



UN/SA COLLECTION
**SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1371st MEETING: 25 October 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1371)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8207);	
(b) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8208)	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 SEVENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York, on Wednesday, 25 October 1967, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Senjin TSURUOKA (Japan).

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/1371)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8207);
 - (b) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8208).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8207);
- (b) Letter dated 24 October 1967 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8208)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 1369th meeting, and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic to take places at the Council table and to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. Rafael (Israel), Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic), Mr. A. M. Rifa'i (Jordan) and Mr. A. Daoudy (Syria) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Security Council will now continue its discussion of the item on the agenda. I apologize for such a long delay but, as a result of the consultations which took place this morning and this afternoon, following the adjournment of our last meeting, I am happy to be able to announce that agreement has been reached on the text of a draft resolution.

3. The draft resolution reads as follows:

[The speaker continued in English.]

"The Security Council,

"Gravely concerned over recent military activities in the Middle East carried out in spite of the Security Council resolutions ordering a cease fire,

"Having heard and considered the statements made by the parties concerned,

"Taking into consideration the information on the said activities provided by the Secretary-General in documents S/7930/Add.43, Add.44, Add.45, Add.46, Add.47, Add.48 and Add.49,

"1. Condemns the violations of the cease fire;

"2. Regrets the casualties and loss of property resulting from the violations;

"3. Reaffirms the necessity of the strict observance of the cease-fire resolutions;

"4. Demands of the Member States concerned to cease immediately all prohibited military activities in the area, and to co-operate fully and promptly with the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization."

[The speaker resumed in French.]

4. I should like to know if there is any objection to priority being given to the draft resolution which I have just read out. Since there is no objection, I take it that the Council has decided to give priority in the voting to this draft resolution and I now put it to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.¹

5. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now call upon the Secretary-General, who wishes to make a statement.

6. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have taken particular note of the expressions in the course of the current debate relating to the possible strengthening of the United Nations

¹ See resolution 240 (1967).

Observer Operation in the Suez Canal sector. I too have been giving some thought to this matter for some time because, in view of the number and serious nature of the breaches of the cease-fire—which has been called for by the Security Council—since the observers have been stationed in the sector in pursuance of the Security Council's consensus of 9/10 July 1967 [S/8047],² it has become increasingly apparent that the operation needs strengthening in certain ways.

7. At present there are forty-three United Nations observers stationed in the canal sector. They man nine observation posts and engage in limited patrolling in jeeps. They have no means of observing by air or sea and their mobility is limited. The canal itself is about eighty-eight miles long and the observers must be deployed on both sides, on its east and west banks.

8. I am in the process of consulting with General Bull, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, on means of enabling the Observer Operation in the canal sector to become more fully effective in maintaining the cease-fire. It is immediately apparent that steps along the following lines are necessary if proper effect is to be given to the Council's consensus.

- (1) To increase the number of observers to ninety in order to increase substantially the patrolling function and the number of observation posts. Such an increase, of course, would require expanding, in consultation with the parties, the national distribution of the observers.
- (2) To double the number of observation posts on each bank of the canal, which means increasing the present total from nine to eighteen.
- (3) To acquire and make use of possibly as many as four small patrol crafts for United Nations observers patrolling in the waters of the canal, the Bitter Lakes and adjacent waters.
- (4) To acquire and use four small helicopters with operational and maintenance personnel for the purpose of increasing the mobility of the observers and for aerial observation, two to be stationed on each bank of the canal.

9. More specific requirements and details will result from the consultations now under way with the Chief of Staff and will be reported in due course. All such measures, of course, would relate exclusively to the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions and its consensus, and therefore would necessarily be of a provisional and temporary nature. The strengthening of the Observer Operation in the Suez sector along the lines thus indicated would entail, of course, a substantial increase in the cost of the operations beyond the estimated cost set out in my report of 4 October [S/8182]. The estimated financial implications will be submitted to the Council as soon as the necessary calculations are completed.

10. Because the observers in the Suez sector have on several occasions been caught in exchanges of fire between

the two sides it is being contemplated, on the suggestion of the Chief of Staff, General Bull, that body armour to protect the upper torso, in addition to the steel helmets already in use, should be provided to the observers. The cost for that item would not be great.

