of Argentina, Mr. Ruda, pointed out on 11 June [1357th meeting]. These are particularly relevant in the light of the reports we have heard of the movement of civilian populations from their homes, many of them refugees from earlier conflicts.

114. I have already expressed in the Council my Government's concern for the welfare and safety of the populations of the west bank of the Jordan. Our concern includes all who find themselves in areas of the Near East disrupted by this conflict, and particularly those who now find themselves in areas under Israel control.

115. The United Nations through its resolution establishing the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees [General Assembly resolution 302 (IV)], assumed particular responsibility for the refugees of the 1947-1948 fighting. We supported that resolution and the subsequent resolutions renewing its mandate. We have been the principal contributor to the work of UNRWA, and therefore have a legitimate concern that the refugees of the 1947-1948 conflict be treated with the humanitarian concern to which they are entitled.

116. We also have an equal concern that other civilians displaced during the recent conflict from their homes, and particularly those on the west bank of the Jordan, will be allowed and encouraged to return to their homes and that all civilians will be provided with adequate assurance of their safety in the same locations in which they resided before hostilities began. We urge all concerned, and particularly the Government of Israel, to exert every possible effort to that end.

117. We have taken a first step in the cease-fire, and commendably the cease-fire is holding. We have many tasks to perform in bringing about a just and equitable solution which, as the Secretary-General has so strongly stressed to us in his report, is so badly needed in that troubled area of the world. Let us pursue those tasks in a spirit expressed by perhaps the greatest United States President, Abraham Lincoln: "With malice toward none, with charity for all". Let us bind up the wounds of this conflict and bring peace, the most precious gift of all, to all people in the area.

118. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia. As the Security Council table has already been filled as a result of invitations extended to four representatives, the representative of Jordan has very kindly indicated his willingness to withdraw temporarily from his seat at the Council table while the representative of Saudi Arabia makes his intervention. I appreciate this gesture of the representative of Jordan and I invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and make a statement.

119. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It is not easy for me not to speak with emotion. However, Mr. President, if you think I become too emotional, you have a mandate from me to stop me.

120. Places of worship in the Holy Land have been respected throughout history. In Islam it is not permitted that a national flag of any Moslem State be hoisted over the minaret of a Mosque. Likewise, Islam always respected the places of worship of other religions than its own. You only have to turn to history, to the middle of the seventh century, when Omar Ibn Al-Khattab, the Caliph, visited Jerusalem, and the patriarch of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre invited him to worship inside the church. "No", said Omar Ibn Al-Khattab, "I will not do this". The patriarch was taken aback. He thought, "Here is a victor who looks down upon us, who would not gracefully enter the church and worship the same God"—for it is the same God that both the Christians and the Moslems worship. When Omar Ibn Al-Khattab saw how displeased the patriarch was, he said, "I told you on purpose that I will not worship inside your church lest, in the years to come, the Moslems who may wish to revere my name would say, 'Here Omar prayed, and there shall be a Mosque erected; Christ is from the spirit of God, who is also one of our prophets' ". And he turned to his God, and they gave him a rug, and he prayed to God outside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. And today in that same spot next to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre there is a mosque known as the Mosque—not the Great Mosque—of Omar, a small mosque, where Omar Ibn Al-Khattab prayed. He was prophetic of what would have happened had he gone inside the Holy Sepulchre to pray. He knew that some hotheads might build a mosque or might turn the Holy Sepulchre into a mosque.

121. And what is happening today? An emblem of the Zionist aggressors has been hoisted on the minaret of a mosque. Please pass it on [indicating photograph]; show it to our colleagues, Sir, with your permission.

122. Why? This is why we have never accepted the Zionists in our midst, and will never accept them. Let my

<sup>2</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), Nos. 970-973.

good friend, Mr. Goldberg, take this out of his mind. There shall be no peace, not because he and I do not wish to have peace, but because it is the mood, the temperament of the Arab world. He mentioned some metaphors about cancer and about maladies. The Arab world, unfortunately—and I do not glory in what I am saying, I deplore the facts—will not accept a cancer inside of it. The cancer may kill the patient; the patients here are the Arabs. But the cancer will be killed with the patient in a holocaust. The illustrious Ambassador spoke of the right of dissent covered by the Constitution of the United States, which we all revere, and the right of expressing one's views. I do not claim to be a prophet, but what I have just said derives from my knowledge of the Arab people. What am I? I am an Arab myself. The Arabs will never accept Western Zionists in their midst. They consider them a wedge in the heart of the Arab world. They consider them an abscess, unfortunately, that will always be causing them fever.

123. Since Mr. Goldberg, my good friend, mentioned medical similes and metaphors, the Western Zionists are an abscess; and you know that pus causes inflammation. When will the patient get well? Only when that pus is drained, only when the Zionists are squeezed out. Maybe not in my lifetime or in the lifetime of my good friend, but there will be a lot more suffering and tribulation. And this is what I have been trying to tell many government officials since 1939 in this City of New York. I even spoke in City Hall on the same platform with Zionists. I found myself outnumbered in City Hall during the war. I was stranded here during the war. In case someone thought I was a rug merchant here—all kinds of rumours were spread about me—I officially represented since 1939 three Arab Governments: Lebanon at the World's Fair, later Syria and now Saudi Arabia—my Syrian friends are all young, they do not remember that—and unofficially I represented all the Arab countries, because I was active on this question of Palestine for many years—and I am not a Palestinian, as *The New York Times* once erroneously reported.

124. I am an Arab, first and foremost, a Pan-Arab. I am speaking as a Pan-Arab, without rancour or hatred, to our Jewish brothers of the area, not cousins—again I must say that. How heartened I was that six persons of the Jewish faith spoke to me over the telephone yesterday. One of them was born in Jaffa; another was born in Aleppo and two others—they told me that they speak Arabic. They chatted with me in Arabic. They had listened to my speech. This is what they told me, my good friend Ambassador Goldberg, “Why should this happen to us?” I said, “To whom?” “To us, who have no quarrel with you. We are Arabs. We speak Arabic. Those Ashkenazim”—meaning the Jews from southern Russia—“They have caused a feud between you and us.” Of course, they are European, otherwise they would not be so disciplined. They would not be so organized, as always, to influence the big Powers since the time of Germany, since the time of William II who was friendly to the German Jews. And they asked him to see the late Sultan, Abdul Hamid—may his soul rest in peace—the same Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, when the Ottoman Empire was getting weak, about whom Gladstone said, “Turkey will always be backward unless the Koran is wrapped with the veil and thrown down into the sea.”

125. We know what the Western countries think, and why there were so many Armenian massacres. So many Greeks had lived and settled there before the Ottomans came, since the Byzantine Empire, because in those dark ages of the nineteenth century, imperialism saw to it to divide the communities that lived in peace, side by side, so much so, that many Jews had opted for Islam—and they are called Dunmeh—in order to save their lives. Feuds were created by the Western Powers inside the Ottoman Empire.

126. And why am I mentioning all this? Because what we are witnessing today is a continuation of the past. The *dramatis personae* have changed, but the spirit, the policy, is still the same. And who would forget, when I was seventeen, when Lloyd George pushed the poor Greeks, who were good Ottomans, who were the people of the land in Smyrna, and asked them to rebel. They lost their property, they lost their houses because unfortunately some of their leaders in Smyrna and in the vicinity became the tools of Western imperialism. The Ottoman Empire was one of the most tolerant empires in history. I lived under the Ottoman Empire. Why were the Ottomans tolerant? Because they came from Asia. There is more tolerance, religious tolerance in Asia. The Milletts had their own religious courts—Lord Caradon will bear me out. The orthodox had their courts. The Moslems, of course, had their courts of Shari'a Islamiya. The Jews had their courts inside the Ottoman Empire. They were all Ottomans. They were more tolerant because they had suffered, not because God discriminates and He makes them a better breed, but because the Asians had suffered throughout their history, throughout six thousand years of history. They knew what it was to suffer. Of course, they were not all angels. They were human. But the tradition was one of tolerance. Omar Ibn Al-Khattab, the Caliph, did not worship inside the church so that it might not be turned into a mosque.

127. Islam itself does not permit a flag to be hoisted over the minaret of any mosque, because God is greater than nations. God is the greatest; man is a shadow, a guest on this earth, a grain of sand on the shores of eternity. Today he is here, tomorrow he is no more. And man has created a cult of personality. Westerners created an image of man. I do not want to mention names out of respect to my good friend, Mr. Goldberg. They make a god of man, of almost a demi-god. There is the cult of the personality of the man in the news, but we Arabs, whenever we find anyone who becomes inflated by himself, and as I have said, we are human, we admonish such a person. We say that greatness is an attribute of God, the Creator; you are only a human being.

128. How did the Zionists, with whom my good friend, Mr. Goldberg, wants us to live in peace, act? They hoisted a flag over a minaret, the minaret of a mosque. There are Moslems sitting around here. There are 600 million of you. Well, I am sorry to say, there will one day be a day of reckoning, which I must deplore because it will mean more bloodshed. It will mean that many innocent Jews will be massacred by some hotheads; and why should the innocent Jews be massacred just because their Zionist leaders, drunk with a theocracy, setting the pendulum of history back, think that they can lord it over other people?

129. Again, I say that Judaism is a noble religion, but unfortunately the Zionists, instead of having Zion of the soul, as the father of Yehudi Menuhin mentioned in his book *The Decadence of Judaism*,<sup>3</sup> do not glory in what Isaiah said, they do not heed Micah to do justice. Will somebody get me a Bible. Laugh at your Bible, most of you, because you have forgotten your prophets. Those Zionists, not the Jews who use Zionism of the spirit, but the political Zionists, have forgotten their God, and it is stated in the Bible that whenever they erred—and I have read the Bible many times in my days, that is why I asked for a copy—“and God was angry that He created Israel, and then He regretted and forgave them”. This was not only once throughout their history, when they were in the land of Canaan, but many times. The Western Powers still advocate peace between the Arabs and the European Zionists. I would not want to mention the word “Jew” because the Jews are our brothers.

130. The Zionists use Judaism as a motivation for a political end. I will bet anything that most of the Zionists including the generals and the officers are secular like the majority of the Christian community or, for that matter, many Moslems. But the Zionists have used Judaism as a motivation for a political end, and the representatives of the United States, whom we love and admire in many ways, either do not have a grasp of the matter or they have been brainwashed by the Zionists. It cannot be anything else.

131. Even with regard to the Communists, and remember I have always told you that I am a monarchist, and I am a contemporary of the Russian Revolution, they never hoisted the Soviet flag over churches or synagogues. I am talking of the Soviet Government, although there may have been some excesses as in all revolutions. The Soviet Constitution also guaranteed freedom of thought and religion, and although the Communists declared themselves officially as atheists, they respected the creeds of others. Neither did the Christians try, when they took the Holy Land, to hoist the emblems of England and France, and whoever joined them in those days many centuries ago, over the mosques. But everything is permissible for the Zionists because the Western Powers have been influenced by them. Everything is permissible for Israel to do, even to hoisting a flag over the minaret of a mosque.

132. I hope you have seen the photograph, Mr. President, and I hope that it has been passed around. Many may have seen it in *The New York Times* and *The Post* of today, but I thought that because you gentlemen had been very busy, you may not have had time to read your daily newspaper.

133. My younger brother, who was gracious enough to allow me to take this seat, Ambassador El-Farra, has told the Council about the fate of the Arab refugees. The Zionists have always claimed that the Arab Government, in 1948, exhorted the refugees to leave their homes because there would be another round. There is nothing further from the truth, and I will prove it. It is well known that in the Zionist State today there are—I do not know the exact number—150,000, 200,000 or 250,000 Arabs still living

there. They did not leave their homes. They had access to the radio, so why did they not leave their homes? I had not heard at that time of what happened at Deir Yassin, a village of over 250 persons which one day at dawn was surrounded by the European Zionists. At dawn they killed the men, the women, the children and the animals and they cut down the trees. There were other incidents not like Deir Yassin, but a good number of them were similar to Deir Yassin, yet people talk of the Nazis.

134. I remember, at that time, I had occasion to accompany myself to that incident, about ten or fifteen years ago when Mr. Nosek, now the Under-Secretary here in charge of the Office of Conference Services, was representative of Czechoslovakia; and before I spoke—it was on a question of human rights—I said to Mr. Nosek: “I have heard of Lidice and we all deplore what had happened there. Tell me, I want to check the facts: it seems that some of the Czechs killed some Nazis; there was retaliation by the Nazis. Did the Nazis kill all the men and women and children of Lidice?” He said: “No, they killed only a certain number of men above a certain age.” He could bear me out, but he is probably busy, in the Office of Conference Services at the United Nations.

