



MAR 20 1971

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1366th

MEETING: 9/10 JULY 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1366)	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),	
Letter dated 8 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8043);	1
Letter dated 8 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8044)	

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 SIXTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 9 July 1967, at 4.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia).

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/1366)

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).
6. Letter dated 8 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8043).
7. Letter dated 8 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8044).

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);

Letter dated 8 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8043);

Letter dated 8 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8044)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Security 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, Libya and Pakistan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, to participate without vote in the Council's discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. Rafael (Israel), Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic), Mr. A. Daoudy (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. Al-Rashid (Kuwait), Mr. Mongi Slim (Tunisia) and Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya) took the places reserved for them.

2. The PRESIDENT: I have received a letter dated 8 July [S/8045] from the representative of Algeria requesting that he be allowed to participate in the Council's discussion without the right to vote. As there is no objection, I invite

the representative of Algeria to take a place at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. T. Bouattoura (Algeria) took the place reserved for him.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the items inscribed on its agenda.

4. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council has once again been convened urgently at the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic to consider the question of Israel's flagrant and premeditated violation of the Security Council's decisions calling for a cease-fire and the cessation of military activities in the Suez Canal zone.

5. At our last meeting the representative of the United Arab Republic provided the Council with information on further raids by the Israel Air Force during the morning of 8 July on the control stations at El Tina, Ras El'Ish and El Kap in the Suez Canal area. He also spoke of shelling by Israel artillery and barbarous air raids by Israel bandits on densely-populated areas containing a large number of inhabitants. These piratical raids resulted in the death of innocent people, and caused further material damage.

6. Thus, Israel is continuing its aggressive acts against the United Arab Republic. These unceasing acts of provocation by Israel's armed forces constitute further evidence of the danger inherent in the situation, and prove that Israel has not abandoned its criminal plans and that Tel-Aviv is ignoring the demands of the Security Council, of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the General Assembly and of all peace-loving peoples.

7. As you know, the Soviet Union has issued several warnings that Israel's continued occupation of part of the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan is fraught with the most serious consequences. The Soviet delegation has repeatedly emphasized that until Israel forces leave the foreign territory and foreign soil which they have occupied, there can be no peace in the Near East, because no people will put up with a situation in which interventionists are throwing their weight about and perpetrating crimes on its territory. We should like to emphasize again that, so long as Israel's armed forces are occupying Arab territories, the flames of war may flare up again at any moment, causing a new further armed conflict of extensive proportions.

8. Until the aggressor has been put in his place, the shadow of war in the Near East will stand relentlessly at every door, the situation will be aggravated to the very limits and there may be a military explosion on a scale which would be dangerous for all mankind. The truth is so elementary and self-evident that I hardly think anyone will presume to deny or doubt it.

9. It is precisely for this reason that the most important and urgent objective, which must be achieved without delay, is the immediate withdrawal of Israel's forces from the Arab territory they have occupied and the elimination

of the consequences of Israel's aggression. The immediate withdrawal of Israel's forces to the positions which they occupied prior to 5 June 1967—this is the most vital matter from the point of view of the interests of peace in the Near East, and of world peace. Israel's aggressive forces are behaving themselves in the occupied Arab territories like shameless brigands; they are still extolling the virtues of arbitrary rule and violence, and they are openly and arrogantly putting forward territorial and other claims in an attempt to dictate and to impose their conditions on others. By constantly organizing criminal acts of military provocation against the Arab States, Tel-Aviv is once again for the nth time challenging the United Nations and the Security Council. Israel's new aggressive acts, and the obstinacy with which the forces of aggression are trying to carry out their designs, indicate that Israel is relying on the support of certain Western Powers. Is it not perfectly clear that, if Israel did not have strong protectors and patrons, it would never dare to act so defiantly and brazenly? Indeed, the events in the Near East, and the discussions in the Security Council and at the General Assembly's fifth emergency special session, have in themselves demonstrated beyond doubt that Tel-Aviv is being supported by Washington, London, Bonn and others. It must be said that Washington and those who follow its line in encouraging Tel-Aviv's aggression will bear a heavy responsibility for the consequences of the events now unfolding in the Near East.

10. It is clear that the aggressor is becoming more and more arrogant. After seizing parts of the territory of Arab countries by force, Israel has now gone to extremes and is trying to slander others—to slander the Arab countries—in the Security Council, instead of complying with the Security Council's cease-fire decisions and instead of terminating its illegal occupation of Arab territory immediately. These self-justifications sound like sheer blasphemy here.

11. As the Council is aware, the representatives of Tel-Aviv are even going so far as to try to accuse the Arab States. This really is the very height of hypocrisy and cynicism. The occupiers, usurpers and aggressors who are flouting the rights of the Arab peoples, and have invaded their territory, still have the impudence to put forward claims and counter-complaints. But has there ever been a shadow of a doubt that the statements made by ruling circles in Tel-Aviv are false through and through, and that their counter-arguments are complete fabrications?

12. Members of the Council will recall that, since the very outset of his country's criminal aggression against the Arab States, the Israel representative has been trying to resort to blatant lies and deceit at the Council table and elsewhere, and has attempted to misinform the Council and the world public in order to gain time for further aggressive annexations. These unseemly ploys, and the mendacity of the advocates of Tel-Aviv, have been duly exposed. The whole world, which has followed the Security Council's work with bated breath, is witness to the fact that the seats behind the nameplate "Israel" are occupied by incorrigible liars whose words are not and cannot be trusted at all.

13. Yesterday, too, the speaker for Israel once again resorted to unseemly manoeuvres in the hope of side-

tracking the United Nations from the main issue—namely, the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor's forces and compliance with the Security Council's decisions calling for a cease-fire. Israel's attempts to pose as the prosecutor are too ridiculous and absurd. We wish to state this publicly, so that no one shall have any illusions. The representatives of Tel-Aviv, whose statements about peace have been merely a screen for the preparation of armed attack and who have cynically flouted the Security Council's decisions, have no right to speak here in the United Nations about justice and fair play.

14. Now the Israel delegate is prevaricating once again and shamelessly denying the new crimes which are still being committed by Israel troops, by the armed hordes which forcibly seized Arab territory. Tel-Aviv is stubbornly disregarding the Security Council's decisions calling for an unconditional cessation of military activities.

15. The fact that the Security Council, a body which is invested with such important powers and responsibilities, has had to adopt four resolutions one after the other, calling upon Tel-Aviv to put an end to its aggressive acts against the Arab countries, is surely cause for righteous indignation. It is a fact, however, that Israel is still to this very day demonstrating its contempt for the decisions of the Security Council, treating them as if they were mere scraps of paper out of one of its own notebooks and regarding the Security Council as a suitable place for performing a shameful farce.

16. Such behaviour by Israel is intolerable; it is intolerable here at this table. The Security Council cannot let its resolutions be treated in this way, since it is not only the prestige of the Council, but the authority of the United Nations as a whole that is being undermined. The high-handed forces of aggression must be called to order and their crimes must be most severely condemned, in the first instance here, in the Security Council in the United Nations.