11. May I take this occasion also to call to the attention of the members of the Council that in the absence of any Security Council action, such as its resolution 236 (1967) adopted on 12 June relating to the Syrian sector and its consensus of 9/10 July relating to the Suez Canal sector, there is no United Nations observation operation beyond token representation in the Israel-Jordan and Israel-Lebanon sectors. Thus for those sectors there is at present no machinery to assist in implementing the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions 233 (1967) and 234 (1967) of 6 and 7 June, which apply to all sectors.

12. Naturally I shall seek and expect the full co-operation of the parties in these measures to strengthen the cease-fire operation and make it more effective.

13. Mr. LIU (China): When I inscribed my name on the list of speakers this morning I intended only to make some general observations, after listening to the many statements made last night. Now, after the initiative taken by the representative of Nigeria with his statement this morning [1370th meeting], with which I was in agreement, and after the happy result which has emerged during the recess, I find it unnecessary, indeed redundant, to make those general observations.

14. I should like, however, if you will permit me, Mr. President, to take this opportunity to offer to you the best wishes of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency at this critical hour. I know of few men better equipped, by both diplomatic experience and juridical acumen, to deal with a situation such as that with which the Council is confronted today. I know also how energetically you have been working in the past weeks in search of a formula for the preservation of peace in the Middle East. It is regrettable that the intensive and constructive consultations which you have been carrying on have been overtaken by events which cannot but aggravate an already highly intense and explosive situation.

15. My delegation, in common with others, profoundly regrets the heavy losses of life and property which have resulted from breaches of the cease-fire which, in our view, can have no justification in any circumstances. My delegation therefore welcomes and whole-heartedly endorses the resolution which the Council has just adopted. It is the least the Council should and must do as a first and essential step in the present crisis, for unless the cease-fire is scrupulously observed and respected a climate conducive to political settlement cannot be created. It is the fervent hope of my delegation that the resolution unanimously adopted by the Council will help to restore tranquillity in the Middle East and prevent a renewal of hostilities, thus paving the way for a durable settlement.

16. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Syria to make a statement.

² Incorporated in the record of the 1366th meeting of the Council. See also *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1967 pp. 6-7.*

17. Mr. DAOUDY (Syria): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to take the floor. You may remember that I had asked to speak this morning before the motion of suspension was presented. Nevertheless my delegation is of the opinion that our point of view regarding the Israel aggression against the United Arab Republic should be put on record, despite the lateness of the hour.

18. While the United Nations was celebrating yesterday, 24 October, its twenty-second birthday with music and an appeal for more harmony among the peoples of the world, and while most governments and nations were in their respective territories rejoicing on that occasion, and manifesting the hopes of mankind, the Israel occupying forces were giving, on the same day and inside Arab territory, their own version of a celebration of the birthday of the United Nations, which had given birth to Israel, by the destruction of Arab lands, the mass killing of Arab civilians, the razing to the ground of industrial installations, and the sowing of havoc, terror, death and annihilation, all in execution of a well-conceived plan which falls within the pattern of war crimes for which the Zionist Israelis are now world-famous.

19. Indeed, the Defense Minister of Israel himself, General Moshe Dayan, referring to the sinking of the destroyer *Eilat* in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic and announcing his new plans for bloody revenge, stated: "We shall know how to consider the actions, step by step." And on the night of 22 October an Israel military analyst ended his commentary on the same event, over Radio Israel, by recalling that: "Israel has never failed sooner or later to settle her accounts."

20. Thus the stage was set by Israel warmongers for the massacre of 24 October, the birthday of the United Nations. Reports in the Press today give an idea of the extent of the damage to civilian life and property caused by that wanton aggression. If there is any doubt about the responsibility for that premeditated aggression, representatives have all read and some have quoted, while unfortunately others have ignored, what was reported by the Secretary-General on 24 October:

"Observation post (OP) Mike at Port Tawfiq reported that Israel Defence Forces initiated artillery fire at 1231 hours GMT, 24 October, at oil refinery south-west of Port Suez." [S/7930/Add.44.]

21. In the same report we are informed by the Secretary-General that:

"At 1235 hours GMT, cease-fire proposal for 1330 hours GMT was made. UAR accepted at 1300 hours GMT; Israel stated communications were distorted and cannot confirm. At 1325 hours GMT senior Israel representative stated he received distorted message from Israel Defence Forces headquarters that Israel would agree to cease-fire at 1530 hours GMT." [Ibid.]