135. Now, one would think that excesses take place in every war. They do; that is true. What is the difference, for example, between killing all the people of Deir Yassin and the Westerners dropping A bombs on Dresden, and the Nazis dropping bombs on Coventry during the Second World War, and for that matter Mr. Truman having ordered after he knew the war was almost over, the dropping of bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Well, these are atrocious, but we are not dealing with Japan or those countries. I mentioned them just to adduce what happened.

136. I am a humble student of the Bible; and, remember, the Jewish prophets are my prophets too. I had occasion to speak to the Third Committee, ten or fifteen years ago, to quote the Book of Joshua. I repeat that quotation:

“And they utterly destroyed all that was in the land, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and ass, and ass, with the edge of the sword.

“But Joshua had said unto the two men that had fled out of the country, Go into the harlot’s house, and out thence the woman, and all that she hath, as ye have done unto her.

“And the young men that were spies went in and brought out Rahab, and her father, and her mother, and her brethren, and all that she had; and they brought out all her kindred, and left them without the camp of Israel.

“And they burnt the city with fire, and all that was therein: only the silver, and the gold,—no wonder, for silver and the gold; they did not burn that—“an iron vessel of brass and of iron, they put into the treasure house of the Lord.”

137. Eighty per cent of the Arab land and hoards. Instead of the poor harlot, who had to sell her body

<sup>3</sup> Moshe Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time* (New York, Exposition Press, 1965).

the gold and the silver, they took 80 per cent of the Arab possessions. Who? The oriental Jews? No, not our brothers. The European Jews? No: the political Western Zionists. They are not Jews. If they were Jews, they would heed the prophets of mercy and compassion. The Bible, the Jews' Bible, is replete with the teachings of the Prophets.

138. No, sir. They robbed Palestine, those Western political Zionists. I am not talking about the spiritual Zionists. And we are supposed here to make peace.

139. Peace? What kind of peace? The peace of the grave? There is peace with them in the grave. When somebody dies, then he is at peace—everybody. But you cannot kill a hundred million Arabs, can you? Peace with injustice knows this? What does the Charter say? I have read it time and again; it is my second Bible. Peace with justice! Where is the justice? To transplant a sort of a kangaroo State in our midst because those poor victims suffered, because the Jews suffered in Europe. I am sure, if Herzl had been alive, he would not have allowed this. He was trying to use peaceful methods to have a sort of a spiritual home, not a national State.

140. Nationalism has been the curse of Europe and the imported curse of Asia, because it has led to many wars. We are supposed to transcend nationalism here in the United Nations, but, unfortunately, every State is still chauvinistically nationalistic when it suits its purpose or when its politicians think its interests are jeopardized. The Zionists have made nationalism out of religion.

141. I have just heard—I should like the Secretariat to check on it because this has happened before—that many television stations have cut their programmes since I have been talking, possibly because there are 2 million Jews here in New York, many of whom are Zionists. I hope not, but I think it would be discrimination; and I would ask my colleague, the representative of the United States, if it is true—and I would hope it is not true—to see that freedom of television will flow on the media and that the voice of Baroody should not be stifled outside. I am not so dangerous; I am human. I should like to talk to many of the Jews in the galleries peacefully, but there are many outside, and they should know what goes on here.

142. Why did we have the United Nations in the United States? The Soviets wanted a platform because they were surrounded; they are Communists; they are the monsters of the past, so they wanted to prove they are human. That was one of the purposes of this Organization.

143. And many Americans said: "Let us have the United Nations in the United States", because America withdrew from joining the League of Nations due to the displeasure of the uncle of our erstwhile colleague Henry Cabot Lodge. He took it to heart that Mr. Wilson did not take him to Versailles, and so he said: "To heck with the League of Nations." So now that the Americans were emerging as a great Power it was decided we should ensure having them in the United Nations because, after all, we believed that they should help in organizing the new world.

144. What a new world! What do the Western Powers want—peace? There are all kinds of peace. I heard my

colleague and my good friend—and I say "my good friend"; do not think I am being cynical; I am very fond of Ambassador Goldberg as a person. What does he want us to have—peace with the European Zionists, the aggressors?

145. People in the gallery are laughing. You shut up! We are talking seriously here.

146. The PRESIDENT: I hope the representative of Saudi Arabia will excuse me for interrupting him. May I ask the audience to remain silent so we can listen to the speaker.

147. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): You may giggle, but not laugh.

148. Peace? What kind of peace? The peace of the robber? A peace which imposes something on you? We have that kind of peace every day. When there is a hold-up, one gives everything in order that his life may be spared. What kind of peace is that? Is that the peace of the United Nations? Is that peace with justice? What kind of peace is it?

149. As I was saying, my good friend Ambassador Goldberg pointed out, and rightly so, that everybody should be allowed to express himself.

150. Do not distract the Secretary-General, Mr. Bunche, I am talking. I want him to hear every word, my dear Mr. Bunche. He is my Secretary-General, I do not have occasion to talk to him. He is so busy with Viet-Nam, and now with Palestine. He should learn what we have suffered.

151. Then there is the subject of freedom of information, which is my pet subject and has been since 1947. I was one of the proponents of the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information, not freedom of licence, mind you. The information media, whether auditory or visual can create a lot of mischief if, instead of dealing with free opinion, it promotes propaganda, States would be poisoned if the information media, under the guise of freedom, peddled licence.

152. And now I come back to this same city where we are today, New York City. I did not want to repeat this, but I am constrained to repeat what the slogans were in 1947 and in 1948: "Give a dollar to kill an Arab". That is freedom of information too. But we do not mind. They still say that after nineteen years. I do not glory in adducing this because it saddens me. And if I were to see a Zionist in the street, threatened with a bullet, I would forget that he is a Zionist. He is a human being. We Arabs are noted for that. We have many faults, but we would throw ourselves forward to save a man who may be shot with a bullet. We do not act like those people in Queens when someone was murdered or raped and thirty-seven people saw it and did not dare to do anything. I do not blame them, because they were alienated from society. There is no more institution of the family. Everybody lives for himself, for his business, for his job. The job, the job; business; money. One does not live by bread alone. Nobody lives by bread alone.

153. If we were animals, it would be better, because animals are controlled by wisdom, which is inherent in their

instincts. We men have perverted our instincts. We cannot live by bread alone. If there were no religion, or a code of ethics instead of religion, or humanitarianism, we would devour one another in no time. And we are doing it every day, because the moral values have passed out of our lives. I do not wish to take up the Bible again, lest I am tempted to read more of it.

154. Now, our Western friends, either overtly or covertly—and I have a great deal of respect for my good friend, Ambassador Goldberg, because he is overt, but many of them are covert—are engineering a sort of peace, the peace they want to impose on the Arab world. And they upbraid our good friend Mr. Fedorenko for being sinister in tabling a draft resolution that they claim will perpetuate war. They forget that the Soviet Union has opted for coexistence. They seem to have forgotten that. Both great Powers worked out coexistence when Mr. Khrushchev came to this country. Why? To fish in troubled water? Why should they? Either the Americans or the Russians, why should they fish in our water? Anyway, our water is scarce; we have no water.

155. It is aggression. It was terrorism. It was injustice perpetrated on the people of Palestine regardless of whether they were Arab or heathen or religious, or whatever they happened to be. These people were the indigenous people of Palestine, and many of them were Jews, no doubt; many of them were Christians. Or they had been Jews and perhaps they were converted into Islam. My own family is a very old family. More than half of them are Moslems; a third of them are Christians. It does not mean that we are ethnologically different, the Moslems from the Christians; we are the people of the area, with the same culture. The European Zionists robbed the natives of their land, of their homes, 80 per cent of it.

156. Why? Because Jews suffered. Who are they that suffered? They are the Jews. Jews? What Jews? Many Jews who had suffered did not survive. Many of them unfortunately, were killed by that tyrant, Hitler, but as I had mentioned before, there were other millions that were also massacred: millions of German civilians, millions of Europeans. Of course, there should have been humanity; there should have been something to rehabilitate the Jews who survived. We are all for it. But at whose expense? At the expense of the indigenous people of Palestine.

157. Why? Why did not Mr. Truman open Kansas, or why did not our friends of the British Commonwealth open Australia for the Zionists? No. Because Palestine was the habitat at one time of the Kingdom of Judea. All right. Then came the Persians, the Pharaohs of Egypt and others. Everybody passed through Palestine. There were the Romans too. Religiously, as I stated the other day, it is the Holy Land of all the three major religions. Do we want to talk logic and common sense?

158. Or, as Mrs. Roosevelt used to tell me: The Zionists are there to stay. Why? I asked her. Because they suffered a lot. Oh, you should make some sort of an arrangement with them. But we cannot make any arrangement at the expense of the Palestinians, I said. You cannot make arrangements. What about the indigenous people living

there? And still some people say: the Zionists should have Palestine because God saw fit to reveal Himself through their Prophets in the Holy Land. All right. Their Prophets are our Prophets too. And then we have additional Prophets. Jesus was a Prophet. And then Mohammed was a Prophet. They all came from the area. We did not say that Islam as such should have Palestine—nor the Christians. The European Christians tried to wrest the Holy Sepulchre during the Crusades. Where are they now, the Crusaders? Where are their castles, their bastions? Tourists go and look at them.

159. We are very tenacious, we Arabs and, mind you, the Jews of the area are very tenacious. Otherwise they would not have remained Jews till today. In spite of all the adversities that the people of the area have suffered, we are still tenacious. More tenacious, but may not survive the atom bomb. If anyone of you here lose it, then that is the end of mankind.

160. Did God give a title deed to anybody? Who had the power of attorney from God? Mr. Balfour and Mr. Truman? Where is the power of attorney—*procurator*, in French. Where is the power of attorney? Is it in the hands of the Zionists? In the West where they have libraries for documents? Where is the power of attorney, the title deed? No, my dear friends, God does not turn title deeds over to any people, nor does He give them any power of attorney. Otherwise, He would be a discriminatory God. He would not be God; He would be an artificial God. It is a hoax to say that God gave them the land. Whom do they think they are fooling? They are fooling themselves. Can such things still be put over in the twentieth century? "What God gave them this land?"

161. What did David say in the Psalms? If my memory does not falter, David, who is one of our Prophets too, said: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." It is the Lord's, the Creator's. The earth does not belong to one faction, one creed, one group; the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof. It is not for the Jew or the Moslem or the Hindu or the Buddhist. We are all ephemeral. Today we are here, tomorrow we are not here. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof."

162. The mighty Western Powers want to create and uphold peace. With what? With justice? Whom do they think they are fooling? Themselves.

163. Now I go back to those refugees whom my friend Ambassador El-Farra mentioned. I do not know how he could speak about them. If I were in his place I could not even open my mouth to speak. They are his people, his own people, his family. But we believe in God, and God gives him strength to fight for justice, for peace with justice.

164. The Zionists gave notice in advance that they would by-pass the United Nations of which they are a Member. They should never have been a Member. They are an artificial Member. You were in Denmark, Mr. President, and you were then much younger than today; but I witnessed all this tragedy here in the United Nations—their success, and how the Zionists carved out a country for themselves in Palestine. The heads of three States were contacted. A

Cardinal of Christianity was acting at their behest in certain countries which I do not have to mention. These Zionists know the tricks of the game. They have the media of information. They have the money and they know how to use it. They did not have the votes. I do not want to embarrass any country, but a friend of mine who is today the president of an Asian university had to quit because his chief of state told him, "Reverse your stand in the General Assembly", with reference to his speech, which was against the partition. I have, in the archives of Saudi Arabia, a note from another delegate, this time an African. Said he: "I am sorry, but last-minute instructions have come from my Government to reverse my stand, and I have to vote against you". I translated this to none other than Prince Faisal, who is the present King. And in Washington a good American friend of mine told me that they tried to pay another delegate \$8,000 for his vote. I will produce that man here in the Security Council, if you want him, and he will put his hand and swear on the Bible—because he happens to be a Christian—and he will swear to this. I do not want to embarrass him, but if you ask me to do so, I will bring him here.

165. This is how the Zionists from Western Europe created their artificial State in our midst.

166. And we should have peace; but they served notice in advance, the Zionists, that they would by-pass the United Nations and exact their pound of flesh in talks with the Arabs. But no Arab dares to talk with them unless he is a puppet and the puppets will be dealt with appropriately. I will be sorry for them as human beings, because nobody should kill anybody else in this world. Thirteen Arab leaders were shot like birds, on the rumour that they were going to talk with Israel, during the last two decades.