17. Israel's aggression against the Arab States is an attempt by imperialism, using the ruling circles in Tel-Aviv, to deliver a blow to the national liberation movement in the Near East; it is an attempt to halt the Arab people's advance along the road of social progress. And that is why all efforts to make out that recent events in the Near East are merely the result of national discord between Israel and the Arab countries can be regarded only as an attempt to deceive the peoples of the world and to conceal the true causes of Israel's aggression.

18. The continuing United States aggression against the people of Viet-Nam, Israel's perfidious attack on the Arab countries, the recent acts of provocation against the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the alarming news of plans which would violate the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus—all these are links in the single chain of a conspiracy by imperialism and colonialism against the national liberation movement. And all the newly independent countries must draw the necessary conclusions from this, since connivance at aggression and a weakening of vigilance are fraught with very dangerous consequences, particularly for these countries

themselves. This danger is very real and serious, particularly for small countries. The peoples are in fact at grips with a united front of aggressive forces which is increasing military tension and provoking conflicts in various parts of the world.

19. All this shows that the forces of imperialism are intoxicated with the idea of aggression and that they are becoming more and more active, threatening the freedom and independence of peoples.

20. The Soviet Government has pointed out that it would be an irreparable mistake if we were to get used to thinking that aggression can go unpunished. The policy of conniving at aggression is creating an extremely dangerous situation and is an encouragement to aggressors in other parts of the world.

21. We all know that there was intervention in the Dominican Republic only a short time ago. The aggression in Viet-Nam has been escalating for several years. Now the peoples of the Near East have become victims of imperialist aggression.

22. Before the eyes of the whole world certain imperialist countries have in the past few days been committing acts of undisguised international brigandage against the long-suffering African people of the Congo. Can the Security Council remain indifferent to the fact that the forces of aggression are grossly violating the sovereignty of independent States Members of the United Nations and are interfering in their domestic affairs in order to impose on them régimes which are acceptable to the forces of imperialism and colonialism? The threat of intervention has been hanging over Cyprus too, and it would be inexcusable to wait until the world is again faced with yet another *fait accompli* of aggression and intervention.

23. The Soviet Union firmly and resolutely supports the Arab States in their struggle for freedom and territorial integrity, and is providing them with assistance of every kind. This assistance has in particular been provided here in the Security Council which, owing to opposition by certain of its members, has been unable to do its duty in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

24. It was the Soviet Union, too, which proposed the emergency session of the General Assembly. As we know this has not yet completed its work, although we must say frankly that it is a matter for regret that the General Assembly was unable to adopt the necessary decision when the various draft resolutions were put to the vote on 4 July.

25. The General Assembly must show that it is equal to the requirements of the situation. We are, of course, glad to note that all Members of the Assembly, with the exception of the aggressor and his direct accomplices, have said that they are opposed to aggressive territorial annexations, and to the idea that the aggressor should derive some advantage from the armed attack which he has perpetrated; and they have thereby, in fact, expressed their condemnation of Israel's policy. This gives grounds for thinking that further vigorous efforts can and must be made to bring about the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from those parts of

the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan which they have occupied, to eliminate the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States, and to create conditions for the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the Near East.

26. The new aggressive acts by Israel to which the representative of the United Arab Republic referred in his statement are intended to undermine United Nations efforts to restore peace in the Near East, and must not go unpunished. Israel must strictly comply with the Security Council's decisions calling for a cease-fire. It is quite clear that these decisions by the Security Council are merely the first step, the very minimum which was required to halt the aggression, to avert a further dangerous deterioration in the situation, and to prevent the armed conflict from spreading.

27. The Soviet Union, which firmly supports the Arab States, believes that the Security Council must adopt extreme measures to put an end to the military activities which Israel has unleashed again and again. The Security Council, as the representative of the United Arab Republic has stressed in his letter of 8 July [S/8043], must call upon Israel promptly and fully to comply with the Council's decisions, and to refrain from all military operations. The Council must in this way prevent a further deterioration in the situation which—as it is—is already fraught with danger for peace throughout the world and not only in the Near East.

28. Under the United Nations Charter, as you know, Members of the Organization have agreed to comply with the decisions of the Security Council to carry them out in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter. Therefore, if Israel does not comply with the decisions which the Security Council has already adopted and the demands it has already made concerning the cease-fire and the cessation of military activities, then one must consider the question of taking further steps in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

29. Under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council is empowered to impose sanctions, if the measures it has taken for the maintenance of international peace and security prove inadequate. Therefore, if Israel continues to disregard the decisions and demands of the Security Council, it will be necessary to apply sanctions against Israel as an aggressor which has violated the Security Council's decisions. If the Security Council decides to take this step the Soviet Union is ready to participate in applying the sanctions.

30. In the situation which has arisen the United Nations must do its duty in accordance with its Charter, and it must put an end to Israel's aggression, safeguard the legitimate rights of the Arab states and restore peace in the Near East.

31. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, with your permission I should like to turn for a short while to reflect on the role of the United Nations in the conflict, turmoil and suffering of the Near East.

32. We have just listened to a speech which, I am sure, has depressed us all—a speech of violence, an intemperate

speech which surely cannot have assisted us in finding a way out of the difficulties we face. But I for my part will speak in a way which will not offend or antagonize anyone. It is surely our duty not to increase animosities. Rather, I suggest that our main purpose should be that stated by Mr. Brezhnev four days ago, when, speaking formally on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, he said that we must all do everything so that the flames of war do not break out again.

33. Surely, we should all set that as our overriding aim. But if we are to achieve it, we shall need to avoid saying or doing anything which fans the flames of hate; and we must turn our minds—and, if we can, the minds of others—from past bitterness to future hope, and from recrimination to reconstruction, reconstruction of confidence and security, on a basis far firmer than ever before. And, what is more, we must be content first of all to take small steps in the right direction.

34. The first action of this Council when the conflict started was to call for and establish a cease-fire. We must see that that cease-fire is observed. We must condemn any and every breach of it. We can make no progress at all until that first advance on to firm ground has been consolidated.

35. I shall not attempt today to go over all the wider arguments and controversies which have recently been the subject of the debate in the General Assembly, but I would wish to make one general comment.

36. Throughout the long debates in this Council and then in the Assembly, the public speeches might often have led us to despair. More important still, millions of people who still put faith in our Organization might have been led to despair too. I have often remembered, as I listened to the debates, the words of an English poet—and I remembered these words again as I listened to the speech by the representative of the Soviet Union just now:

"Earth is sick;
And heaven is weary of the hollow words
Which States and kingdoms utter
When they speak of truth and justice."

But it is comforting to hope that we shall not be judged by our public speeches; and I hope this may be of some comfort to my distinguished friend from the Soviet Union. We may hope that what we do will speak so loud that the world will not hear what we say.