22. The inherent sadism of this stand, so typical of Zionist behaviour, need hardly be emphasized, for on the morning of 5 June the Israel system of communication proved itself deadly accurate during the Israel attack on Arab countries.

Were the Israelis, in their sneak attack, unable yesterday to communicate an order to their commanding officer to accept a cease-fire? Two hours were indeed needed to complete to the full their plan for destruction, annihilation and mass killing. The only thing which has not been reported in the Press is that the great Rabbi of the "new Israel" did not blow the horn addressing prayers for this new victory over the Arabs.

23. As is customary, and following the usual pattern, the Israel representative launched an appeal for peace with the Arab States. He said:

"Israel again declares that it is ready right here and now, tonight, under this very roof, to meet representatives of the United Arab Republic and of any other Arab State and to discuss with them all measures designed to ensure security for all and to lay the basis for a peaceful future." [1369th meeting, para. 35.]

24. I shall not use my own words to expose the hypocrisy and utter cynicism of the Israel representative. Suffice it to mention here that such appeals are always made at gunpoint and under conditions of conquest and duress. But the final, definitive and convincing answer to Mr. Rafael comes from the lips of his own Prime Minister. On 20 October, *Le Monde*, under the headline "Mr. Levi Eshkol rejects the idea of negotiations with the United Arab Republic through the Mixed Armistice Commission", reported the following:

"'Israel is not in favour of "reviving" the Israel-Egyptian Mixed Armistice Commission'. Mr. Eshkol was here referring to a statement by Sir Dingle Foot, the former United Kingdom Minister, in which he said that President Nasser would be ready to undertake negotiations with the Israel representatives within the Commission. 'We have no intention of resurrecting the dead,' the Israel Prime Minister said.

"...

"There is no question of Israel accepting the bargain proposed by the Arabs: to withdraw the Israel troops from the occupied territories in exchange for an end to hostilities. 'The cessation of a state of belligerency, which in itself constitutes a hostile and illegal act, does not deserve any special reward,' Mr. Eshkol said. He added, 'My reply to all these proposals is therefore negative. We emerged victorious from a war which was imposed upon us. To propose the withdrawal of our troops in exchange for the cessation of the state of war is to propose rewarding those who have committed a hostile and illegal act.'"³

Those words speak for themselves: the rejection of the United Nations machinery still in force, rejection of all efforts at peace, and a new doctrine of belligerency; the Israelis, having practised acts of belligerency for the last twenty years, now formulate their wars into a doctrine.

25. When the destroyer *Eilat* was sunk within the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic and some of

³ Quoted in French by the speaker.

its crew were killed or were not found, a great deal of publicity was given to that incident so as to arouse the humanitarian feelings of American public opinion. The representative of the United Arab Republic told us yesterday that his country indicated to United Nations authorities its readiness to help to rescue the survivors. Victims are to be regretted anywhere, from any cause. But one fact struck our attention, and that was that when the American ship *Liberty* was attacked, its sailors assassinated by the Israel air force and by torpedo boats, the same media of information, together with some other quarters, hushed the news and played it down in a way diametrically opposed to what they have done with regard to the sinking of the *Eilat*. One wonders what the reason is for this discrimination. Are the missing Israel sailors whose ship was engaged in an aggressive mission, to be mourned in this country while its own sons, killed in cold blood by Israel military forces, are passed over in inexplicable silence?

26. The Israel representative in his statement yesterday referred to the fact that the destroyer *Eilat* was hit twice and became disabled when the third and fourth hits came through. He alluded to the fact that the destroyer was in no position to continue its journey when it had been sunk. It is clear that the Egyptian authorities, while engaging in defensive activities against a naval craft which had previously sunk some of their boats, were not in a position to ascertain the outcome of the battle. What about the tens of thousands of Egyptian soldiers in the aftermath of the June war who struggled for days and days in the waterless desert without being helped or rescued by the Israel helicopters and aircraft which were circling over their heads and, in some instances, strafing them?