167. So then, let us not mislead ourselves here in the United Nations by saying that any talks will solve the problem. I wish they would, but I have said that the injustice perpetrated against the Arab world and the indigenous people of Palestine rules out any arrangements that may be concocted behind the scenes through pressures and negotiations. Any such arrangement, I must warn you, will be abortive because of the temper of the Arab people, who are no less resilient than the British. When Dunkirk fell, Mr. Churchill did not say, "We have lost the war"; he promised his people blood, sweat and tears. When Napoleon was at the gates of Moscow, and later when Hitler repeated it, the Russians did not give up. Why? Were they fooled? No; they were fighting for their homeland and they were not fooled. If they had been fighting for somebody else's homeland they would have been fooled; but they were fighting for the verdant isles of the United Kingdom and for Holy Russia, and for the motherland, lest it be desecrated by an invader who had no business being there.

168. Why should the Arabs be different? Are the Arabs a different breed of people, are they not human, have they no dignity?

169. I wish Mr. Goldberg were here, because I would have liked—Yes, I want you, Richard,<sup>4</sup> to transmit all this to

Mr. Goldberg who is not here; but you are now the representative.

170. "Give me liberty or give me death"—every American knows that Patrick Henry said that. In Virginia I saw the plaque: "Give me liberty or give me death." This is your motto. Why should we Arabs act differently? "Give me life, but take away my liberty"—what kind of life is that? Is that what they want us to do, the reverse of your motto? No, sir, we are all human. You are all good fellows, I know, but you are the pawns of the politicians. All of you, you are the pawns of the politicians. We do not want the peace of the grave, we do not want peace with injustice. No, the Arab people will not die unless, as I said, there is a holocaust.

171. We are being counselled by certain Powers to be reasonable and pragmatic; I know that this is a Greek word. The first one who used it in the psychological sense was another American, William James, the father of pragmatism. Pragmatic in what? In the life of people, or pragmatic in business? We do not want that pragmatism. Everything will be dissolved if we are pragmatic.

172. I could speak on and on and on on this subject; I have been speaking on it for forty years, twenty years inside the United Nations and twenty years before that. They say "Why does not Baroody give up? He is too old." One of the cables I received said, after cursing me, "Your ideas and you look senile". I do not know how senile I look. He no doubt was a Zionist who said this. I forgave him because he had been brainwashed, to have written to me in this way. I am not senile. But that shows how they inculcate the American politicians. But the American politicians yield in order to catch the voters.

173. As regards the Western Powers, I have just come from Europe and I saw the mood there. I should not be unfair to the United States. But the people of Western Europe—amongst them Jews, friends of mine—told me "Why should the intransigent Zionists do this to us?" The American people have some of the best ideals, otherwise they would not have created such a great country. But watch out. I will not name them; I do not wish to call them by name. I said, "Let these politicians wash their mouths before they speak about the Arabs because the Arabs might get dirty from their foul mouths". There is a systematic campaign against us, but I pity them. They do not know what they do. They would sell their souls for a pittance so that they might perpetuate themselves in power. Greatness is an attribute of God, not of human beings.

174. I now come to the draft resolutions before us. I am going to be technical for a change, having given you the background. There are two resolutions before us, contained in documents S/7951/Rev.2 and S/7952/Rev.2. The highlight of the United States draft resolution is that, in paragraph 2, it calls for "discussions promptly thereafter among the parties concerned, using such third-party or United Nations assistance as they may wish, looking toward the establishment of viable arrangements encompassing the withdrawal and disengagement of armed personnel..." [S/7952/Rev.2].

175. The highlight of this operative paragraph is that discussions should be conducted through third parties in

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Richard F. Pedersen, Deputy Permanent Representative on the Security Council.

order, as Ambassador Goldberg explained, to attain or achieve a lasting peace. If after everything I have told you you still believe that there will be lasting peace, then I have wasted my breath and your time. I told you that this would be academic after all. The purpose is noble. In practice it is like trying to treat an abscess in the liver with aspirin. There will be a little peace. But what is time for the Arabs, with their six thousand years of history. Then there will be another outbreak of hostilities. Why? I do not have to go into the whole panorama before you again today. All Arabs are explicit about their stand. Therefore, I appeal to my United States friends and colleagues to forget about such a paragraph; it is not feasible. It is wishful thinking inasmuch as its purpose is noble for creating peace.

176. But what kind of peace? Temporary peace in the light of what Mr. Ben-Gurion, the patriarch of Zionism, mentioned. I quote from the *New York Post* of 12 June 1967: "Former Premier David Ben-Gurion urged the Jews to resettle . . .". He should have said the Zionists, because there are many Jews who are not Zionists. The Jews are everywhere; they are human beings having loyalty to the countries in which they live. I have no doubt that there are innumerable loyal American citizens of the Jewish faith. Their loyalty is to America, and they do not have a dual loyalty, as Mr. Ben-Gurion wants them to have.

177. There are many Jews in Russia; they forget that they are Jews. Their religion is between them and their God. There are atheists in Russia. That is their privilege. There are those of the Orthodox Church and that is their privilege. But they are loyal citizens of their country. Let nobody sell us the hoax that the Russians persecute the Jews.

178. I know about the Russian revolution as I was a contemporary of that revolution. Many Jews were among the architects of the Russian revolution. Have the New York Zionists forgotten this fact? The Jews were the pillars of reform in Russia. The American Jew is, as he should be, loyal to America. But Mr. Ben-Gurion wants him to have a dual nationality: "Make your money in America but send it to us and have your heart in Israel". All this does not preclude one co-religionist from having deep feelings for his co-religionist. I do not say that they should not, whether they are Jews, Christians, Moslems, Buddhists, Hindus, or whatever religion they belong to.

179. The article in the *New York Post* continued: "Former Premier David Ben-Gurion urged the Jews to resettle the Old City of Jerusalem immediately as well as some other communities captured from Jordan". What the patriarch of Zionism said is tantamount to: "Annex the land and hoist the Zionist emblem not only over Jerusalem but also over the places of worship." The Moslems and the Christians should come like sheep to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and to the Mosque of Omar by suffrance, asking permission to go and worship their God. Why? Because Zionists have the keys, the figurative keys, to heaven, it seems, and to hell. The Zionists can open the gates of hell when they want to, and open the gates of heaven when they want to. When I say they can open the gates of hell when they want to it is because that through their influence I am sure that they would plunge the world

into a holocaust, a third world war. That is why our good friend from the Soviet Union has been treading softly. He knows that his country might be involved in a confrontation if he went beyond a certain limit.

180. Then we come to the other draft resolution, and I am talking technically. I will tell you what goes on behind the scenes, although you know much of it; but I know a little too. There is a lot of lobbying around here in the United Nations not to obtain nine votes for the Soviet draft resolution. I am telling you exactly what is going on, because I have my channels of information, having lived here long enough. If the Soviet draft resolution does not get nine votes, then it fails. Also the United States draft resolution is bound to fail. Therefore, what they are saying now is that the two super Powers do not want to have a confrontation on account of the Arabs and Zionists, thereby leading to a great war. "To heck with them both; a plague on both their heads. Let us shift this question perhaps to a special session of the General Assembly"—under whatever chapter or paragraph.

181. Another special session. We know about peace-keeping operations. We know about the special session on South West Africa and its results: zero, zero—an Arabic invention. At least there was a good Arabic invention, without which the computers of the Western Powers would not be able to function. Zero. As we witnessed, it was zero. I warned them during the Assembly's twenty-first regular session, "do not have a special session". As Clemenceau said, "If you want to kill any item, constitute a committee and refer the item to it". That special session was just such a kind of committee. The results were zero.

182. Now if the two major Powers do not want to have a confrontation, in so far as the Zionists are concerned and the Arabs are concerned, the results will be zero. But the great Powers will still go on—"this will allay the Arabs; and the difficulties will be solved by time and time heals everything". Many such proverbs are misleading. Time will not heal. This is a rubric, a slogan which may or may not be true. Time heals if it is something on the surface and you can use ointment. I am again using Mr. Goldberg's similes and analogies. But how can you heal cancer with time? "Time will heal everything." People are very simple-minded the whole world over. That may be fortunate, because if they were not there would perhaps be a lot more commotion in the world. "Time will heal everything. It is hoped Arabs will tell the Zionists, 'make some concessions'." And Zionists will make some concessions, no doubt, with *largesse*, and then "time will heal everything in the United Nations". The United Nations had better fold up if it were to come to that, because it cannot take another setback like it has been taking—war in the Far East, the threat of war in the Middle East, South West Africa still under the thumb of imperialism. What for?

183. I am amongst the most loyal to the United Nations. I have served its causes and many a time I forgot my nationality when it came to the United Nations. I thought it would transcend the balance of power and the political arrangements between States. But it is following the same pattern as the League of Nations, which I observed in my early days.

184. Whom are we fooling? Are we fooling ourselves or just public opinion? Public opinion in the Arab world cannot be fooled any more. And I want to sound a warning to none other than Jew and Gentile, if I may use the terms. We Arabs do not want the Jews to be hurt. As I said during my last intervention, leave us alone. Leave us alone. We have not hurt you; we have not hurt Europe nor have we hurt America. Leave us alone. For heaven's sake, leave us alone. But they do not leave us alone. If they do not leave us alone, we will think of "liberty or death". We will opt for liberty.

185. We have no grudge against the Jew as such. In fact, the Jew prospered in our midst throughout our history. The Jew was an Arab. I am talking of the Sephardic Jew; I am talking of the Oriental Jew. They were our brothers and they still are our brothers. But this is another breed. They are not Jews in the real sense of the word, the Zionists, because if they were Jews they would do as Micah said and as Isaiah said. Micah said, "Walk humbly with thy Lord", not with the arrogance that I am afraid is contaminating us as human beings in our part of the world. They are entitled to live. Let us open the gates of emigration simultaneously so that any Zionist who thinks he has no future amongst the hundred million Arabs may leave and go back to where he came from. There are so many opportunities in Europe. Why should they always be living under the sword of Damocles, so to speak. Let us open the doors of immigration simultaneously for the people who owned the land, and water will seek its own level. There will be no trouble between the Jews and Arabs if those who remain there are ethnically and culturally our brothers. Not the intransigent Western Zionist, but the real Jew, the Jew who has the same God as the Christians and the Moslems, not only in name, but in practice. There are many Jews who really walk humbly with their God. There are Jewish friends of mine all over, in the East and in the West. We are not against the Jews. The Zionists are against the Jews. Before I bring this intervention to an end, I will give you a concrete example.

186. During the 1930's, I was in the country of my good friend, Lord Caradon, in London. I was having tea in the Savoy Hotel at 5 o'clock, and I heard two persons conversing in Arabic. I turned around and they noticed that probably I was an Arab. They smiled and we began talking. One of them was an orange exporter from Jaffa, a Christian by the name of Khouri, and the other was a Jew from Baghdad by the name of Elias. Mr. Khouri had a business appointment and had to leave. Mr. Elias brought his cup of tea to my table so we could have our tea together. That was in 1937, thirty years ago. I said to him, "You must be from Iraq, aren't you?" He said, "You knew from that mark on my face." Many Iraqis have a scar on their face caused by a parasite. He said, "Yes, I am from Iraq." I could also tell from the accent. He was talking in Arabic, and not in Hebrew. He was a Jew. I said, "Tell me about yourself, I would like to be briefed." So he said, "I lived in Germany before." I asked "What brought you here? I guess it was Hitler's policy." He said, "Yes, Hitler's policy brought me here."

187. I said, "I would like to know what is happening inside Germany, and why is Hitler so intransigent?" He replied, "Look, I am a Jew myself, but to a large extent the

Zionists are responsible for Hitler—their policy at the Conference of Versailles". I pricked up my ears. He said, "You know, they have always been after the establishment of that national State"—he said that homeland or something like that, I am paraphrasing—"in Palestine. And you know, I am an oriental Jew. They have spoiled it for us because Germany, which was pro-Jewish during the Kaiser's days, has become vehemently anti-Jewish". I said, "Why is Hitler like this?" He said, "Those Zionists manipulated foreign currencies in the twenties when it was forbidden to the German to deal in foreign currencies. Their number is 4 per cent of the Berlin population. They have come to own and control 56 per cent of the property". I said, "Isn't that an exaggeration?" He said, "It may be an exaggeration, but a lot of property passed into their hands. This is one of the factors", he said. Then I asked: "Why did you come here, you are not a European Jew?" He said, "Well, they started to put emblems on my door. I was going to marry a German girl. I am not very religious, but I am a Jew. So I thought I had better leave before the calamity". And he was right.

188. Mr. Ben-Gurion, the same Mr. Ben-Gurion, says—and he will leave a legacy behind him—that Israel should be the place for the in-gathering of the Jews. Will the Jews of New York City leave the skyscrapers they have built, to go to Israel? He wants them so that they may be locked in war with the Arabs. Never mind, Mr. Ben-Gurion's prophecy should be fulfilled. The idea of Herzl was to solve the Jewish problem, because of the persecution of Jews, by creating a home in Palestine—that was his idea. But there are, I believe, 16 million Jews in the world. How does Mr. Ben-Gurion, or anyone of his persuasion, expect to squeeze 16 million into Palestine, who would not want to leave the Western countries or the Eastern countries, where they are loyal citizens?