37. What has been happening here at the United Nations while the public debate has dragged on? Make no mistake about it, a great deal has been happening. Below the rough surface of words there has been persistent, anxious search for common ground of agreement. Disagreement on some essential questions persisted, but there was a wide area of growing agreement. Withdrawal of forces from occupied territory: widely agreed; the need not only to preserve the cease-fire, but to make sure that firing never starts again: widely agreed; the necessity to deal urgently with all the other issues: widely agreed; a pressing need to bring succour to those in distress and to give them not only relief, but justice too: widely agreed; the need to give freedom of

worship to all religions in the Holy City: widely agreed; the need to secure freedom of passage on international waterways: widely agreed; the need to prevent the squandering of resources so desperately needed for development on a renewed arms race: widely agreed; the need to strengthen the United Nations presence in the Near East: widely agreed.

38. I pay my respectful tribute to all those of all groups—yes, of all groups—who have worked for these purposes. The work they have done in recent weeks will not be lost; it will form the basis of the work now ahead of us in the Security Council. The weeks of debate here in the United Nations have not been wasted; they have not driven us further apart; I trust that they have brought us all closer together.

39. We are often reminded of the wisdom of those who drew up our Charter, and time and again we benefit by recourse to the principles they laid down. All of us, every one of us, subscribe to the Charter. We subscribed to a document which states the principle of the sovereign equality of all States of this Organization. We all subscribe to a pledge which requires us to settle our international disputes by peaceful means, in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered. We are pledged, all of us, to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

40. I come back to the immediate question before us, the question of what practical step can be taken now, immediately and effectively. I trust that we shall all heed what the Secretary-General said to us yesterday and act at once on the practical suggestion he put to us. From the first, my Government has been anxious to concentrate attention not on accusations and on generalizations, but on the practical steps required to escape from violence and start out on the hard road to a stable and secure settlement; and such steps can be taken, so I believe, only in the United Nations.

41. It is fashionable to decry the efforts of the United Nations. But as we look back, we should realize that whenever the United Nations has been given half a chance it has served us all very well. The United Nations Emergency Force kept the peace on the borders of Israel and the United Arab Republic for ten years. The Secretary-General and General Bull and his United Nations staff played an invaluable part in stopping the firing. Mr. Michelmore and his United Nations staff have been working day and night to relieve suffering and hardship. We warmly welcome the decision of the Secretary-General to send a special emissary to review the whole question of relief and to make practical proposals for dealing with that vast problem. We badly need not less but more international involvement and international action.

42. That brings me to the main argument which I wish to leave in our minds today. Those who seek stability and security can, so I suggest to them, hope to achieve those aims only by international authority; those who seek relief and justice can also achieve those aims only by international action. Experience has well shown how effectively the international Organization can act when we give the

necessary authority. We should at once authorize the Secretary-General to send observers to Sinai and to the Canal, and I trust that we shall do so without delay and without reservations. I hope that we can also authorize him to send his Special Representative to the area to make progress in dealing with all aspects of the situation, including certainly disengagement and withdrawal. We have long been pressing that this should be done; indeed, we see no other practical way of proceeding.

43. We hope, moreover, that following the action which the Secretary-General has already taken to deal with the humanitarian problem, a new international initiative can soon be started in the whole field of relief and rehabilitation.

44. To all concerned I would say that the only hope for us all is to back, not one side or the other, but to back the cause of effective, practical, immediate and impartial United Nations action. We took the essential first step in this direction when we in the Council called for and insisted on a cease-fire. I trust that we shall now take a second practical step in restoring and maintaining international order so that, in Mr. Brezhnev's phrase, "the flames of war do not break out again."

45. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): In speaking to the Council today, the delegation of the United States had hoped to deal exclusively with the complaints for which this Council was called into urgent session at the request of the Governments of both the United Arab Republic and Israel, in order to act promptly with respect to those complaints. My delegation was indeed prepared to act on those complaints last night. But today we are faced once again with provocative, baseless and entirely irrelevant charges hurled about by the representative of the Soviet Union. These charges have but one design: to divert the Council's attention from the business at hand. My delegation has no desire to be a party to such an effort, and I shall try therefore to present my delegation's views on the problem we have before us and to refer only briefly—because I am compelled to reply—to the irrelevant charges which have been made.

46. The attempt of the representative of the Soviet Union to link this conflict to other named places in the world is just a piece of "boiler-plate" which we have heard many times before, a record played so many times that you can hear the scratches. Perhaps the most interesting thing about tonight's performance was that our colleague Ambassador Fedorenko was playing solo trumpet. We have not heard any similar complaints in this Council from the countries in other areas for which this self-appointed defence attorney purports to speak. Perhaps that fact speaks more loudly than what he has said. Ambassador Fedorenko speaks of aggression with the air of one familiar with the subject, and when he speaks, also, of boundless hypocrisy and cynicism, no doubt he knows whereof he speaks.

47. When the Council met yesterday [1365th meeting] we heard statements by the Secretary-General and the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Israel. We know from their statements that renewed incidents of fighting have taken place in the area of the Suez Canal, where Israel

and United Arab Republic forces are both present, and that the incidents which are immediately the subject of our concern took place yesterday, 8 July. While fortunately the fighting has apparently ceased, the incidents of 8 July would appear to be the most serious of several that have occurred during the past several days. Though the details of the 8 July incidents are not complete, it is nevertheless clear from both statements that the cease-fire orders unanimously adopted by this Council last month have not been honoured. Such serious breaches of the cease-fire obviously require the prompt attention of the Council, which of course is still seized of the problem.

48. Both the United Arab Republic and Israel accepted the cease-fire after resolutions calling for such a cease-fire were unanimously adopted by the Council. Both sides are thus obliged to observe the cease-fire, and observe it scrupulously. If nations of the Middle East are to be extricated from the disastrous cycle of recurring conflict which has plagued their history for the past twenty years, surely the first necessary step, we must all acknowledge, is for all fighting—and this must include all incidents of fighting, however major or minor—to cease.

49. At the moment, as I am sure all members of the Council are equally aware, we are disadvantaged here in our consideration of the matter immediately before us because of a lack of independent and objective information of the kind which the Secretary-General has been able to provide in other instances. It is for this reason that we particularly welcome the Secretary-General's proposal to the Governments of both the United Arab Republic and Israel that they accept United Nations observers to report on compliance with the Council's cease-fire orders. Observers of the United Nations have been able to report on the implementation of the cease-fire and its observance by the parties in those areas where Syrian or Jordanian forces face Israel forces. There are, however, no United Nations observers positioned to report from the area along the Suez Canal, where Israel and United Arab Republic forces face each other.

50. My delegation, concurring in the recommendation of the Secretary-General, believes that it would be most useful to the Council and to the implementation of the cease-fire if United Nations observers could be sent to the area to report to the Secretary-General and, through the Secretary-General, to the Security Council on the implementation of the cease-fire and compliance therewith by the parties. The presence of such observers would also, we believe, have a calming effect on the situation in the area and would make further incidents of the sort we are considering today less likely.