27. The Israel representative in the same statement quoted, among other things, Damascus Radio as calling on the Arab people to resist Israel occupation of Arab land. Does it surprise the Tel Aviv authorities that the Arabs are determined to resist foreign occupation of their territory? Is it an unusual phenomenon in the history of peoples the world over that foreign occupation should be resisted and condemned? How many peoples whose representatives are sitting around this table were part of the valiant resistance movements which arose during the Second World War to combat the Nazi occupation? Do I have to mention here the fact that the heroic peoples of the Soviet Union, France, Bulgaria, Denmark, and, before them, Ethiopia, gave the world a magnificent lesson on how to resist occupation and liberate their homeland? The Arabs are no different, and will never be different, and their resistance will not cease until their occupied territory is cleared of the invading troops whose presence and method are reminiscent of the fascist occupation of Ethiopia and the Nazi German occupation of European countries.

28. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In its statement at the emergency meeting of the Security Council on 24 October [1369th meeting], the Soviet delegation had the opportunity to express its views on the new serious violation by Israel's forces of the Security Council decisions on the cease-fire in the Suez area. We now consider it necessary fully to reaffirm that position.

29. As members of the Council will recall, the Soviet delegation yesterday submitted its own draft resolution [S/8212], which we consider fully justified and appropriate in view of the new acts of provocation by Israel. However, we did not oppose the draft resolution submitted earlier by you, Mr. President [para. 3], since we realized the need to meet the wishes of some members who thought that the Council should produce a unanimous decision.

30. Since the Security Council has unanimously adopted a resolution on the question raised by the United Arab Republic, there is no need to put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The nature and meaning of the decision which the Security Council has just taken are quite clear, and it requires no lengthy comment. Firstly, it condemns the violation of the cease-fire. Of course, no one is in any doubt as to what violations are meant or who committed them: it was Israel, and Israel alone, and no one else, which deliberately and arrogantly violated the decisions of the Security Council regarding the cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities.

31. The Security Council in fact convened an urgent meeting last night for the very purpose of considering the new act of aggression committed by Israel in the Suez area, which resulted in heavy casualties and serious damage in the United Arab Republic. The Council has quite rightly expressed its regret about this matter in the decision it has just taken, although we have always thought from the very beginning, and we do now, that the Council should condemn these barbarous acts committed by Israel's armed forces and should demand compensation for the tremendous losses sustained by the United Arab Republic.

32. The fact that the Council's decision applies only to the Israel invaders is quite clear from the reports submitted by the Secretary-General of our Organization.

33. At the 1369th meeting of the Council, the Israel representative, followed by certain other members of the Council, attempted to build some sort of story around the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Eilat*. Such stories are only possible under the cover of darkest night. Now that the Council has before it the Secretary-General's report [S/7930/Add.49], it is quite clear that once again Israel, and Israel alone, bears full responsibility for the crime and that it was Israel which violated the Security Council decision by sending its destroyer into the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic.

34. The Secretary-General's report states that the vessel *Eilat* "was 11 nautical miles in north-eastern direction from Port Said" [*ibid.*], that is to say, within the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic. In this connexion it should be recalled that in resolution 236 (1967), adopted on 12 June 1967, the Security Council affirmed that "its demand for a cease-fire and discontinuance of all military activities includes a prohibition of any forward military movements subsequent to the cease-fire".

35. It is quite clear that this applies fully to the Israel naval vessel sent forward into the territorial waters of the

United Arab Republic, an act of provocation. The legitimacy of the actions taken by the United Arab Republic forces to defend that State's sovereign interests and security is just as clearly demonstrated.

36. So the attempts of certain representatives to shield the aggressor—and this is borne out in the documents—are now completely unmasked, and all the statements of the Israel representative are, as was to be expected, falsehoods from start to finish.

37. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation considers it its duty to point out yet again to the Security Council that there can be no peace in the Middle East so long as Israel's aggressive forces continue to occupy the territory of the Arab States.

38. As the situation in the Suez Canal area and on the Israel-Syrian and the Israel-Jordanian fronts becomes more tense, the Security Council has a duty seriously to consider the need for prompt political settlement in the Middle East.

39. It is a matter for deep regret that so far neither the Security Council nor the General Assembly has taken the decisions necessary to liquidate the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States. At the same time it should be noted that the majority of the members of the Security Council have indicated in their statements that the situation in the Middle East is extremely tense and that all efforts should be devoted to restoring peace and a normal state of affairs.