189. But I sound a warning, because I feel sorry for the Jews. I have always felt sorry for the Jews who were persecuted, because they were human beings like you and I—but I also feel sorry because they will one day become the scapegoat—not in Christian countries as such, because the Christians have forgotten a lot of their religion. When anything goes wrong in those Christian countries, they will blame the poor Jew; they will say, "You were at the root of our trouble", although he may have been totally innocent. This is the warning I should like to sound. It may take long, but it happened in Germany, it may happen once again. When people have reverses, they look for a scapegoat and the Jews have been chosen as scapegoats throughout history, unfortunately so, deplorably so. We do not want the Jews to be hurt. But what is the picture? It is grim indeed. And Zionists are still hurting us.

190. Having made myself amply clear, it is not so much out of conviction, but because I have studied this question throughout more than four decades. Otherwise I would have failed in getting my message across not only to the Security Council, but to anyone who will study what I said. If everything goes differently, and if there will be no suffering, no one will be happier than I. But if things go the way I have described them—and the portents are on the wall—at least I would have had the satisfaction before I leave this earth, that I have spoken with honesty and I have

spoken sincerely, and before I die, my conscience will be at rest, that I meant not to hurt either in thought or by design our Jewish brothers, but that in humanity I have attempted and endeavoured to warn the Zionists, who are in humanity also brothers of us all, that they have erred and it is better that they should not persist in a dream which they have created themselves, a dream which if it has not been fulfilled as yet, will not only fail but may plunge the world into a third world war, because of their influence in many capitals of the Western world.

191. I beg you, Mr. President, to forgive me for having taken so much time in unfolding the facts as I see them. But I should like you to recall, and the Secretary-General knows, that Saudi Arabia has never sought a seat in this Council throughout twenty years, although we are a signatory to the Charter, nor have we claimed to tell the international community what it should do in social or economic affairs, having never sought a seat in any Council of the United Nations. We kept ourselves as people who would like to learn rather than to be didactic as many of the major Powers seem to be. We are still learning. But we do not have to learn on this question. What I have told you here comes not out of my mind but from the bottom of my heart and all my thoughts are imbued with the prayer that there shall be peace with justice in the world.

192. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

193. Mr. KIDRON (Israel): Mr. President, I thank you for this opportunity that you have given me to present my Government's case to the Security Council. At the outset, I should like to explain why I am here and not Ambassador Rafael, who is the Permanent Representative of Israel in the United Nations. The reason is that Ambassador Rafael was called to Jerusalem for a few days of consultation and I am taking over in his place until he returns. I hope that that will be by the end of this week.

194. After a respite of about one and a half days, the verbal assault on Israel has been resumed. Once more my delegation is faced with a campaign of vilification, in intemperate language, and of gross misrepresentation of its motives and of its actions. A veritable edifice of prevarication has been built up designed to put Israel in the dock and to depict her as an aggressor.

195. I do not wish to employ the same language or to tread the same paths of calumny, vituperation and distortion along which certain speakers have attempted to drag this Council. Such as, for example, this vile libel over the *Liberty* tragedy, a dreadful error of war conditions for which my Government has expressed its sincere and heartfelt regret to the United States Government, or the obscene fulminations—and, I repeat, obscene fulminations—from the representative of Saudi Arabia about the Jews and about Zionism.

196. I am a Jew; I am a Zionist. It is a privilege to be a Jew; it is a privilege to be a Zionist. It is a source of pride to be a Jew; it is a source of pride to be a Zionist. Zionism is the finest expression of the national liberation of the people. It has restored an ancient nation to its ancestral home. It has

created there cities, towns, villages, farms, new forms of society, a national spirit and a true patriotism which expresses itself in service and in sacrifice. These have elicited the admiration of multitudes of people throughout the world, in Africa, in Asia, in the Americas, in Europe, from all walks of life who see in Zionism and who see in Israel the fulfilment of a divine prophecy and a sublime historical repatriation.

197. But I do wish to state clearly and unreservedly my utter and total rejection of the charges which have been levelled against my country. They bear no relation to the truth. They are wilful and deliberate distortions of facts which have been in the hands of the Security Council for the past two weeks, and, indeed, for the past nineteen years.

198. Let us look again at the events which preceded the outbreak of fighting on 5 June. On 18 May, the Government of the United Arab Republic demanded the eviction of the United Nations Emergency Force which was deployed along the Gaza Strip and the Sinai desert and at Sharm el Sheikh at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, and on that day UNEF ceased to exist. Was this an act which promoted peace? Was this an act which demonstrated peaceful intent? It was not; it was preparation for aggression. The Emergency Force had to be gotten out of the way so that the aggression on Israel could be prepared and mounted.

199. On 23 May, the United Arab Republic declared that the Strait of Tiran would be closed to Israel shipping and to ships of other nations carrying what were described as strategic goods, that is to say, anything which the United Arab Republic chose to define as strategic goods, to Israel's southernmost port of Eilat. Was this act of blockade a peaceful act? Did this re-imposition of the blockade demonstrate peaceful intent? It did not. This was a clear act of hostility and the exercise of an internationally rejected claim to belligerency. A blockade is a classical act of war.

200. During this time, that is, the last week of May, Egypt started a massive build-up of forces in the Sinai desert. Some 80,000 men were assembled, with hundreds of assault aircraft, a thousand tanks. These huge forces were deployed in an offensive position along the Sinai frontier with Israel, along the Gaza Strip and at the approaches to Eilat. The deployment of these forces was accompanied by a mounting crescendo of warlike propaganda from Cairo. A holy war was proclaimed by the religious authorities in the Egyptian capital, and the Egyptian people were urged to march forward in a *jihad* to destroy Israel. The Egyptian President naturally was foremost in inciting his people for the coming war. This is what he said before the Central Council of Arab Trade Unions on 26 May 1967:

"The Arab people want to fight. We have been waiting for the suitable day when we shall be completely ready, since if we enter a battle with Israel we should be confident of victory and should take strong measures. We do not speak idly. We have lately felt that our strength is sufficient and that if we enter into battle with Israel we shall, with God's help, be victorious. Therefore, we have

now decided to take real steps. The battle will be a full-scale one, and our basic aim will be to destroy Israel.”

201. What were we in Israel and what was the Security Council expected to make of these words? A call for peace, or a call for war?

202. On 30 May, President Nasser signed a military agreement with King Hussein of Jordan, and Jordan began to mobilize. On 4 June, a similar agreement was signed with Iraq, and Iraqi detachments began arriving in Jordan and in Egypt. Was this evidence of peaceful intent? Were these agreements in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations? Were these aggressive movements of troops in accordance with solemn agreements which Egypt and Jordan had entered into with Israel in 1949 with the object of preventing all hostile acts and serving as a transition to permanent peace? They were clear evidence of a preparation for aggression.

203. While these military moves were going on in Egypt, Jordan and Iraq, Syria had also mobilized its forces to the last man, and 50,000 troops were poised aggressively on the heights which overlook Israel. We were surrounded. The armed ring was closed. All that the Arab forces were waiting for was the signal to start.

204. That signal was given on 5 June, when Egyptian planes in accordance with the plans contained in battle order 6/67 of Air Force and Air Defence Headquarters of the Eastern Area in Sinai, dated 26 May 1967, took off for their assigned targets in Israel, while at the same time an artillery barrage on Israel farming villages was opened from the Gaza Strip. Shortly afterwards, Jordan guns sited amid the holy places of the Holy City of Jerusalem started shelling the Israel capital, causing heavy casualties, and the Syrian artillery joined the devil's chorus in the north. The aggression had begun.

205. This is the record; this is what happened. Israel was designated to be the helpless victim of a massive assault. In accordance with its rights under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the victim defended itself, alone and successfully.

206. Here I want to interpolate a comment on a remark by the Soviet representative, who blamed Israel and condemned her for seeking gas masks in Germany. This was evidence to him that Israel was not alone. There was every reason for the Government of Israel to seek gas masks. Memories are not short, and for the Council's information I should like to put in the record a statement made by the International Committee of the Red Cross on 2 November 1966 in Geneva on the question of the use of poison gas. This is the statement:

“The International Committee of the Red Cross has again received from its delegates in the Yemen reports of bombing by toxic gas. A medical team led by the head of the International Red Cross Mission in Yemen went on May 15 and 16 to a village in the northern part of the country to attempt to give aid to the victims of bombing which had taken place some days previously and as the result of which, according to survivors, many victims had

died of asphyxiation. Delayed by an air raid, the ICRC doctors on arrival at the site immediately gave treatment to some of the wounded and collected various indications pointing to the use of poison gas.

“Extremely disturbed and concerned by these methods of warfare, which are absolutely forbidden by codified international and customary law, the International Committee at once communicated its delegates' report to all authorities concerned with the Yemen conflict, requesting them to take the solemn engagement not to resort in any circumstance whatsoever to the use of asphyxiating gases or any other similar toxic substances.”

It is surely no wonder that the Israel Government was compelled to seek gas masks; it was the same enemy.

207. No amount of casuistry, no heights of vehemence, no shrillness, no vituperation can alter the truths which I have just uttered. No distortions can transform this victim into an aggressor.

208. And if one requires more evidence, it was supplied this morning, in *The New York Times*, which has been quoted so often in the Council during the past two weeks, in a story datelined Beirut, 12 June. This is the quotation:

“A military analysis of the war appearing in the Damascus newspaper *Al Thawra*, the Government organ, asserted that the Arab forces should have concentrated their offensive against Israel on the Jordanian front while Syria and Egyptian troops used defensive tactics to tie down Israel forces.

“..

“The results of the battle, it added, showed the importance of the Syrian strategy of a war of guerrillas inside Israel as well as orthodox warfare from outside. It suggested that the ‘entire Arab homeland should turn into a well-trained barracks as soon as possible’ to continue the guerrilla strategy.”

209. But the record goes even further back than that; it goes back eighteen years, nearly nineteen years, to when the State of Israel was founded. Nineteen years ago, the Arab States declared war on the State of Israel, which had been established in accordance with a resolution of the General Assembly [181 (II)]. This was how the Secretary-General of the Arab League at that time, Azzam Pasha, put it on 14 May 1948: “The Arab States”—he said—“will conduct a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades.” In pursuance of that the armies of six Arab States—Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Lebanon—marched into the new State of Israel in order to accomplish its extinction at birth.

210. The Secretary-General of the United Nations at the time, Mr. Trygve Lie, described that as an aggression: the first armed aggression ever to have taken place in the history of the United Nations.

211. A distinguished predecessor of the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, characterized it as a threat

to peace and as military operations aimed at suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine. His colleagues Mr. Tsarapkin and Mr. Manuilsky were equally explicit in their condemnation of that Arab aggression.

212. This is the same Israel; these are the same Arab States. The aggression is also the same. For nineteen years now, Israel has been compelled to live in a state of siege. There is not a border which is not crackled with fire; there is hardly a village or a town in the country without a bereaved family and which has not seen the fruits of agonizing toil to make the land fruitful and prosperous destroyed in an instant by the guns and the bombs of Egypt and Jordan and Syria. Not a day has passed without a broadcast threat to our very existence.

213. This from President Nasser of Egypt: "We will act to realize Egypt's solidarity and the closing of the ranks that will eventually put an end to Israel. We will liquidate her."

214. This from President Al-Atassi of Syria: "We raise the slogan of the people's liberation war. We want total war with no limits, a war which will destroy the Zionist base."

215. This from Jordan: "Drive Israel out of Gaza by force, and don't stop at Gaza, but liberate all of Palestine, for world opinion is with us. Throughout the ages, the Jews have sought peace and security, and they thought that Israel would give them these. But Israel itself will drown in the sea; for Israel there is neither security nor peace."

216. We have been besieged, blockaded, attacked, threatened; our destruction has been openly proclaimed. Every weapon, political, diplomatic, economic and military, has been used against us for nineteen years. And all this has taken place under cover of the Charter of the United Nations and of the General Armistice Agreements, and with impunity.

217. What do those documents say, and what are the obligations applying equally to Israel and the Arab States which derive from them? Here is the Charter of the United Nations, Article 2:

"1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

"2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

"3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

218. And what does the Armistice Agreement say? The wording is more or less identical in all four General Armistice Agreements:

*"Article I:*

"With a view to promoting the return to permanent peace in Palestine and in recognition of the importance in this regard of mutual assurances concerning the future military operations of the Parties, the following principles, which shall be fully observed by both Parties during the armistice, are hereby affirmed:"

One of those principles is that:

"No aggressive action by the armed forces—land, sea, or air—of either Party shall be undertaken, planned or threatened against the people or the armed forces of the other;"

Another principle is as follows:

"The right of each Party to its security and freedom from fear of attack by the armed forces of the other shall be fully respected."