51. Scrupulous observance of the cease-fire by all the States concerned is vitally necessary on our road to progress in solving all of the complex problems facing the Middle East, and I trust that the Council will, without further delay, call for scrupulous observance by all concerned of the cease-fire orders of the Council, and endorse the Secretary-General's request.

52. I had hoped not to enter upon this subject, but because it has been mentioned, I must refer to the effort

being made now to use the outbreak of fighting that we are considering at this evening's meeting as an occasion for once again putting forward certain views on the question of the withdrawal of Israel troops. The withdrawal of forces—something which we support—is of course an important and essential part of any over-all peaceful solution of the problems of the area. But as the discussions last month in the Security Council and, more recently, the debates and the voting in the General Assembly have shown, a substantial body of world opinion supports the idea that withdrawal must be accompanied, at the very least, by a termination of any state of war and of any claims to the exercise of belligerent rights. In other words, we must have peace, total peace, in the area.

53. In this connexion, the President of the General Assembly, Ambassador Pazhwak, told the fifth emergency special session on 5 July that, in addition to wide agreement on the need for withdrawal, there existed in the Assembly "a broad consensus that the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of States allow them a rightful freedom from threat of belligerency".¹

54. In his statement to the Assembly on 4 July, the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, Ambassador Solomon, put the crux of the issue this way:

"... it is enough that a state of belligerency does exist and has been recognized to exist, and that in order that there should be peace it is essential—it is one of the preconditions of peace—that this state of belligerency should cease to exist. If in fact it were agreed that the forces that occupy foreign soil today should be asked to withdraw, what would there be to prevent the further outbreak of hostilities the moment either side should determine that the time was opportune? What guarantee is there, without a cessation of the state of belligerency, that hostilities, active hostilities, will not again result?

"No, it is unrealistic and impractical to ask for the withdrawal of troops and still to maintain firmly and irrevocably that a state of belligerency exists."²

55. Surely, the United Nations and all States Members of the United Nations, particularly the members of the Security Council itself, will continue to be preoccupied with the question of how the over-all peaceful solution for which all of us hope and which all of us fervently seek can be secured. No matter where the troops are facing each other, there will continue to be incidents unless there is an arrangement for a secure settlement. That has been the history of the past twenty years. That is why my country has emphasized that an over-all solution to the problems of the area is essential in the interests of the peace and security of all the countries concerned.

56. Tonight, however, we are charged with a more limited subject: the immediate question of how to deal with the incident of fighting which was reported in the area of the Suez Canal yesterday, and of how best to take steps which

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1549th meeting, para. 13.

² *Ibid.*, 1548th meeting, paras. 48 and 49.

will help to prevent further such incidents in the days ahead. And here we must, in my view and in the view of my delegation, be clear and unequivocal. We must call upon the parties scrupulously to observe the cease-fire, and we must endorse the wise counsel of the Secretary-General to dispatch observers to the scene to help implement the cease-fire orders of the Council.

57. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*translated from French*): I shall be brief. On behalf of my delegation I should like first to mention a few points. Ever since 5 June my delegation has been insisting that the cease-fire called for by the Security Council should be accompanied by the immediate withdrawal of Israel's forces. Unfortunately this has not happened and we are now meeting again to discuss the same problem.

58. I do not think that anyone here has any illusions about certain aspects of this problem. I should like to begin by mentioning one word which is habitually used here, namely, "belligerency". The fact is that, since the Israel aggression, some Arab territories have been occupied by Israel troops, and these troops after all the bargaining and manoeuvring which have taken place in the United Nations, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, have not only failed to halt their aggression but are continuing to annex Arab territories. Therefore I should like the Security Council to decide what the word "belligerency" means. In my delegation's opinion there cannot be belligerency on the part of an occupied country which is making every effort to expel the occupier. There is a tendency to say here that the state of belligerency by the Arab countries whose territories are occupied must be terminated. I wonder whether people are thinking about a utopia or whether there is any kind of logic in this idea. It is impossible to talk about belligerency to someone whose territory is occupied. When we demanded, on 5 June, that the Israel occupation troops should be forced to withdraw to the positions they were occupying on 4 June, we did so with the aim of helping to create a peaceful atmosphere in which the problem could be settled.

59. My delegation would like to point out that the bargaining to which I have already referred has made a laughing stock of this Council and of the United Nations; and, what is more, there is no use thinking—and I do not imagine that any one at this table really does think—that violations of the cease-fire will stop so long as Arab territories are occupied by foreigners. No, they will not. Let us be logical. How can you imagine that you can come and occupy my house and that I will stand there with my arms folded and let you get on with it? If I can, I shall throw you out; this is called self-defence and justice, not belligerency.

60. If the Council wants to be serious and to take decisions which are worthy of it, my delegation urges once again that efforts should be made to bring about the immediate withdrawal of the Israel troops to their positions of 4 June. Unless this withdrawal takes place, we shall continue to come here to discuss violations, and we shall be told again that the Arab States are belligerent. But no, because the Arab countries are occupied.

61. I should like to quote a short communiqué of today's date from the *Agence France-Presse*. It originates from Jerusalem, and reads as follows:

"The serious incidents which occurred on Saturday in the Suez Canal zone are part of a campaign inspired by the USSR to demonstrate that peace will be threatened as long as Israel troops remain on the present cease-fire lines. This is the opinion of political circles in Israel."

62. This is what Israel says. Israel knows this and I believe that everyone here knows it too. It is not an idea that can be attributed to any particular country. If we want peace, we must try to be logical; we must try to find paths which will lead us to justice and to a situation in which countries will be able to live in peaceful coexistence. But manoeuvrings will not help us to achieve any positive results; they will only make a laughing stock of us. I am sorry to have to say this to the Council, but it is the truth. The Council must have sufficient courage since, as I have already said, it is shameful and humiliating for the Council to remain inactive and not to be able to make a decision because X or Y does not want it to take such a decision.

63. As I said here earlier, we are waiting for the occupying Power to assume a position of strength from which it can impose its will on those whose territory it is occupying. No, this is not right. But everyone here should think about it carefully. It is not a question of defending the Arabs or any one else, though I should like to point out that the United Arab Republic, which has been attacked, is an African country. I am here in the Security Council as a representative from the African countries and I should be failing in my duty if I did not draw attention to each case in which an African country is deprived of its rights, its privileges and its sovereignty. This has happened in the present case, and it is shameful for us Africans around this table and for all Africans. People have been trying to treat us like small children ever since this affair began. Let us therefore be logical.

64. *The German Tribune* of 1 July 1967—that is, before the emergency session of the General Assembly which was convened to consider the problem we are now discussing—contained an article stating that it was not yet possible to foresee what vague resolution—yes, vague resolution—would emerge from the noble words and oratorical skirmishes of the General Assembly. If the person who wrote this on 1 July is not a prophet, then at least he is very intelligent, because indeed we have been going round in circles; no one has spoken of justice, and it has all been demoralizing and depressing. Nothing is more depressing than to see the right path and not be able to follow it. But this is what is happening with us.