40. It can therefore be deduced that there is an almost unanimous feeling that consultations must be speeded up with a view to working out a decision which will lead to a political settlement in the Middle East and guarantee peace and the lawful rights of peoples.

41. Of course, the Soviet delegation did not fail to take note of the statement which the Secretary-General has just made to the Council and we, who share his concern about the complex situation in that area, are ready to give all due attention to the considerations which he put forward.

42. We also note the Secretary-General's statement that there are many details on which we do not as yet have reports. Moreover, we think it should be emphasized that the question of increasing the number of observers must be examined by the Council in accordance with the terms of reference granted it under the Charter. We refer to the statement made by the Secretary-General concerning the increase of the number of United Nations observers in the Suez Canal area and other measures to verify compliance with Security Council decisions regarding the cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities.

43. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): It is a positive achievement of the Council that it has gone on record today, as my delegation urged last night [*1369th meeting*], to reaffirm the cease-fire orders of the Council and to demand mutual and scrupulous adherence by the parties to the cease-fire and an end to all military activities between them. The Council has also acted with vigour and wisdom in condemning all violations of the cease-fire—not

only because they are violations of our resolutions, but also because they delay our efforts to make a further step towards peace in the area and prejudice them.

44. Once again, and rightly so, the Council has refused to take a one-sided view of the situation or to adopt one-sided resolutions. Instead, we have dealt in a balanced, even-handed manner with incidents involving two of the parties in the area. The resolution fully meets the spirit, language and intent of our draft resolution of yesterday [*S/8213*] which, as a result, need not be acted upon. We are gratified that this agreement among all members of the Council has been possible.

45. We continue to believe that the events of the last few days are tragic in themselves and have a much greater significance. As I stated to the Council last night, these events underscore what we have all known for a long time: that what the Near East needs is not just a cease-fire, essential though it is, but new steps towards a durable, permanent and just peace.

46. We join in the demand that the incidents which gave rise to the last two Council meetings will not be repeated, and again express the conviction that this Council must begin promptly to help move towards a just settlement of all of the outstanding questions between the parties. And we believe that in some of the statements that were made last night there is the framework by which such a settlement can be concluded.

47. We take note of the constructive statements of the Secretary-General today in announcing his willingness to take appropriate steps to strengthen the Observer Operation in the canal sector in order to make it more fully effective in maintaining the cease-fire. We regard the steps he has announced that he will take to be fully in accord with his responsibilities to strengthen UNTSO and in full keeping with his established authority under the Charter and established practices of the United Nations. We, therefore, fully support this initiative, so necessary if we are to move to conditions of peace in the area.

48. Reference has been made to the Press coverage in my country. I reject completely the statement that our free Press does not cover all incidents and events in the area fully and objectively. We have only to look at the headlines and the copy of yesterday and today, as well as past coverage of all events, to disprove this statement. We will place our Press, for its objectivity, against the Press of any nation in the world. We Americans place great stock in our free Press, for with us freedom of speech and of the Press is the matrix of all of our liberties. Thomas Jefferson, one of our greatest presidents, once said that if we had to choose between a free Press and government, a free Press is to be preferred. Fortunately, in the United States, we do not have to make this choice. We have both a freely selected government and a free Press, and take pride in both.

49. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): During last night's debate members of the Council were virtually unanimous in asserting that this was not the time to pursue recriminations and acrimony. At the end of my statement yesterday [*1369th meeting*], I expressed the same sentiment, and I

suggested a positive and constructive approach designed to ensure security for all.

50. In that spirit, I will not deign to answer the slanderous allegations poured out by the representative of Syria. They are as stale as they are false, they are as vile as they are perverse. A representative of a country whose leaders in the Second World War were among the most ardent Nazi collaborators, who had worked and prayed for the Nazi victory, comes here to praise the valiant anti-Nazi resistance fighters. This is the height of perversity and it is a low in defilement of the resistance fighters as well as the Nazi victims. I am obliged, however, to the Syrian representative for having repeated my appeal for a peaceful meeting between Israel and Arab representatives. I would have preferred that instead of referring to my appeal the representative of Syria had responded to it.