And yet another:

"No element of the land, sea or air military or para-military forces of either Party, including non-regular forces, shall commit any warlike or hostile act . . ."

And finally:

"This Agreement, having been negotiated and concluded in pursuance of the resolution of the Security Council of 16 November 1948 [62 (1948)] calling for the establishment of an armistice in order to eliminate the threat to the peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine, . . ."

219. Are these obligations, are these commitments, are these undertakings, to which the Arab States are party, in conformity with their actions, with their proclamations, and with their deeds during the past nineteen years? Is the belligerence, openly proclaimed, the belligerence which is the official doctrine of the United Arab Republic and the other Arab States—the belligerence which is the root of all the crisis in our area—is that belligerence compatible with the Charter of the United Nations and the obligations of the Arab States?

220. I should now like to say a few words about the present situation. The cease-fire called by the Security Council in its resolutions is in full effect with the United Arab Republic, with Jordan, and with Syria; and my authorities are co-operating fully with the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, General Bull, in order to ensure this. However, there is a point about the cease-fire which has not, my delegation feels, had sufficient emphasis: the Governments of Algeria, Iraq, and Yemen have openly proclaimed their intention to pursue belligerence against Israel, in brazen defiance of Security Council resolutions, and in open violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Kuwait has even gone so far as to inform the Security Council of its determination not to observe the Council's decisions. Other Arab Governments, which declared themselves in a state of war with

Israel, have not, up to now, announced their return to the respect of their solemn obligations under the Charter.

221. It is important to note that all these Governments have actively participated in the aggressive war against Israel by actual military operations, on land and in the air, by the dispatch of troops and materiel to the zone of the fighting, and by the deployment of ground and air forces in adjacent areas. Until all Governments concerned communicate officially that they have relinquished belligerence and have implemented the cessation of all military activities in the area, according to the resolutions of the Security Council, it is obvious that the cease-fire cannot be regarded as fully in effect.

222. Upon the cessation of hostilities, the Government of Israel adopted prompt measures for the restoration of formal civilian life in the area under its control. The Government of Israel is concerned to ensure the safety and welfare of inhabitants in these areas and strict regulations have been issued and are being implemented to that end. Electricity, water and health services have been resumed, despite great difficulty. The Arab police of the Old City of Jerusalem have been recalled to duty and are assisting in the maintenance of public order.

223. The actions taken by the Israel authorities in trying, and under very difficult conditions, to restore civilian life to normality, as far as this is possible in the present situation, have been marked with appreciation by a prominent resident of the Old City, Mr. Anwar Al-Khatib, who had been Governor of the Old City. He declared, the day before yesterday, that the inhabitants of the Old City and of the west bank as a whole had been astonished by the good behaviour of the Israel troops and of the way in which they had acted in their relations with the local population.

224. Moreover, urgent attention is being given to the needs of the refugees. During the fighting there was obviously some movement of people from one place to another, mostly inside the west bank area. There have been movements in a westerly direction as well as in an easterly direction. Some people crossed to the east bank to rejoin their families. However, there has since taken place a large-scale return movement from the east bank to the west bank. And the Israel authorities are doing nothing to prevent this.

225. I have been informed recently that an agreement between Israel and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Arab Refugees is under discussion and that it is expected to be signed very shortly, which will provide for the continuation of all UNRWA services. Similar arrangements are being made with international voluntary organizations engaged in caring for the refugees and civilians in general. I am authorized to assure the Council that the Government of Israel and all its authorities fully respect the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. The Government of Israel has established contact with the International Committee of the Red Cross, which has a delegation in Israel now, concerning the question of prisoners of war and their speedy exchange. My Government hopes that the other parties concerned will act likewise so that the exchange of prisoners can be implemented speedily.

226. The situation which obtains now provides the Security Council, the United Nations, the international community, with an historic opportunity to put an end to nineteen years of belligerence, of incitement, of aggression, and to achieve peace, security and stability in the Middle East. My Foreign Minister, in his address to the Council on 6 June [1348th meeting], touched on some of the ideas which we feel might be taken into consideration to achieve this. They include a recognition by the Arab States that Israel exists and has a right to exist; that Israel is as much a part of the Middle East as they themselves are. They include the establishment of direct, sovereign relationships between Israel and the Arab States. They include the peaceful settlement of disputes; freedom of passage through international waterways; that the security, the integrity and the independence of all States in the Middle East shall be assured. We are pleased to note that many of these concepts are reflected in the constructive draft resolution presented by the United States delegation a few days ago [S/7952/Rev.2].

227. However, none of these aims can be achieved under the system which has existed up to now. This system has given rise during the past nineteen years to three major armed clashes. There can be no return to these dangers. They have not promoted peace. They have served as a cover for belligerence, in word and in deed. They have caused war with all its tragedies. Israel does not seek war, and we never sought war. War is a grievous and tragic burden. There is no more cherished objective, no more ardently sought aim of our national policy than peace with our Arab neighbours. Peace will not be achieved by going back to the sterile arrangements of the past. This is a great opportunity, an historic opportunity to go forward, to achieve a stable settlement which will benefit all the peoples of the Middle East, Arabs and Israelis alike. We seek no more than this.

228. None of this will be gained by the negative and one-sided draft resolution just presented by the representative of the USSR. It is destructive in intent. It is designed to put the clock back, to restore the conditions of hostility, of belligerence, of blockade, of boycott, of armed clashes on the borders every day, of sabotage and of murder. My delegation respectfully expresses the hope that the Security Council will reject it out of hand.

229. Permit me to close my remarks by repeating and by emphasizing that our eyes and our hearts are turned to peace. Our dearest wish, our most cherished aspiration, is that peace shall reign in the Middle East and that all States in the area, the Arab States and Israel, may live their lives in amity, in concord and in constructive endeavour for the good of all peoples.

230. The representatives of the Arab States have rejected the proffered hand in the past; they are doing so in the Council today. They say they do not want peace with Israel, that they will never make peace with Israel. They want war. They dream of the second, the third, the fourth round. We pray that this mood will change, that the Arab States will come to realize that the victories of peace are greater than the victories of war; that the Middle East, from which the sublime truth of the Prophets went forth thousands of years ago to a world still in darkness, will once

again become a beacon of the spirit of peace, which it has been ordained to be by history.

231. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Tunisia. The representative of Syria has very kindly indicated his willingness to withdraw temporarily from his seat at the Council table while the representative of Tunisia makes his intervention. I appreciate the gesture of the representative of Syria and I now call on the representative of Tunisia to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

232. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*translated from French*): I should first like to thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for having generously yielded to me both his seat and his turn to speak.

233. In a letter dated 12 June 1967 to the President of the Security Council, [S/7974], I drew his and the Council's attention to the extremely alarming situation in Jordan caused by the Israel authorities, which are bringing undue pressure to bear on the people living on the west bank of the River Jordan to induce them to leave their homes and cross to the other side of the river. I mentioned various press dispatches, including one from United Press International, which, contrary to what the Israel representative has just stated, indicated that that was a deliberate policy of the Israel authorities.

234. The representative of Jordan has just given us a wealth of details on that operation, leaving no doubt as to the occupying authorities' actions and the intentions of the Tel Aviv Government. *The New York Times*, which can hardly be faulted for excessive sympathy towards the Arabs, estimated that 100,000 persons have been driven out of their land and homes.

235. The Tunisian Government believes that the Security Council should consider this aspect of the issue and adopt a clear-cut resolution as quickly as possible to put an end to these inhumane actions by the Israel aggressor. The Council cannot stand by and do nothing about this flagrant attack on human dignity, this premeditated attempt to undermine and invalidate all the efforts of the international community, through the United Nations, to settle the tragic problem of the refugees which has plagued it since the State of Israel was established.

236. The representatives of the Tel Aviv Government expound their love of peace here, while everything they do and all their machinations are carefully calculated to prevent peace from ever reigning again in the Middle East. It is their deliberate intention to sow the seeds of violence while they continue to brandish the olive branch in this Council. The Western friends and protectors of the State of Israel justify their sympathy for the Zionists by pointing to the suffering and painful experiences European Jews suffered at the hands of the Nazis and European anti-Semites. But when they are told of suffering endured by Arabs on Arab territory or by Africans on African territory, these same scruples, these same principles, suddenly become very flexible, even accommodating.

237. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia urges the Security Council to demand the prohibition of further

population transfers carried out in the most orthodox Nazi tradition. The Council should immediately adopt the most vigorous measures to instil in the Israel occupier a bit more decency and a greater awareness of its responsibilities towards its fellow-men.

238. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Morocco, and I understand that the representative of Jordan has kindly indicated his willingness to withdraw temporarily from his seat at the Council table while the representative of Tunisia makes his intervention. I appreciate this gesture of the representative of Jordan and I now call on the representative of Morocco to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

239. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): I should like to express His Majesty's Government's full support for the appeal which the Tunisian representative has just addressed to the Security Council regarding the status of Arab populations, particularly the refugees, whose position is internationally recognized.

240. My Government has instructed me to address an appeal to the Secretary-General that all measures will be adopted by the United Nations specialized agencies, including WHO, FAO and UNICEF, immediately to provide all necessary humanitarian assistance to the one million new refugees driven from their land and to the civilians forced by the Zionist invasion to begin a new exodus, this time, to a destination I do not know. This is an official and formal request to the Secretary-General. We hope that the United Nations will adopt these steps immediately, as they represent the least that it can do in the present circumstances.

241. It is no mere turn of phrase when I say that I listened most attentively to the long statement the Israel representative has just delivered. Perhaps it should be conceded that a certain personal factor influenced the presentation of the statement and that the language we have heard during the past few days has noticeably changed. I nevertheless believe that the substance of the Israel representative's statement calls for some comment.

242. In addressing the Council for the first time since he arrived from Geneva, he did not wish his identity to remain a mystery. He told us that he was Jewish and that he was a Zionist, that he was proud to be Jewish and proud to be a Zionist. I do not believe that anyone can challenge another person's right to be proud that he belongs to a particular faith. We Moslems have never questioned the value of Judaic spiritual teachings. Since our faith was established even after Christianity, we were not the ones who inculcated the concept of the guilt of the Jews. We were not the ones who made the crucifixion of Jesus and the search for his executioners a dogma of the faith. We do not believe in the crucifixion and we did not invent the dogma of Jewish responsibility for it. This theory of the guilt of the Hebrew people, which has plagued it throughout its history, was the invention of another religion. I believe that eminent ecclesiastical authorities have discussed the issue, in terms which I shall not dwell upon.

243. Divine will decreed that Mesopotamia would be the cradle of the three religions and different prophets pro-

claimed the word of God at various times through the ages, from this same land the Lord had designated as the birthplace of His message. It did not matter how that message was transmitted, each prophet supplementing the message which came before, each time in a manner reflecting the particular era in man's thinking.

244. The notion that we contest the right of Judaism to exist must therefore be discarded once and for all. No historian can point to any pogrom in the Arab world. The story of the Jewish people, a sorrowful story perhaps, has not been played out on the stage of the Arab world. The Jews have never suffered because they were Jewish under the Abbaside, Omeyyades or Turkish empires, or under the Arab empire in Spain. However, on several occasions they have been forced to flee from Europe—from Germany, France and Spain, whence they fled the Inquisition. And it was in the Moslem countries—which at the time possessed vast territory and world power—that they found refuge. There not only their lives were safe but they enjoyed a position under which their religion continued to flourish, their people could live according to their personal status and their synagogues were protected. I might add, with regard to my own country, that many Jews became ministers and governors of large provinces and distinguished court physicians, and that never, until Israel was carved out of Palestine, did a Moroccan Jew feel that he had a homeland outside Morocco.

245. However, I challenge the argument that Judaism is being confused with Zionism. Zionism is a totalitarian philosophy which did not emerge for the first time on the day Hitler decided to exterminate the Jewish race. It was invented in the writings of well-known philosophers long before the appearance of Nazism and at a time when the Jewish upper middle class in Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Paris and London, held full sway and power. In 1915 or 1916, when the first Zionist philosophical writings, the first appeals for a homeland for the Jews, were published, the Jewish community throughout the world was protected where it had no power and, in the financial capitals of Amsterdam, Zurich, Hamburg, London and elsewhere, the Jews held the purse-strings, so to speak.

246. Israel as a Jewish homeland cannot be justified by invoking Hitler's massacre of the Jews. In 1942, when the Vichy Government, through the Resident General in the Protectorate of Morocco, demanded that all Jews be dismissed from the Moroccan administration, the King of Morocco made a solemn appeal to the entire population and categorically refused to allow laws which applied in Occupied France to be extended through the legal fiction of the Protectorate to a sovereign Territory where citizenship had nothing to do with religious faith. Mr. René Cassin has paid a tribute to this position in his writings.