65. I am sorry to say that for us, the African members of the Council, and for the African-Asians, the Latin Americans and all the under-developed countries, the spectacle we have witnessed is shameful, discouraging and demoralizing. We are not defending anyone, but we do have a duty to defend justice, or what we regard as justice. But in spite of all our efforts there are some occult powers which prevent us from achieving anything. We must reach agreement and make a choice.

66. I do not wish to continue these remonstrations but I should like to tell all the members of the Council that tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, or at some future date the Council is bound to have to meet again. I am not saying this as a prophet: I am merely being logical. This Council will be convened again for the same reason. And why? Because there will still be foreign troops on the territory of other countries.

67. As long as countries are occupied by foreigners, the peoples of these countries are bound to defend themselves against the occupiers. This is only natural; and in this connexion we should not speak of the belligerency of countries which are defending themselves against foreign occupation. I do not believe that anyone at this table would allow his territory or his house to be occupied by foreigners, or would argue that those whose territory is occupied should do nothing to defend themselves. That is not the way my delegation sees it, at least. Personally I should do everything in my power to throw out the occupier, and this would not be belligerency but legitimate self-defence.

68. I believe that one serious and honourable step which the Council can take is to recommend the withdrawal of Israel's forces to their positions of 4 June 1967 as soon as possible. This is the first positive and practical step which the Council can take; otherwise it will have to meet again—once, twice or even more—to discuss the same problem.

69. If you will allow me, Mr. President, I should like through you to ask for a suspension of the meeting under rule 33, sub-paragraph 1, of the provisional rules of procedure, since I am afraid I have spoken too long on this subject and I think that a suspension of the meeting might give us an opportunity to exchange ideas and perhaps arrive at some useful conclusion.

70. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the rule of procedure which the representative of Mali has cited, his motion should be put to the vote straight away, but I had arranged with the Secretary-General that he would put before the Council certain additional information which would supplement the statement he made yesterday. If the members of the Council are agreeable, we could first hear the Secretary-General, and then decide on the motion put before us by the representative of Mali.

71. There being no objection to the proposal I have made, I now ask the Secretary-General to make his statement.

72. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Members of the Council will recall that in my statement to the Council at its 1365th meeting of yesterday, 8 July, I pointed out that if there should be agreement on the stationing of United Nations observers to observe the cease-fire in the Suez sector, additional observers would have to be made available to the Chief of Staff, General Odd Bull.

73. I have since consulted General Bull and he has informed me that for the Suez sector his estimated need would be for an additional twenty-five observers who should be made available to him as soon as possible.

Pending the arrival of these additional observers, the Chief of Staff, if called upon to do so, can dispatch a small team of observers now on his staff to the Suez Canal area. They could institute patrols on both the United Arab Republic and the Israel sides of the front.

74. The observers operating in this area, of course, would have to have logistical support to be provided by the United Nations Field Service, including radio operators, transport and transport mechanics, supply, security and secretariat personnel. For immediate purposes, this could be provided from UNTSO's existing establishment.

75. United Nations observers have been serving in the Near East since 1948, when there were well over 700 as against the 133 now serving in the area. Wherever United Nations military observers have been employed, it has been established practice to have the approval of the Governments directly concerned—in the present case the Governments of Israel and the United Arab Republic—regarding the countries from which military observers for the particular operation may be drawn. That practice still continues.

76. The financial implications of such an increase can be made available to the Security Council later. It can be said now, however, that they would not be excessive.

77. The PRESIDENT: I wish to thank the Secretary-General for his statement. I come immediately to the motion that is before the Council. I should like to add the suggestion that we suspend for half an hour. If I hear no objection I shall take it that this is agreeable to members of the Council. Since there is no objection, the meeting is suspended for half an hour.

The meeting was suspended at 7.10 p.m. and resumed at 10.20 p.m.

78. The PRESIDENT: I now call on Ambassador Adib Daoudy, Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

79. Mr. DAOUDY (Syria): The new Israel acts of aggression which have been committed all through this week and which yesterday assumed larger dimensions, are not the first of their kind since the cease-fire, nor will they be the last. If any proof is required, it will be found in the events of 9, 10 and 11 June 1967, which engaged the uninterrupted attention of the Security Council and in which Israel carried through its defiance of the numerous cease-fire resolutions and persisted in its aggression against Syrian territory, in spite of Syria's acceptance of the cease-fire. The only verbal justification Israel falsely gave to the Council then was, as today, that the Arab side had violated the cease-fire. Israel's continued defiance was occurring during the very time of the meetings of the Security Council.

80. It is pertinent here to emphasize the fact that every inch of Syrian territory that was occupied by Israel forces was occupied after our acceptance of the cease-fire. It will also be recalled that this acceptance was officially communicated on the morning of 9 June, and that the Israel invasion stopped only on 11 June.

81. I am sure that all those who heard the Israel representative yesterday attempting to hold the United Arab Republic responsible for the non-observance of the cease-fire will remember that almost the same terms were used one month earlier, with this difference: that then it was Syria which was blamed. When we were informing the Council about the occupation by Israel forces of El Kuneitra and the bombardment of the Damascus area, the Israel representative repeatedly denied what was subsequently proved to be factual. This is not incidental to Israel conduct: one necessarily acquires the habit of falsehood after twenty years of contempt for the United Nations—which created Israel—utter cynicism and the misleading of world public opinion.

82. Now, what is behind this new aggression; and how does Israel dare to persist in this policy, which no impartial party not committed to Zionism can hesitate to describe as aggressive, expansionistic, and portending the gravest consequences for world peace? In our view, the answer lies in the impotency inflicted on this Organization, whether in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, which paralyses any action on its part in discharging its responsibilities provided for in the Charter, in fulfilling the clear duty of condemning the aggressor, compelling it to withdraw from the occupied territory, and eliminating the effects of that aggression. Let us hasten to say that had it not been for the attitude of the United States, and necessarily the attitude of those who embrace its policies in the Council and in the Assembly, the Organization would not have fallen victim to such paralysis.

83. As a necessary result of these attitudes and policies, overt or disguised, Israel developed this complex of being able to do what it wants. The purpose of its new aggressive action is equally obvious: Israel, with the protection of its supporters, is endeavouring to achieve, by further acts of war and invasion, its objectives in the Canal zone, thus creating a new situation and attempting to by-pass the General Armistice Agreements.

84. In this respect I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to an important question which has a direct bearing on the present situation. On 4 July, the Secretary-General distributed document S/7930/Add.20, under the title, "Supplemental information", in which he reproduced a letter addressed to him by the representative of Israel. The last paragraph of that letter reads as follows:

"It is understood that in the view of the Government of Israel, the sole function and concern of General Bull and his staff is with those cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council and no longer with the General Armistice Agreements and the now obsolete arrangements of the past." [See S/7930/Add.20, para. 3.]