51. Neither will I argue here, at this hour, with Ambassador Fedorenko, whose monolithic and one-sided views of events are by now a well-established tradition.

52. I have asked to speak at this stage simply to comment on certain statements which do not conform with the facts. Regarding yesterday's incident, it was alleged that the reports of General Bull established that Israel forces were the first to open fire. I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to paragraph 4 of General Bull's report which states that: "At about 1430 hours local time (1230 hours GMT), small arms fire was opened by UAR forces"—towards Israel positions—"toward the area of the Mitla road junction." [S/7930/Add.45.] It is the usual practice of the observers to communicate these reports even when they have themselves been unable to observe that there has been a breach of the cease-fire. In many instances reports originating exclusively with the United Arab Republic authorities have been thus transmitted to the Security Council. I refer, for instance, to the exchange of firing on 27 September reported in document S/7930/Add.40, based on a United Arab Republic communication, on which General Bull commented that the origin of the fire was not observed by the United Nations military observers.

53. Since the July meetings of the Security Council a number of incidents have been reported which establish that the United Arab Republic has opened fire mostly from positions inside urban areas and has provoked heavy artillery duels. Basing myself on Egyptian communiqués, United Arab Republic artillery was heavily engaged in yesterday's action. And going by their unsubstantiated accounts of damage inflicted on Israel, there is no doubt that very heavy and substantial United Arab Republic forces were involved in yesterday's action.

54. It has been argued that Israel was at fault in not agreeing to put the cease-fire into force at the hour proposed. There is nothing unusual about it. There are a number of General Bull's reports in the records of the Security Council which show that the United Arab Republic refused to accept the time proposed for the cease-fire by the observers and, what is more serious, continued firing after the agreed hour. The reason given for the default, and accepted by the United Nations observer,

was difficulties of communication with forward units. The delay in effecting the cease-fire yesterday at the hour proposed by the United Nations observer was due to the fact that a communications centre of the Israel forces had been hit early at the beginning of yesterday's incidents, thus interrupting communications with command posts of several units.

55. With regard to the sinking of the destroyer *Eilat*, it has been alleged here that it was inside the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic. We have already given the vessel's position and that can easily be checked. The representative of India referred to forward military movements subsequent to the cease-fire but, as is well known and not denied by anybody, the vessel was immobilized and crippled after it was first hit and was not capable of any movement in any direction. There cannot be any explanation whatsoever for the cowardly second missile strike, except that it was prompted by deliberate aggressive intention. Contrary to the allegations of the representative of the United Arab Republic, the *Eilat* was not speeding towards Port Said and was not in the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic when it was first attacked. It was on its normal patrol on the high seas, following a routine course well known to the United Arab Republic authorities.

56. This morning the representative of Nigeria suggested [1370th meeting] that further investigation could be useful to determine the vessel's position when it was sunk. I have not heard any similar suggestion from the representative of the United Arab Republic, but if such an investigation is desired my Government is prepared to co-operate fully in it. My Government is confident that such an investigation will corroborate that the ship was sunk on the high seas.

57. The United Arab Republic has furnished no reasonable explanation for this outrageous attack on an Israel vessel. It has given no convincing reason why its armed forces struck the ship with their first missile and then deliberately returned to the attack an hour and a half later when the ship was already helpless. The true explanation the United Arab Republic has published in its Press and radio, that this attack was a part of the continued Egyptian warfare against Israel.

58. I wish to reiterate here in this Council that it is the firm policy of my Government to see this warfare stopped. We have accepted the cease-fire resolutions. Their very basis is mutuality and reciprocity. If the cease-fire is observed on this premise, it can be the point of departure on the road to a durable peace.

59. Mr. DAOUDY (Syria): The representative of the United States referred to the Press in the United States and expressed pride in its coverage and what he called "its independence". It is natural that Mr. Goldberg should take pride in the coverage by his country's Press if he is so happy about it. But one point remains unanswered and that is the fact that the New York Press, at least, hush-hushed the Israel attack against the ship *Liberty* during the June war, an attack which resulted in the killing of over forty American sailors. We would very much like to know what was the result of the inquiry, if there was any. This question remains valid because Mr. Goldberg in one of his statements promised us the result of the inquiry.