247. When the allies won the war, the countries which had been occupied by the Nazis obtained the necessary reparations. Some several thousand Polish Jews (who were Polish citizens), French Jews, German Jews, and Jews of other occupied countries felt that the reparations paid to their countries and the compensation they received after the war constituted just compensation for the the occupation of their territory and the massacre of their people. But after

Poland regained its territory and reparations had been made by Germany to the victorious Powers, I did not gather that anyone claimed the right to a double reparation, one, for example, as a Frenchman and the other as a Jew. Those with a clear understanding of their rights of citizenship were satisfied that the country of which they were citizens had obtained the reparations which had to be made following victory to the victims of Nazism. Consequently, the Jews of these countries, who had already received the necessary reparations from their Governments, did not have to look upon themselves as an international Jewish community and claim a homeland as compensation for Hitler's massacre of the Jews. Neither as Jews nor as victims of Nazism could they legitimately lay claim either legally or morally to Palestine as a homeland for Jews and Zionism.

248. We have heard a long and very composed statement that sought to depict the State of Israel as a peaceful force which for the past nineteen years has constantly expressed the desire to live in peace with its neighbours. Neighbourliness is a highly venerated concept in Arab culture. Respect for one's neighbour is a duty as important as respect for one's parents and family. But can the immigrants whose reasons for leaving those countries I have just pointed out be considered neighbours of the Arab world? Are they simply the neighbours of the bordering Arab States? Are they the neighbours of the two million refugees whom they drove from their homes? Whose neighbours are they to demand that they should be treated according to the traditional values of good neighbourliness? How did Israel come into existence? Was it created out of a desire for peace? For nineteen years, many delegations in this Hall have described the circumstances leading to the creation of Israel in detail. In our culture we have a precept which says that the dead must not be spoken of except in terms of their good deeds. I am afraid that, as I speak of those responsible for the creation of Israel, my respect for that precept falters somewhat. I know that those who made mistakes, at Yalta perhaps, felt very guilty about them and wanted to rectify them in 1948. But although those distinguished leaders of the time, who, having won the war, held in their hands the destinies of perhaps 90 per cent of the people of the world, were motivated by a sentimentality which their faith or political belief may have justified when they imposed the establishment of Israel in the name of humanitarian principle and feelings, they forgot that in signing Israel's birth certificate they were committing another great injustice in the name of mankind by condemning 2.5 million Palestinians and Arabs from other countries to exile.

249. At the time there was the excitement of the Yalta, Potsdam and other agreements which, reverting to nineteenth-century concepts, sought to establish peace by dividing the world into spheres of influence with consequences which, unfortunately, were distressing from the human point of view and serious politically. We are seeing the results in the Middle East today. If Israel had not been created, it would have been a peaceful region, its peoples living in peace, with great potential for immense wealth, great culture, that is to say, with the moral and material assets which would have enabled them, during the last twenty years, to bring to all mankind, in their region and elsewhere, the gift of their spiritual and material resources.

250. The creation of the State of Israel generated unrest in the Middle East and the countries which allowed it to be created are the same countries which, for nineteen years, have been refusing to face reality.

251. We have had assurances—and I believe they are sincere—that the United States, among others, wanted to defend the territorial integrity of all the countries in this region and that they have tried to protect the refugees. That is very true but, as in every political action, should we adhere to the cause or the finality of the political effect? Does the responsibility for the creation of Israel make it possible to salve one's conscience by throwing a few scraps, not even the equivalent of half a dollar a day, to those who were driven from their country and who now, twenty years later, are again living in refugee camps? Does the defence of territorial integrity merely consist of studying a map to find out where the pipelines run, where the strategic positions lie, which factories should be preserved and which destroyed?

252. I have no taste for personal recriminations in this Council. I have the highest personal esteem for the representatives who have tried to justify their positions, and that is why I shall refrain from directing my remarks to any particular member.

253. But, since the Council has been meeting to consider this situation, what has been done to protect territorial integrity? Two-thirds of Jordan is occupied, so is the Gaza strip; Suez is under foreign control; Eilat is occupied. Is it the intention that peace should be established on that basis? Do you, Mr. President, does any member of the Council believe that the obviously sincere appeal made to us and the provisions of a resolution which we would like to think of as an expression of a sincere wish to restore peace can be justified in the present situation?

254. For the past ten days, the Council and the various speakers have repeatedly drawn the attention of the great Powers to the fact that aggression does exist, that territories have been occupied and that this appeal for a cease-fire is a bitter reminder of the truce accepted by the Arabs when they were twelve kilometres from Tel Aviv and which became a smoke screen behind which ships unloaded the weapons needed to reverse the military situation in the ports of Haifa and Tel Aviv.

255. Now we are once again being lured by appeals, by reminiscences of the past, by the same tactics as in 1956, to accept a cease-fire while armies are being reinforced and are advancing with impunity into territories where there is no threat, no suggestion of a military operation, no act of aggression, nothing that has been alleged.

256. A few days ago, I said heatedly that if the Council had exercised its full authority with regard to responsibility for aggression from the outset, you would not have a situation in the Middle East today which resembles the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire or the conditions imposed on Turkey at the Lausanne Conference. You would not have a situation in which, tomorrow, we might perhaps see the great Powers discussing peace terms over our heads in a region in which contradictory interests

sometimes dictate conflicting positions but where these Powers, out of self-interest for the future, but in the name of peace, could very well forget that the Middle East can become the victim of this peace.

257. We are the first to want peace; throughout our history, we have never taken up arms to conquer or to attack. We are among those in this Organization who have accepted sacrifices, seen our territory amputated, suffered attacks on our dignity because, every time, we felt that each group of countries should be willing to surrender a fragment of its sovereignty or of its territory in the interest of the more lofty objective of world peace and security, if that was the price demanded.

258. We will not agree to a return to the *status quo ante* in the Middle East by telling ourselves: "Now there is an irreversible situation created by factors which should be weighed and used as a basis for discussing the future." If that is the conclusion to which we are being led by those who, from the first day that India courageously and conscientiously tried to persuade the Council to adopt a draft resolution demanding the withdrawal of troops to the positions they held on 4 June, refused to consider that possibility and are now telling us that they cannot go back to the situation which previously prevailed, do those same people think that they will be able to induce us to take as a point of departure for the future a situation brought about by a clear-cut aggression and perhaps even diplomatic complicity? I shall refer at a later stage to articles in magazines, which are internationally known for their sympathy towards the State of Israel, although their owners are on good terms with the Arab world, drawing attention to deals made in certain capitals by Mr. Abba Eban, before his return to his country a few hours prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

259. These historical truths must be told. Perhaps that diplomatic complicity did not assume the proportions of direct participation in the war, but the silence, the procrastination, the appeals which had the ring of sincerity, were no more than a smoke screen for an international manoeuvre which is just beginning to come to light. Peace can be established in the Middle East, whatever the price. Peace could easily have been re-established in other parts of the world which constitute more serious threats to international security, because of the powerful nations they bring into confrontation. Today, there is a sudden eagerness to safeguard peace because it was considered wrong for a sovereign State in the Middle East to ask the United Nations forces to withdraw from its territory, or that a port, which was being used to strengthen the military potential of a country which was at war with it, should be returned to its sovereignty.

260. Mr. Eban said last time that Eilat was a lung through which Israel drew breath. But Eilat was not part of the territory of Israel, even after the armistice. It was occupied after the terms of the Armistice Agreements. If Israel wishes to become stronger and to breathe, let it not breathe through another's lungs. Does it not consider its Mediterranean coastline enough, with the ports of Haifa and Tel Aviv? According to its own statistics, only five to six per cent of its economic resources come into the country

through the port of Eilat. Is that a sufficient reason for going to war and jeopardizing international peace? Tomorrow, in Latin America, are we going to let Bolivia demand that Chile give it an outlet to the sea because it does not have one? Have we realized the consequences of such a precedent, which will leave the door open for any challenge, any day, in Africa, in Latin America or anywhere else where countries are land-locked and have no outlet for trade or shipping? Is the claim to the port of Eilat by the country to which it belonged the real threat to peace today? We are told: aggression was committed against us, we went to war and we were victorious. But military situations do not come to an end. These conflicts have been going on in the Middle East for nineteen years. Can the advance of the Israel troops, the invasion of Arab territory be justified on the grounds that a peace-loving country saw the military build-up of the Arab Powers? Where does Israel get its arms? The declaration on preserving the military balance in the Middle East has always prevented the Arabs from having the weapons to stand up to Israel, whereas Israel benefited from bilateral agreements outside the tripartite guarantee. I would go so far as to say that the tripartite guarantee was not upheld because the amount of weapons of a certain origin which we now know and which Israel used is totally out of proportion to deliveries of arms to the Arab countries when they asked certain capitals for arms for self-defence against Israel. Israel has always asserted, "I cannot exist in this region; I must expand" and called for four million Jews to occupy the Negev desert. At the same time did it not ask for arms to withstand any move to prevent the immigration of those people?

261. These are some examples taken from a series of facts which cannot be challenged, which can be found in international archives, in statements at the United Nations, in the world's responsible magazines, in editorials signed by well-known commentators on international affairs, and are not merely Arab claims, which might be open to question. Today, with superb oratory, the Israel representative tried to cover up these facts and make the Council forget that it is faced with a problem which is not Judaism, or denial of the right of Jews to live in the territory which is the cradle of their religion because, until 1948, the true Jews of the region lived and prayed there in peace, alongside the Moslems, the Christians, in the same houses, celebrated the holidays of all the three religions of the country in a common hope and a common prayer, knowing that they belonged to what we call the People of the Book.

262. Zionism upset this common philosophy of life. Zionism is a materialistic philosophy which disturbed the community of thought and belief in which this part of the world was living peacefully, respecting all religions and faiths. Herzl and Balfour are responsible, not the Arabs' attitude against Judaism or against the Jews who were massacred by Hitler.

263. I apologize for speaking at such length about that part of the Israel representative's statement. I was afraid that a new face which came here to put forward this thesis in a new style might divert the Council's attention from the real problems it has to tackle.

264. It is true that we are meeting today in a new context: the situation in the Middle East is different from what it

was even last night. We are told that the cease-fire is general. We welcome the efforts which have achieved this result, but we do not want a Pyrrhic peace. We do not want the ten days of diplomatic manoeuvring which led to the cease-fire to enable Israel to attain its ends. Mr. Abba Eban told us the other day that the next phase should be to build new structures in the Middle East. Moshe Dayan said on television: we are in such and such a part of Arab territory, why should we get out?

265. Today, at the end of the statement made to this body, the Council and indirectly the Arabs were told what the terms for peace are. Well, if the cease-fire is a truce, an armistice, we are still among those who will show their loyalty to the United Nations by accepting it. But I should like to quote something Rivarol said—although I do not accept all his extreme-right ideas: "Woe betide those who stir up the innermost depths of a nation." If tomorrow the Arab world does not find its territories as they were on 4 June, and we might perhaps go further, as the whole Assembly said they were to be under the terms of the 1948 armistice, a nation will have been stirred to its innermost depths. If peace is to be universal, it must be paid for by the whole universe. In a particular international crisis, a part of the world which was hoping with the greatest will to improve its economic and social lot, which was trapped in a military betrayal and abandoned generally by the diplomatic community, should not be chosen to be the one to pay for Israel's consolidation and for peace among the great Powers.

266. The PRESIDENT: I have a number of speakers on my list. I have consulted members of the Council as to the further procedure of the Council. Some members are in favour of our adjourning now for a couple of hours. Others are in favour of our adjourning until tomorrow morning. However, there being no motion, I would permit myself to suggest that we continue, but that we have a suspension for fifteen minutes. If I hear no objection, we shall suspend for fifteen minutes.

267. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I do not wish to stand in the way of this suggestion that you have put to us, Mr. President, and I think it would be valuable if we could have a short break, as you say. I would, at the right opportunity and at the right time, wish to make an appeal to the members of the Council, and particularly perhaps to the Ambassador of the Soviet Union, to agree that we should continue our debate tomorrow. I had hoped for an occasion to put this suggestion to him. The draft resolution which he said he wishes us to vote on tonight is a resolution, as he has explained, of the very greatest consequence.

268. I would certainly wish to speak to it, but I did not see it in its present form until I came to the Council this afternoon, and I would not be able to speak to it adequately without consulting with my Government. I would have thought that it might be in the interests of all of us if we could, at a convenient time this evening, break and continue tomorrow rather than to proceed late tonight.

269. I wish to make the point now, so that the Soviet representative in particular might consider the appeal which

I have put to him. After we have had the short break you proposed, Mr. President, perhaps he would be good enough to comment on the appeal I have made.