Here the attention of the members of the Security Council is particularly drawn to that specific and revealing phrase, "obsolete arrangements of the past".

85. We, for our part, categorically reject such a unilateral interpretation of the task of UNTSO, and shall not recognize it. In our view, the United Nations machinery in

the area is still functioning in accordance with the appropriate resolutions of the Security Council concerning the armistice régime. We furthermore request the Secretary-General to take note of our stand on this question. Surely, the Security Council must share our concern over Israel's rejection of the United Nations machinery.

86. Referring to the proposal regarding the stationing of United Nations observers, we are of the opinion that their mission, temporary in nature since the forces of invasion must be withdrawn immediately, should be exercised within the framework of the General Armistice Agreements.

87. The Israel act of aggression in the Canal area comes in the wake of a series of acts of defiance of the world community. The Israel Defence Minister stated that his Government had decided to annex the Gaza Strip to Israel and that he considered it, as well as the western bank of the Jordan, to be integral parts of Israel's territory. How interesting to note the similarity between these Israel undertakings and the acts of the Nazi armies in the lands they occupied. Indeed we should not be surprised to hear very soon that the Israelis have appointed *Gauleiters* in those lands, as their Nazi predecessors did. The analogy between the acts of the Nazi army and the Zionists does not stop at such practices as blitz, panzer divisions, *Anschluss*, mass extermination and the installing of *Gauleiters*; the analogy extends to the practice of plundering the riches of the occupied countries, especially when it comes to historical treasures. We all still remember the plundering of museums by the German Army in occupied lands. Today history repeats itself, for we are witnessing a similar episode.

88. The Government of Israel is now undertaking excavations in the Syrian city of Banias in order to remove to Israel memorable archaeological finds whose origins go back to the first century A.D. We sincerely hope that world public opinion, especially Christian public opinion, will be moved by this alarming news, for it is well known to archaeologists and historians that Banias was the site of the very first Christian church and that its historical and archaeological treasures are invaluable. To this end the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. Tomeh, addressed a letter on 7 July 1967 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, from which I quote as follows:

"... the Israel occupying forces in Syrian territory have started excavations in the historic area of Banias searching for archaeological finds. Israel Radio confirmed this fact and announced that high Israel officials and archaeologists went to the Banias area to witness the excavations. Looting of this historical property has already started.

"...

"I would very much appreciate it if you would kindly take the necessary measures to prevent this international robbery contrary to all norms of decency and international law and the appropriate conventions for the protection of this human heritage, and in order to prevent this criminal assault on all these historic sites which are

rightly considered to be among the very first of Christianity in the world. . . ." [S/8040].

89. Another event of importance was revealed during this past week which corroborates the point of view put forward by us in the past. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall read out to members of the Council excerpts from a statement made by the Prime Minister of Israel concerning the deliberations which took place between his Government and President Johnson regarding the initiation of military hostilities against the Arab countries. Only yesterday, *The New York Times* published a very revealing statement, from which I quote the following excerpts:

"Mr. Eshkol acknowledged that he had put off military action at the request of President Johnson.

"But after the President of the United States requested whatever he requested," Mr. Eshkol said, "it was decided by an inner Cabinet group after consultation with leaders of Gahal and Rafi, who were then in opposition, to give him the requested respite.

"After I explained the President's request, all agreed that if President Johnson asked us to wait a few days, we should wait."

"Many of us thought we would perform a good deed for him if we acted," the Premier went on."

90. This statement by the Prime Minister of Israel explained the extent of the co-operation between the Governments of Washington and Tel-Aviv before, during and after the aggression. I wish, in this connexion, to draw the Council's attention to what Mr. Eshkol meant when he said: "Many of us thought we would perform a good deed for him if we acted." This is a decisive admission that Israel started the aggression and is an outright denial of all the assertions we have heard in this Council from the Israel representative and others to the effect that the Arab countries started the hostilities on 5 June. Mr. Eshkol's statement affirms unequivocally and without ambiguity the full co-ordination that existed between the Governments of the United States and Israel. It is no longer a secret that while these intrigues were under way, assurances were given to Arab leaders, on the highest diplomatic level, that Israel would not start a war against the Arab countries.

91. The responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the world lies with this Council collectively. One month has already passed since Israel committed its aggression against Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic, and yet nothing has been done by the Council to condemn the aggression and order the withdrawal of the occupying forces. This is because of the attitude of some of the members of the Council.

92. We believe that if the Council continues to remain silent about what has happened, the result will be an open invitation to aggressive forces the world over to carry out their pernicious designs against innocent peoples. Thus the rejoicing with which the European minority in Rhodesia received the news of the Israel invasion of the Arab

countries—as reported by the French press—illustrates what that aggressive régime considers to be the superiority of the white men over the coloured peoples. If that is the case, such an attitude would have dangerous results for mankind.

93. It is not repetitious to affirm once more, given the solemnity of the times, that we are living in a very dangerous period which compels every Member of the United Nations to put the interests of world peace based on justice above everything else. More and more voices are being heard, day after day, condemning the Israel aggression against the Arab countries.

94. Thus, speaking as a member of the General Board of the National Council of Churches, which represents virtually all United States Protestantism and which, in the past, supported Israel, the Very Reverend Henry P. Van Dusen, past president of the Union Theological Seminary, wrote in a letter to *The New York Times*, published on 7 July, the following:

"All persons who seek to view the Middle East problem with honesty and objectivity stand aghast at Israel's onslaught, the most violent, ruthless (and successful) aggression since Hitler's *Blitzkrieg* across Western Europe in the summer of 1940, aiming not at victory but at annihilation."

95. We believe that this fitting warning to the world community against the escalation of Israel aggression should be heeded, and that the Security Council should rise to the level of this ominous challenge.

96. The PRESIDENT: The next and last speaker on my list is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

97. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): We had reason to believe that Ambassador Fedorenko would be more austere in the use of invective and personal abuse. The world has watched Mr. Fedorenko's exercises in vituperation. We know what is the judgement of decent men all over the world. It is on record.

98. Ambassador Fedorenko, the great torch-bearer of the immaculate truth, had better concern himself with the impression which his outbursts of invective have left in the minds and feelings of multitudes of his listeners. According to Mr. Fedorenko, there is only one truth: the truth of Cairo and of Moscow. It is the truth that asserted that Israel aeroplanes had bombed the city of Cairo. It is the truth which claimed that Anglo-American forces had participated in the recent hostilities. It is the truth which the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party exposed as blatant falsehood.