60. As for the representative of the Israel hordes, let me remind him of what a famous Jewish author said about the criminal behaviour of the Israel authorities towards the Arab people. Mr. Moshe Menuhin, father of the famous violinist Yehudi Menuhin, wrote a very well-known letter in which he commented on the killing of the Arabs by the Israelis and said—I am paraphrasing—that his Judaism was not the Judaism of the napalm bomb and mass extermination.

61. As for the ridiculous accusation that the leaders of Syria collaborated with the Nazis during the Second World War, I should like to refresh the memory of this gentleman. Syria was not independent during the Second World War, we were under French Mandate. So there was no point in saying that we collaborated with Germany. I wish to remind him that it was Winston Churchill himself who for the first time in history compared the Zionists with the Nazis. Winston Churchill, who was considered a very great Zionist, when they announced to him the killing of Lord Moyne coined that statement. He said "They are behaving like Nazis" and we maintain that description.

62. The PRESIDENT: As no other representatives have indicated their wish to speak at this time I should now like to make a brief statement in my capacity as representative of JAPAN.

63. The Japanese Government has followed very closely and with increasingly grave concern the repeated firing incidents in the Suez Canal area during the past few months. These incidents have taken place in contravention of the cease-fire resolutions adopted by the Council. In the interval since then, no progress has been made towards the establishment of a permanent and just peace in the Middle East.

64. Those sporadic incidents culminated in full-scale military operations on 21 and 24 October and, seemingly, have not yet come to a complete halt. It is particularly regrettable that this most recent exchange of major military hostilities should have taken place while the non-permanent members of the Council were engaged in intensive efforts, in consultations among themselves and with others, to find an acceptable formula for the comprehensive solution of the various problems that are involved in the Middle East conflict. The details of these deplorable incidents of the past few days have been clearly explained in the Secretary-General's notes based on the information supplied by General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of UNTSO. To General Bull and his co-workers striving to maintain the cease-fire in the field we owe a debt of gratitude.

65. My delegation is happy with the resolution that was adopted unanimously a little while ago. But once more this is only a first step. The clear duty of the Security Council at this juncture is to measure up to its solemn responsibilities by finding that formula which, acceptable to the parties concerned, will establish a durable and just peace in the Middle East. While the Council is engaged in this task, scrupulous observance by the parties of the cease-fire is essential. The sad fact that more blood is now being shed

and more life lost as a result of the long-standing conflict in the Middle East points up most eloquently the urgent task still confronting the Security Council.

66. The Council's pre-eminent task now is to discharge its responsibilities for the solution of the problem of the conflict in the Middle East. In the words of the Foreign Minister of Japan, Mr. Miki, on 22 September 1967 during the general debate at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, our task is to seek "an equitable solution of the problem on the basis of justice and reason".⁴ My delegation is fully prepared to do everything possible to co-operate with other members to that end.

67. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Taking into account the remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union a little while ago, and the general feeling among members of the Council, I suggest that the Council could now agree to adjourn on the understanding that you, Mr. President, will continue to hold informal consultations. All of us are aware of the time and effort that you put into these consultations until we met here last night. In our opinion, the consultations should not only proceed further, but should be intensified in order that the Council should be able to resume its consideration of the grave situation in West Asia at the earliest possible date.

68. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I should just like to say two things. First, the Canadian delegation welcomes very much the remarks of the Secretary-General. As I understand it, he is now in the process of getting a report from General Odd Bull about the details of the requirements. I shall, of course, report what he has to say about the general outline of the requirements.

69. Secondly, I would say with regard to the resolution that various interpretations have been made of it. I think that the resolution speaks for itself and, as far as the Canadian delegation is concerned, I wish to associate myself with the observations made by you, Sir, and also by the representative of India, namely, that it can only be useful if the parties observe the cease-fire and the Council bends all its efforts to find a basis for a solution of a peaceful kind based on sending a representative to the area, within guidelines on which, we hope, we shall agree by negotiation.

70. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): With regard to the point just raised by the Indian representative, which, I believe, was supported by the Canadian representative, I should like to say that I intend to remain in contact with all the members of the Council so that our consultations on the question now before us may continue with the necessary urgency.

71. The date of our next meeting will be announced following these consultations.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1563rd meeting, para. 54.*

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.