270. The PRESIDENT: As I understand there is no objection to my suggestion, the meeting will now be suspended for fifteen minutes.

*The meeting was suspended at 7.50 p.m. and resumed at 8.15 p.m.*

271. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): We have just had the opportunity of hearing the Israel representative review nineteen years of history, history as he sees it, in which he naturally overlooks all the sufferings of the Palestinian people, the Arabs of Palestine, who were driven out of their country by the millions. In telling that story he tried, as an ardent Zionist, to make a case for Zionism in order to justify the aggression which has just been committed against the Arab States. If Zionism is the underlying cause of this aggression and if it is responsible for the events that have occurred in the Middle East—and it seems that it is—then it certainly needs to be defended before the peoples of the world.

272. Now no one can have any doubt about who is the aggressor: the aggressor is on the scene of the aggression, the aggression is glaring. The events of the past few days cannot be changed by recounting history from a specific point of view.

273. The Israel aggression began at dawn on 5 June 1967. The purpose of the aggression was, as everyone had known for a long time, to halt the progressive development of the Arab peoples who were in the vanguard of the anti-colonialist struggle on the African and Asian continent; to violate the territorial sovereignty of the Arab States, which have thrown off imperialist rule and started out on the path towards progressive development; to intervene in the internal affairs of the Arab States; to strike serious blows at the progressive régimes that have been set up, to overthrow them and install Governments which would be submissive and willing to take orders from the imperialists and the mercenaries who make up the leadership of the State of Israel. In that way it hoped to re-establish and broaden the imperialist base in that region of the world, which is particularly important not only strategically, as we all know, but also economically because of its tremendous natural wealth.

274. Before the aggression and at the beginning of the attack on the Arab States, the leaders of the aggressor State, namely Israel, kept saying that Israel did not seek territorial aggrandizement, and that all it wanted was peace. And how did they intend to get peace—let me tell you—through war, as it is very important for us to know. Now the adventurers who are the leaders of the State of Israel are openly saying that they intend to seize some Arab land, gain control of certain strategic points in the Middle East and dictate the terms for a solution that would satisfy only their own lust for conquest which continues to grow as time goes on.

275. For several days now, not only the Israel press but particularly, it seems, the United States propaganda

machine—which, it must be pointed out, has been wholly placed at the service of the territorial and other claims of Israel—have been saying that the State of Israel cannot remain within its present borders, that it wants to remake the map of the the Middle East to its own advantage. The position taken by the United States press is only too easy to understand. The press obeys the dictates of the United States imperialist circles which have instigated, armed and supported the Israel aggression against not only its neighbouring Arab States but against all the Arab States in order to achieve the objectives which the imperialists have set for themselves in that region. However, neither world public opinion, nor the United Nations as an organization with pretensions to universality, nor the peoples of the world as a whole, nor the peace-loving States can accept such a policy or such a position. Now when the peoples of the whole world, and especially the peoples of the continent which was the stronghold of imperialism, have risen up against it and are throwing off foreign rule, they cannot tolerate a remaking of the map of the world through aggression and the legal fiction that might makes right.

276. Those peoples support the Charter of the United Nations, they are for international law, which should prevail in relations among nations. Yet, today, the United States newspapers are full of statements by Mr. Eshkol to the effect that Israel will take its own decisions without regard for the United Nations or its resolutions. Israel itself will decide what it will do, how it will remake the map, how it will decide to present its claims, and how it will win them.

277. A brief summary of Israel's claims was given, as we all know, in an article published yesterday in *The New York Times*. Some of them are tirelessly repeated by United States propaganda every day, every hour. The purpose of the propaganda is to persuade us that the map of the world cannot remain as it is and especially not as it is in the Middle East, where victory has been won and military gains made. People are expected to accept these military gains. We know that military gains can go to your head, but we think that the peoples cannot and should not allow history to be dictated and the world to be ruled in this way—and indeed they will not allow it.

278. Mr. Goldberg, the distinguished representative of the United States, tried to present his country's position in a more favourable light by quoting documents published by the Secretariat saying that no Israel troop build-up had been observed at specific times when the Middle East crisis was starting to develop. However, for a proper assessment of the distinguished United States representative's remarks we need only refer to some subsequent statements reporting that Israel's troops could be mobilized within twenty-four hours, that its whole army was ready for the attack and that there were military successes because the troops were in a state of alert.

279. In the circumstances, how much credit can we give to Mr. Goldberg's observations and statements? When a State is permanently on a war footing, when it can mobilize its troops within twenty-four hours without anyone noticing, what is the point of asserting that there was no troop build-up at a given time? The intention is sufficient. We

know that the Secretary-General is not an intelligence agent who can find out what is in the minds of the Government of Israel and of the mercenaries there or what their intentions are. The Secretary-General cannot know what those who began the aggression, who have perpetrated it and are continuing it now, had in their minds and hearts.

280. Moreover, in his statements Mr. Goldberg said, if I remember correctly, that he did not want to go back, through the decisions the Security Council might take on the Soviet draft resolution [S/7951/Rev.2] to the precarious peace that existed before. He urged the adoption of his own draft resolution. He maintained or implied in his resolution that the aggression had not been consummated. He tried to make us feel that the aggression should not be condemned. If this is not an encouragement of aggression, an endorsement of aggression on the part of the United States, what can it mean? Not to condemn the aggressor, not to want to return to the *status quo ante*, but to suggest conditions for changing the situation and satisfying the claims that the State of Israel tried to win by force, and has attempted to impose through the aggression it has committed, all this is tantamount to supporting the aggression, encouraging it, and supporting its continuation. The statements of the United States representative, which we are asked to take as very solemn—we might almost say ringing words—make us feel immediately that all the statements he made before this aggression began have been forgotten.

281. You will remember that before the aggression the United States representative quoted and requoted certain statements about the territorial integrity of the States of the Middle East and about their sovereignty which were apparently intended to reassure the members of the Council, and to which the representative of the Soviet Union referred in his remarks at the beginning of this meeting. However, the United States representative apparently forgot to reply. Not only did he not reply to the Soviet representative, but he has not replied to many other representatives who have been putting similar questions to him for a long time. Perhaps he did not reply for reasons known only to himself, but his reasons cannot satisfy the members of this Council, or world public opinion and they cannot, of course, be supported by the peoples of the world.

282. Certain circles in the United States that want a foothold in the Middle East—and some of you know whom I have in mind—may of course want to satisfy the claims Israel is making as the fruit of its aggression, but the peoples of the world cannot, should not and will not meekly accept that demand.

283. However, to tell you what is really happening, I must say that the United States is making great efforts to validate the claims of the Israel extremists. It seems that a special committee has been set up in the United States for the purpose of facilitating the job of dismembering the Arab States for the benefit of the mercenaries who hurled their armies against those countries.

284. All this encouragement has obviously led the extremists who are now ruling Israel to initiate, then continue and now to maintain their aggression against the Arab States.

285. The aggression which is now being carried out by Israel against the Arab States is going to develop and continue against the background of these events in the United States. As long as the Arab countries are occupied, the Israel aggression will continue. As long as these territories are occupied, we must expect further incidents and clashes. That is why the Security Council must take the necessary measures.

286. You will recall that the Security Council has already adopted three cease-fire resolutions. In the first resolution [233 (1967)], the Council called upon the Governments forthwith to take all necessary measures to ensure an immediate cease-fire. Everyone knows what the word “immediate” means.

287. However, despite the verbal acceptance of the cease-fire by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel and reiterated by the Permanent Representative of Israel, the cease-fire was not immediate. Why? Merely because it was necessary, as it was before—and those who know history have reminded us of this here—to occupy the Arab territories, establish the *fait accompli* and then reassert the claims which the Israel representative made once again at the end of his statement. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel, and especially his representative here, have of course made some reservations—as, for example, that the other party should also accept the cease-fire—but the Council then had to adopt two further resolutions [234 (1967), 235 (1967)] to reprimand the Israel Government and to call it to order over the cease-fire.

288. Instead of complying with the cease-fire resolutions, Israel troops have continued their aggression, with the result that further territory and other places in the Arab countries have been occupied. It is now much more essential than ever before that conditions of peace and security should be restored in the Middle East.

289. Since the cease-fire resolutions were interpreted by the Israel Government, with the support of some of its friends sitting on the Security Council, as an invitation—as they are—to continue its aggression, to occupy Arab lands, and to impose its conditions on the Arab countries, we must now speak in clearer and more precise language.

290. This clear language is of course missing from the United States draft resolution [S/7952/Rev.2]. On the contrary, the United States draft, on which I commented when it was submitted a few days ago, emphasizes, as you know, that arrangements must be worked out for a withdrawal of troops, but these arrangements must be made by the Israelis with the Arab countries. Secondly, the effect of the draft resolution would be that the Arab countries would surrender some of the rights that they have and Israel would arrogate to itself certain rights it now wants.

291. In the circumstances, such a resolution, which is designed to serve the purposes of the aggressor, can only abet and prolong the aggression. The United States resolution seeks only solutions which favour aggression and which neither the international community nor the United Nations as an international organization could or should

accept. As we have already stressed, and stress once more, the draft resolution can therefore promote only imperialist interests and further the territorial claims of the Israel extremists. It should accordingly be rejected, as I am sure it will be when it is put to the vote.

292. The Security Council should not sanction incitement to aggression or aggression itself, as the substance of the United States draft resolution would have it do. On the contrary, it should speak out clearly, take a clear stand against aggression, condemn the aggression and demand the withdrawal of the troops, as called for in the Soviet draft resolution. This draft resolution calls for the vigorous condemnation of the Israel aggression. This condemnation is more essential than ever before because if we fail to condemn the aggression now, we will have other aggressions and other hotbeds of conflict in other regions to jeopardize world peace. A number of aggressions are being carried out throughout the world and those who are trying to prevent the Council from condemning the Israel aggression do so because they want to protect themselves against a similar condemnation. I am sure everyone understands the aggressions to which I refer. There is an aggression in South-East Asia and others in other parts of the world which are being perpetrated by United States imperialism.

293. The Soviet draft resolution demands that Israel should immediately and unconditionally remove all its troops from the territory of the neighbouring Arab States and withdraw them behind the lines where they were when they launched their attack against the United Arab Republic and the other Arab States, that is, to the positions they occupied on 4 June before the attack began. Moreover, Israel is to respect the territorial sovereignty of those countries. Only after Israel has been condemned for its aggression against the Arab States and forced to withdraw its troops from the territories they have occupied can a start be made towards creating the necessary climate for the solution of existing differences and for the establishment of a lasting peace in that troubled part of the world for the common good of the international community. Unless this is done, there will surely be no peace and the vital problems of the Middle East will remain unresolved.

294. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic, to whom I now give the floor.

295. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): My delegation has come to the Council with the firm belief that this is the time for action and not for words. The Security Council and the world at large are faced with a clear-cut case of aggression not only against my country but also against a number of other Arab States. This is not the first time that the United Nations has had to deal with such an aggression committed wantonly by Israel against my country, nor is it the first time that the Tel Aviv authorities commit such a treacherous aggression with the blessing and assistance of outside Powers. We do not, at this stage, need to prove that an aggression has been committed. I have had occasion several times in this Council to state clearly and without ambiguity that my country had no intention of undertaking any offensive action. We had been urged by our friends, and even by those whose collusion with the

aggressor was later evidently proved, to exercise self-restraint against the provocations of the Tel Aviv authorities against part of the Arab nations. I submit that we have exercised the utmost self-restraint; only two hours later a surprise and dastardly attack was launched against us. Even the aggressors themselves do not deny that their forces marched against several Arab countries at the same time and that they undertook what they call a surprise attack and what was in fact a treacherous aggression.

296. I feel it is my duty to the Council and to mankind to be frank with you. I feel it is my duty to do so because my country, our Arab sister countries and most certainly the United Nations as a whole are passing through a decisive period. During this period and as a result of what the United Nations decides, the fate of the small countries is affected. These moments do not concern the Charter of the United Nations alone; they most definitely affect the moral and ethical principles of our present day life.

297. During these moments the Security Council is put to a severe test, a test affecting the morality and prestige of this Organization, which has been established for safeguarding international security and peace, peace based on justice and equity, not an artificial peace, not a peace based on the *fait accompli*, not a peace which is contrary to fundamental rights of peoples, not a peace which is imposed by great imperialist Powers and their jackals on other nations.

298. The world for the last few days has been closely watching the endeavours of the Council, and indeed history will in the future assess those endeavours.

299. One of the elementary prerogatives of the Council when confronted with such an act of aggression is to assess the situation and work into the facts of that case. And in the case before you, is there any doubt about the perpetrators, the originators, the architects of that crime? I submit, the case is not confused. On the contrary, it is a clear-cut case of aggression, premeditated aggression, carefully planned and executed, and yet the Council did not rise to its responsibilities and condemn the aggressor. That is one of the most elementary tasks of the Security Council. Yet the Council was made unable to assess the situation and to condemn the aggressor. That was so because of the pressure, the heavy pressure, the intimidations and the threats exerted by the United States and the United Kingdom.