99. It is obvious that Ambassador Fedorenko has a certain difficulty in concealing and controlling his unmitigated hatred for my nation and my people. His outburst of today, following his utterances on previous occasions, revealed the true nature of his thinking and sentiments. They do no honour either to him or to the great country he represents. They do no harm to my country, nor are we personally impressed by these aberrations. We are, however, impressed by what his colleague Mr. Roschin had to say about

personal abuse in United Nations debates. I quote a statement made by Ambassador Roschin in the First Committee of the General Assembly on 25 November 1966. He said:

"We cannot but regret that some representatives of the West, and especially the representative of the United Kingdom"—I apologize for having to say that, but it is Ambassador Roschin that I am quoting—"have come forward with polemical speeches containing personal attacks upon the representative of the Soviet Union to the United Nations, Mr. Fedorenko. Such personal attacks upon the representative of any country are, of course, quite out of order, and are surely not in keeping with the traditions that have been established in these halls in the discussion of substantial questions."³

In this case I am on the side of Mr. Roschin, and I hope that upon reflection Ambassador Fedorenko will agree that there can be only one law in the United Nations, one law in an Organization based on the sovereign equality of all its Members.

100. Before dealing with the substance of some of the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union, I wish to address myself to the matter for which the Security Council has been convened, upon the initiative of the United Arab Republic and of Israel.

101. The subjects under discussion are incidents on the Israel-Egyptian cease-fire line, and not on the Israel-Syrian cease-fire line, which fortunately has remained, by and large, quiet. At our last meeting I gave a detailed account of the recent incidents at Kantara and Ras El'Ish. The representative of the United Arab Republic has claimed that the cause for the Egyptian armed action was Israel's alleged intention to move beyond its present positions and to occupy Port Fuad. Israel has no such intentions. Israel's Defence Forces have strict orders to observe the cease-fire and to hold to their present positions.

102. Assuming that the Egyptian Government also is anxious to maintain the cease-fire, my Government wishes to propose that local Israel and United Arab Republic commanders in the area of the incidents should meet and agree upon appropriate arrangements to avoid breaches of the cease-fire in the future. Similar local arrangements are already in existence in the Port Said and Kantara areas in respect of civil affairs, such as the supply of water and the transfer of wounded military personnel and prisoners of war. These arrangements have worked to mutual satisfaction through the co-operation of the local authorities.

103. I come now to the observations made by the representative of the Soviet Union. His central theme and basic premise is that Israel has committed aggression, that Israel is an aggressor. Despite their incessant and persistent repetitions, the Soviet representatives have not obtained the support either of world opinion or of the United Nations itself for their unfounded charges. Indeed, the General

Assembly at its fifth emergency special session has rejected them by an overwhelming majority as recently as 4 July. The Security Council likewise did not adopt the Soviet thesis. The United Nations has refused to accept the Soviet contentions that Israel has committed an act of aggression. It has completely refused to endorse them, no matter how they were worded or who sponsored them. The General Assembly has rejected the original Soviet version; it has defeated the embroidered Cuban formulation; it said a decisive "no" to the valiant but not particularly inspiring Albanian attempt to rewrite contemporary history; it refused to support the Yugoslav-unaligned text, which was based on an artfully veiled premise that Israel had committed an act of aggression. Only on the basis of such an assumption can the demand for an immediate withdrawal of the Israel forces, without the renunciation by the Arab States of the state of war and without the termination of belligerency, be sustained.

104. The allegation of Israel aggression is a Soviet-Arab doctrine. It is not shared by the overwhelming majority of the United Nations, nor has it found any credibility in world opinion, including that of eminent personalities and so-called progressive groups which are usually in sympathy with the Soviet Union and its viewpoints. It is obvious why the Soviet representatives cling so stubbornly to their charges of Israel aggression. All their policy prescriptions for the Middle East are based on this premise. That premise having been found unacceptable, the whole structure of Soviet-Arab policies, which want to perpetuate the state of war, collapses.

105. Official and well-placed representatives of the Soviet Union had ample opportunity to examine the factual situation existing prior to the outbreak of hostilities. While Arab propaganda, for purposes of its own, had charged Israel with concentrating large forces along the Israel-Syrian border—allegations which were refuted not only by Israel but by the Secretary-General in an official report—the Soviet Union rejected the invitation of my Government to permit the Soviet Ambassador in Israel to investigate the situation on the spot. Complete freedom of access and all facilities were offered to him. Yet the Soviet Government, instead of agreeing to verify the facts, chose to support the Arab fiction.

106. President Nasser himself revealed in his speech of 9 June, in which he gave the first hint to his people of the military disaster that had befallen his army, that responsible Soviet leaders had at the end of April informed a visiting Egyptian parliamentary delegation that Israel had concentrated large forces on its northern borders and was about to attack Syria. As Nasser explained the course of events, this warning compelled him to dispatch massive forces to Israel's southern borders.

107. I was in Moscow at that time, and I encountered that Egyptian delegation on Red Square at the 1 May celebrations. I wish I had had the opportunity to talk to them. I would have extended to them the same invitation to verify the facts that my Government extended to the Soviet Ambassador in Israel. But they were exposed to Soviet admonitions and advice, the sole purpose of which was to advance Soviet political and strategic ambitions in the

³ This statement was made at the 1464th meeting of the First Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

Middle East, which apparently have not changed since the days of the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement, by which the Soviet Government obtained Nazi recognition of its expansionist designs extending as far as the Persian Gulf.

108. The Arab peoples have paid a heavy price for having been misled. Their leaders, in their blindness, have become a wilful but helpless tool in the game of big-Power politics. There is no jubilation in our hearts at the toll the Arab peoples had to pay for the folly of their leaders and the recklessness of their partners. Of course, we feel relieved and thankful that the very threat to our national existence has been removed by the valour of our army and the determination and sacrifice of our nation. But we had to pay a very heavy price for our deliverance and our survival in freedom.

109. For our own sake, and I dare say for the sake of the Arab people, we have to embark, all together, upon a forward-looking course. The fundamental change will not come about through the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel forces from the territory where they stand now as a result of Arab belligerence and hostility and as a protection against the renewal of hostilities. This change can be brought about only by Arab withdrawal from the fruitless policy of rancour, hostility and belligerence. The lesson of the month of June is not to withdraw to a state of affairs which has caused such terrible suffering to the peoples of the area and such concern to the peace-loving nations of the world; the lesson of the month of June is to go forward to the negotiation of a stable and secure peace between Israel and the Arab States.

110. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): I am advised that there is a prospect of reaching an agreement on a consensus on which all of us have been working. I therefore would propose, under rule 33 of our provisional rules of procedure, that we recess for ten minutes for consultations.

111. The PRESIDENT: The representative of India has proposed, under rule 33, that there be a recess for ten minutes. If there is no objection, I shall take it that this is agreeable to the Council. There being no objection, the meeting will be suspended for ten minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 10.55 p.m. and resumed at 12 midnight.

112. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Mr. President, I should like to associate my delegation with the felicitations extended to you by my colleagues who have spoken before me, on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council. It is a source of special pride and satisfaction to my delegation, particularly in view of the very close relations between our two countries and our personal regard for you, that the Council should have the benefit of your wise and dedicated leadership at this juncture. Representing as you do a great African nation, which has consistently played and continues to play a leading role in the resurgence of Africa, it is most fitting that you should guide the deliberations of the Council, particularly at a time when it is considering the serious situation in the Middle East, which is of great concern to all countries, especially to those in Africa and Asia. It is our

earnest hope that under your able Presidency, the Council will be able to complete its unfulfilled task in dealing with this serious situation.