300. The case, as I said, is not obscure. The representative of Israel, when he first addressed the Council, was in a mood of exhilaration. That mood was even more evident in the address which we heard from Mr. Eban. The many other statements and addresses which we have been reading cannot but substantiate this fact. Besides the reports of the Secretary-General, could there be any clearer assessment of Israel's responsibility in carrying out that aggression? Again I say, in the face of all, that the Council did not discharge one of its primary responsibilities.

301. The facts of life compel me to be blunt. The United States was definitely behind all these events in the Middle East. The United States together with the United Kingdom

has drawn the blueprints of the situation confronting the Middle East, the United Nations, and the world. They have engineered it; they have furnished all possible aid to Israel—aid in material, in equipment, in scientific data, in intelligence information, and no less in warfare, all devices for a wicked and treacherous aggression.

302. Furthermore, an American vessel of the Sixth Fleet was spotted facing El Arish. May I ask for what reason a part of the Sixth Fleet should be in the vicinity of the hostilities? It should be noted here that this contradicts the statement of the representative of the United States when he on several occasions said that the Sixth Fleet was hundreds of miles away.

303. Naturally, the aim was to score a success for Israel, and by that means to impose their objectives on us, but they are certainly wrong. This is a black spot in the history of the United States. And yet, the representative of the United States comes boldly before the Council and speaks about peace and the endeavours of his Government to avert war.

304. This cannot be believed. A glance at the news appearing for several days in the newspapers coming from Washington would leave no doubt about the intentions, past, present and future, of the United States with regard to the Middle East. The establishment of committees, the expressed feeling of satisfaction with respect to the events in the area, the designs and plans arriving at the solution of all the problems of the area, an area which is many thousand miles away, all these are but an indication of the intentions of the United States and its plans which it intends to impose on us. They are acting as if that area of the Middle East is a backyard of their own, arranged in the way and in the manner to suit their own purposes. They think that the Middle East is an industrial and economic concern of theirs, that it is for them to shape its destiny. This is definitely the reason behind the establishment of a committee in Washington to look into all these matters and sort them out and settle them to their satisfaction. This is the essence of their draft resolution.

305. As a flagrant proof of the shameful attack perpetrated against my country, Israel forces are now stationed on our territory as well as on the territory of other Arab States. The Council has to act promptly. It should without hesitation condemn the Israel aggression on the Arab States and call upon the aggressor to withdraw its forces beyond the armistice demarcation line immediately and without any conditions.

306. Israel has been saying, time and again, that it owes its existence to the United Nations. Has Israel maintained its vow to respect the obligations and provisions of the United Nations Charter? Has Israel maintained the Armistice Agreement with the United Arab Republic, or shall we believe the leaders of Israel when they announce that the Armistice Agreement with Egypt is dead?

307. The decencies of the Charter have fared badly in the extreme at the hands of Israel, whose dark conspiracy with others and its aggression against my country will have forever a conspicuous place in the annals of treachery and

shame. When an overt act of aggression is committed, it is the primary responsibility of the Security Council, as I have already stated, to condemn that act and to take all the necessary measures to restore international peace. In this respect, the provisions of the Charter are amply clear. Ending hostilities by prescribing a cease-fire is only a preliminary step. The aggressor should never be permitted to defy this Organization and claim any right over the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another State.

308. The United States delegation submitted a draft resolution which, in its operative paragraph 2,

*“Calls for discussions promptly thereafter among the parties concerned . . . the renunciation of force regardless of its nature, the maintenance of vital international rights and the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East” [S/7952/Rev.2].*

This amounts, clearly and unambiguously, to an acceptance by the Council of the Israel aggression as a means of achieving its own wicked aims. Therefore, my delegation cannot but oppose such an attitude which would mean surrender to aggression. This is an endeavour on the part of the United States Government to legalize the Israel aggression and to reward Tel Aviv for its crime. The United States Government is an accomplice in this aggression. It cannot claim that it is impartial on this question. It is disqualified to come out with any solution.

309. I believe that the Security Council should, in the discharge of its primary responsibility, adopt without delay the United States draft resolution.

310. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has taken the floor to comment on the statements made at today's meeting of the Council.

311. As usual, the United States representative attempted in his statement to repeat the familiar demagogic arguments of United States propaganda. We reject the United States Ambassador's false reasoning in its entirety. It is obviously unfounded and scarcely needs any further refutation.

312. We should like merely to mention one point raised by the United States representative—namely, why was the Security Council unable to take the necessary decision in the first hours or on the first day of Israel's armed aggression? The United States representative has his own version of this, but the facts belie his imaginary ideas. A decision could not be taken because the United States of America refused to support the proposal that the aggressor's troops should be withdrawn immediately behind the armistice line. Why? Because it was deliberately helping the aggressor to gain time for seizing more Arab territory.

313. This is the true version, and it cannot be changed by any words or any falsifications by United States representatives. The United States representative again tried to suggest that the question of the withdrawal of the Israel troops from the territories they have seized should be linked to certain other conditions, such as a general settlement.

314. But surely it is clear what all this is leading up to. The whole point—which is to condemn the aggression and to bring about the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the aggressor's troops—is being watered down and replaced with something else. This will enable the aggressor to continue the occupation. Thus, Washington is an accomplice of the aggressor. This is the crux of the matter.

315. There are definite reasons why the United States Ambassador, in spite of all the obvious facts, could not pluck up enough courage to condemn the aggression, although the whole world knows perfectly well who perpetrated the piratical and treacherous attack on the Arab States. It was the Israel interventionists, the Israel aggressors.

316. In our statement at today's meeting of the Council, we have already described at length the Soviet Union's position in regard to Israel's aggression against the Arab countries. We have also stated with the maximum possible clarity the Soviet Union's position in regard to the various proposals to the effect that the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan should be linked to other conditions of various kinds—in the form, that is, of a "package deal". These are all disreputable manoeuvres designed to help the forces of aggression entrench themselves in the Arab territories, and to obtain advantages for the aggressor and encourage his expansionist designs.

317. The United States representative stated here that, if the Security Council adopted the Soviet draft resolution, this would mean a return to an explosive situation. These may not be his exact words but this was the general sense of his statement. Now what does this mean? Simply that he is defending the aggressor's position. We are told that, if Tel Aviv's aggressive designs are not satisfied, there can be no peace in the Near East. If Tel Aviv's claims to parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria are not satisfied—or so the United States says—the conditions for war will exist. So, you unleashed a war in order to change conditions. This is further evidence of participation and complicity in the crime which has been committed; and it is also evidence of open encouragement and defence of aggression.

318. The Security Council must condemn most vigorously the aggressive acts of Israel and its continued occupation of the territories of Arab countries. The Council must demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the aggressor's troops.

319. The United States draft resolution does not contain the necessary provisions to this effect, and it is therefore unacceptable. It is in fact designed to encourage the aggressor's expansionist claims. We do not think there can be any useful discussion on the basis of the United States draft, which favours Israel's aggressive designs. This draft has no substance. There is nothing in it. There is nothing in it to discuss or consider. If the United States delegation wants to put the draft to a vote, it is fully entitled to do so. In our view, however, the Security Council should not be allowed to waste time on account of the United States draft resolution. We must finish our work today and we must

take a vote today on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation.

320. As many representatives have quite rightly pointed out here, the Security Council has no right to waste time, or to tolerate even for a single hour the occupation of part of the territory of Arab countries. For these reasons, the Soviet delegation will vote against the United States draft.

321. Let me say again that the Security Council's very first and most important duty in accordance with the United Nations Charter, apart from condemning the aggressor, is to adopt a decision calling for the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan immediately and unconditionally. I repeat—immediately and unconditionally. Israel's forces must be withdrawn in their entirety behind the armistice lines and moved back out of the respective demilitarized zones.

322. The Soviet delegation would again like to express its confidence that the Security Council will do its duty, and we appeal to members of the Council to adopt a decision without delay to protect the Arab States, a decision which would put an end to the aggression and restore the legitimate rights of the United Arab Republic, Syria, Jordan and the other Arab States. We insist that the Soviet Union draft resolution should be put to the vote immediately; and in order to avoid any misunderstanding or any incorrect or dishonest interpretations of our draft in future, we should like to emphasize that the demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israel forces behind the armistice lines, as expressed in the Soviet draft resolution, naturally includes the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the troops of the Israel aggressors from the territories of Gaza and Hamma, which are under the administration of the United Arab Republic and Syria respectively.

323. In conclusion, I venture to say again that, if the Security Council does not take immediate measures, a grave responsibility will rest with those States which have not done their duty as members of the Security Council. In that case, of course, it will be necessary to seek other ways of ensuring that the Council does its duty under the United Nations Charter.

324. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

325. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Earlier in tonight's proceedings, I gave warning that I would like to suggest to the Council that we should not proceed longer with our work tonight, but should be prepared to adjourn until tomorrow. Throughout these proceedings, my delegation has always been in favour of urgent action, and never in favour of delay. But there are very positive reasons why I believe that it would be well, from the point of view of all of us, to continue our deliberations tomorrow.

326. I speak with the greatest respect to those who are inscribed to speak to us tonight, and we shall look forward, of course, to hearing them tomorrow. But the essential point is the one to which the representative of the Soviet

Union has drawn our attention now. He suggests that we should proceed to vote on a draft resolution which, in its final form, we saw only as we entered this Council chamber tonight.

327. On the fundamental and vital issues which are raised in his draft resolution I wish to speak with the authority of my Government. It is, however, not possible to do so now. It has not been possible to do so between the time when the draft resolution was presented and tonight.

328. I therefore am most anxious that the position of my Government should be made clear and that I should have an opportunity of making it clear tomorrow. I am not anxious for delay; I am certainly not pressing that the voting should be delayed beyond tomorrow. But I believe it is right and in accordance with our best procedures that we should be given time to consult our Governments before we take such a vital decision as that which the representative of the Soviet Union has invited us to take tonight.

329. I therefore feel it is right to move the adjournment of this meeting.

330. The PRESIDENT: May I ask the representative of the United Kingdom under which precise rule he is moving the adjournment?

331. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Under rule 33, sub-paragraph 2, of the provisional rules of procedure.

332. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has asked to speak, but a motion has been made, under rule 33, sub-paragraph 2, to adjourn the meeting.

333. According to rule 33, "Any motion for the suspension or for the simple adjournment of the meeting shall be decided without debate." Therefore, under the rules of procedure of the Security Council I now put the motion for adjournment to a vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:* Bulgaria, Mali, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Abstaining:* India, Nigeria.

*The motion was carried by 10 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

334. The PRESIDENT: The motion is adopted. The meeting will be adjourned until tomorrow. I take it that it should be tomorrow morning.

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

336. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has already stated its attitude towards the question of continuing our work. We should merely like to draw your attention to the fact that not all the points made by our United Kingdom colleague in his statement were clear or logical. Everyone around this table can understand that we are guided not by our own ideas, but by instructions from our Governments. It was not surprising, therefore, that in this case the United Kingdom representative wanted to get in touch with his Government and obtain further instructions; but his arguments, as I see them, were not altogether convincing.

337. I have no intention of taking issue with the points made by the United Kingdom representative, but the Soviet draft resolution was submitted as long ago as 8 June. The revised draft does not differ in principle from the earlier one, and so it is very difficult for us to understand the United Kingdom representative's remark that this is his reason for requesting a special postponement. If one stretches a point, however, even this can be explained somehow. But the logic of the United Kingdom representative's comments on the question of continuing our work this evening, in order to hear statements by representatives who have already put their names down to speak, is completely unintelligible. If you do not have any hidden motives and if, as you said, you have no intention of delaying the work of the Security Council or the adoption of a decision (though I take the liberty of doubting this), why should we postpone hearing the statements of representatives who wanted to speak today? This is what is not quite clear.

338. I turn now to the technicalities of the procedure we have just adopted. I should like to point out that we have indeed taken a decision to adjourn the meeting but we have not decided to resume our deliberations tomorrow. As the speakers on the list are ready and do not want to lose time, why should they not be invited to speak today—after a brief recess, say, of one hour—if we really want to work in a business-like and responsible way in the Council, if we do not want any delays and if we are not guided by ulterior motives.

339. The PRESIDENT: I have been very liberal, considering that a decision to adjourn had been adopted by the Council. The representative of the Soviet Union wanted to speak on a point of order, I understood; I called on him. However, the Council has decided to adjourn now. I will reconvene the Council on the basis of consultations.

*The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.*

---

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

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

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

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

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

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

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

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

---