113. We should also like to express our deep appreciation and regard for the diligence and high sense of duty with which Ambassador Tabor of Denmark conducted the meetings of this Council during the last few weeks, when the Council devoted considerable time and energy to the consideration of this difficult question. I should like to associate my delegation with the many statements made by previous speakers, in appreciation of Ambassador Tabor's able and efficient Presidency in trying circumstances.

114. The Security Council has met under the dark shadow of a renewed threat to the peace resulting from clashes in the sensitive area of the Suez Canal. So far as temporary measures like the sending of observers to this area are concerned, my delegation has no objection. We approve of the suggestions made by the Secretary-General in his two reports in this respect. But the problem of restoration of peace in the Middle East has to be dealt with in a more fundamental way.

115. Members of the Council will recall the great difficulties which the Council experienced in effecting a cease-fire, which was brought about only after insistent demands for a cease-fire in three resolutions of the Council.

116. In its resolution 236 (1967), the Council reaffirmed its demand for a cease-fire and discontinuance of all military activities, including a prohibition of any forward military movements. From the very beginning of the outbreak of hostilities, my delegation has taken the position that the call for a cease-fire must be coupled with a provision for immediate withdrawal of armed forces. It has been our judgement, and events have proved it to be true, that it is much more difficult, if not impossible, to ensure a total cessation of hostilities without simultaneous withdrawal.

117. Since the last cease-fire resolution [236 (1967)] of the Council was passed, nearly four weeks ago, we have received a number of reports of incidents and clashes between the Israel and Arab forces. It is not only on the territory of the United Arab Republic but also in Syria that violations of the cease-fire have taken place. I need refer only to paragraph 2 of General Bull's report of 7 July [S/7930/Add.21] which shows that Israel troops opened fire against Syrian military positions on 6 July.

118. Are we to look helplessly at the situation and wait for a settlement of all the complicated issues before taking action to prevent another conflagration? No, we cannot go from cease-fire to cease-fire, nor periodically merely reaffirm our decisions regarding the cease-fire.

119. I should like to recall in this context my statement in the Security Council on 11 June, in which I said:

"... we shall have to take more far-reaching steps, the most important of which would be to order an immediate withdrawal of all forces to the positions they occupied on 4 June 1967. Unless we take that step immediately, we

shall be faced every day with situations like the ones we have had to deal with in the last few days." [1357th meeting, para. 172.]

120. As the Council is aware, the series of cease-fire resolutions was predicated on a clear understanding that this was to be only the first step. As I have stated earlier, the Council must now take the next step, which is to call upon Israel to withdraw immediately all its armed forces to the positions they occupied prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

121. At the same time, my delegation believes that the Secretary-General should be requested to take steps to strengthen the United Nations machinery existing in the area, with a view to arresting deterioration of the situation, securing withdrawal of Israel forces, and ensuring strict observance of the General Armistice Agreements by all the parties concerned. My delegation is also in favour of the Secretary-General designating a special representative to go to the area for these purposes and to help bring about reduction in tension and restoration of peaceful conditions, and to report to the Security Council.

122. Our deliberations in the Security Council and in the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly have once again reaffirmed certain fundamental principles. Our discussions have shown that the overwhelming majority of Member States agree that no dispute should be settled through the use of force. It is also generally recognized that Member States have an obligation to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of other States. It is on the basis of these twin principles that the Council should proceed to give urgent consideration to the problems of West Asia and seek solutions within the framework of the sovereignty of the States concerned. It is only by such a concerted approach that the Council can facilitate the transition from conflict to peace.

123. But I repeat that, unless we decide to order withdrawal of the intruding armed forces, there can be no progress towards the objective of peace which we all earnestly desire.

124. What I have outlined above is the basic approach of my delegation, for the acceptance of which we shall plead and press, whether the matter is considered in the Security Council or in the General Assembly.

125. The PRESIDENT: Since there are no more speakers on my list for this meeting, with the permission of the Council I shall present what I consider to be a consensus of the views of the members:

"Recalling Security Council resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June, 234 (1967) of 7 June, 235 (1967) of 9 June and 236 (1967) of 11 June 1967, and emphasizing the need for all parties to observe scrupulously the provisions of these resolutions, having heard the statements made by the Secretary-General and the suggestions he has addressed to the parties concerned, I believe that I am reflecting the view of the Council that the Secretary-General should proceed, as he has suggested in his statements before the Council on 8 and 9 July 1967, to request the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, General Odd Bull, to work out

with the Governments of the United Arab Republic and Israel, as speedily as possible, the necessary arrangements to station United Nations military observers in the Suez Canal sector under the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization."

126. I believe that the statement which I have just read represents the consensus of the views of the Council members.

127. Since I hear no objection, I declare the consensus accepted by the Council.

It was so decided.

128. I cannot allow this moment of accord in the Security Council to pass without giving expression to what, I am sure, is a common feeling of satisfaction on the part of all members at the decision which we have just adopted.

129. The task of peace-keeping is hard, slow and often painful, but in this endeavour every positive step counts and helps to prepare the way for more positive achievements. Every move forward, however small it may be, and however small it may seem compared with the high objectives ahead, is none the less a welcome pointer to the final goal and is a sign of progress in the right direction on the way to that peace with justice which it is our challenge and responsibility to achieve.

130. The step that we have just taken today makes the previous cease-fire decisions more complete and more effective in their over-all application. The nature of today's decision and the common accord that accompanied it can augur well for our ceaseless efforts to achieve genuine peace in this troubled region, but this will be possible only if we are willing to work diligently, with courage, common accord and imagination.

131. The biggest hindrance to peace and the sure obstacle to its fruitful progress is a state of stalemate. Our common objective should therefore be to get things moving surely and constructively and with that reasonable speed which is compatible with the common accord that is so essential a factor in the effectiveness of the Security Council.

132. Before I conclude, I feel duty bound to thank the Secretary-General in the name of the Council for the useful initiative which he took in this regard. I wish to assure the Secretary-General of the Council's full support in all his efforts to carry out the task entrusted to him. I also wish to express, through him, the Council's appreciation and gratitude to General Bull and the United Nations personnel serving under him for the excellent peace-keeping job they are doing on behalf of the United Nations.

133. I wish, in conclusion, to appeal to the parties concerned to give to the Secretary-General their full support and whole-hearted co-operation both in ensuring full compliance with the Council's decisions and by extending, wherever necessary, such facilities as the Secretary-General or his personnel may require in the performance of their peace-keeping duties in the area. Again I thank my colleagues for their understanding and co-operation.

The meeting rose on Monday, 10 July, at 12.20 a.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 Организация Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в нашем 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.
