

UNITED NATIONS



APR 22 1971

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1353rd MEETING: 9 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1353)	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)	
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)	1
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)	

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 9 June 1967, at 7.15 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1353)

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).

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).

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council, I shall now, with the

consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Tunisia and Libya to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

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

2. The PRESIDENT: Two of the parties directly concerned have asked whether it would be possible for them to be seated at the Council table, since it is very difficult for them to participate in the Council debate when they are not seated at the Council table. I would therefore put it to the members of the Council whether we could not seat the three countries directly involved, that is, the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, at the Council table. If there is no objection, I shall now invite the representatives of those three countries to take places at the Council table. As there is no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. Rafael (Israel), Mr. M. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic) and Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) took places at the Council table.

3. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, while I share the view which you have just expressed regarding the seating at this table of representatives who are directly concerned with the question we are discussing, I think that it would also be in order to see the representative of Jordan at this table. I therefore suggest to you that the representative of Jordan should be given the opportunity of taking a place at the table.

4. The PRESIDENT: I have no objection. Does the Council agree that we should also seat the representative of Jordan at the Council table? As there is no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan) took a place at the Council table.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its consideration of the three items on its agenda.

6. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, we are obliged to speak on a point of order.

7. In accordance with a commendable tradition in this Council, we are guided by elementary principles of punctuality and punctiliousness in our meetings. It is regrettable that there has been a very considerable delay, of nearly one hour, starting our meeting today. I know that the President, as is often said, is in the hands of the Council. I am sure that you had adequate grounds to justify such a long delay in opening a meeting of the Council circumstances when even a single minute's delay is intolerable. I would like to make some inquiries about the reasons for such a long delay in opening the Council's meeting. The President of the Security Council was in the hands of which members of the Security Council? In any case, no one provided us with any information on this delay, and I think that other members of the Council as well were kept in ignorance of the reasons for the delay.

8. The PRESIDENT: In reply to the representative of the Soviet Union I would say that first I had consultations on one particular matter on which I also consulted the representative of the Soviet Union. I was later asked by one of the members of the Council whether he could have a little delay, because he wanted to talk with the head of his Government.

9. I have on earlier occasions, in accordance with the courtesy that I thought I owed to the members of the Council, granted such delays to other members, including the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and I have done so without informing any member of the reason why I had granted the delays.

10. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, may I say with all due respect that I cannot see any satisfactory grounds for such an inordinate delay. And I do not think that your statement that you consulted the Soviet representative is very well founded, since it was not you who consulted me but I who went to you to protest that a meeting of the Security Council was being delayed at the very time when fighting was in progress, people were being killed and cities were being destroyed. Was that not reason enough for me to protest?

11. Further, would you be kind enough to tell us which member of the Security Council it was who was contacting his capital and was therefore responsible for delaying the meeting of the Security Council?

12. The PRESIDENT: It is correct that the consultation that I had with the representative of the Soviet Union was held at his initiative, since he wanted to talk to me to protest against the fact that we had not yet started the meeting. However, after I had received that protest, we proceeded to discuss another question, on which I consulted with the representative of the Soviet Union.

13. I received the request for a short delay from the representative of the United States. As I have said, granting such a delay is a courtesy that I extend to all members of

the Council, as I did the other day to the representative of the Soviet Union.

14. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, may I thank you for your explanation. The picture has now been clarified and I should like to point out, with your indulgence, that we have a President of the Security Council who is at the disposal not of one or more members of the Security Council, but of all the members, and if someone needs to do something, then delegations should consult one another and not impose their own will and delay the beginning of a meeting on such an exceptional situation for a whole hour merely because someone wished to telephone Washington.

15. We have heard the voice of America enough already, and I hope the President will have a voice of his own.

16. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I should like to make it very clear to my distinguished friend and colleague, Ambassador Fedorenko, that I am rather proud to be the voice of America.

17. With reference to convening the meeting, I sat here this morning while at the request of the Soviet representative many consultations took place. I was very anxious that the meeting should start, so that the Council could adopt a cease-fire resolution. I was here, and my deputy was here, at 6.30 p.m. for the convening of the meeting. Consultations were taking place. I made my telephone call at 7.20 p.m.; it took exactly three minutes.

18. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its consideration of the three items on its agenda. Our last meeting was adjourned at 4.30 p.m. to await confirmation that orders had been issued for the cessation of hostilities and that fighting had actually stopped. Accordingly, I shall call first upon the Secretary-General to give the Council the information currently available to him on this important point.

19. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, immediately after the adjournment of the Security Council meeting this afternoon, I sent cable communications to the Foreign Ministers of Israel and Syria. The text of the cable is as follows:

"Your Excellency,

"The Security Council decided at 1625 hours to ask me to seek immediate confirmation that orders have been issued for the cessation of hostilities and that fighting has actually stopped. Since I am required to report back to the Security Council on these points within two hours I shall be grateful for your immediate reply.

"U Thant"

20. At 5.30 p.m. today I received a telephone message from Ambassador Daoudy of the Syrian Arab Republic. This oral message was later confirmed by a written communication¹ from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian

¹ Subsequently circulated as document S/7983.

Arab Republic to the United Nations; the text of the communication reads as follows:

"With reference to the message which you have addressed to the Foreign Ministry of Syria, I have the honour to confirm the telephone conversation which Ambassador Daoudy had with you at 5.30 p.m. today.

"1. Israel forces are still firing at the civilian population in Banias, which is located inside Syrian territory near the northern sector of the armistice line.

"2. Israel aircraft are still flying in Syrian skies.

"3. Israel helicopters are dropping paratroopers behind Syrian lines in order to carry out sabotage activities.

"4. A huge number of tanks and armoured cars are taking positions inside Syrian territory for further offensive.

"I wish to confirm that orders have been given to the Syrian Armed Forces to stop military operations forthwith in accordance with Security Council resolution 235 (1967) of 9 June 1967.

*"(Signed) George J. TOMEH
"Permanent Representative of Syria
to the United Nations"*

21. At 6.5 p.m. today, I received a personal oral message from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, Ambassador Rafael; the message was as follows:

"I am instructed by my Government to confirm that the Government of Israel has accepted the cease-fire resolution [235 (1967)] adopted by the Security Council today. Orders for the cessation of hostilities have been issued to the armed forces. I wish to assure the Secretary-General that on our part all fighting has stopped except for measures of self-defence when we are still being attacked."

22. At 6.50 p.m. today, I received the following second written communication¹ from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic; the text of the communication reads as follows:

"Further to my letter No. S/41 of today, I wish to draw to your attention that at 6.15 p.m. local New York time, I received a telephone call from Damascus informing me that:

"1. Israel Air Force has bombarded the Villages of Al-Yaquteh and Al-Ouyun near the town of Fiq inside Syrian territory.

"2. At the moment of the telephone conversation with Damascus, namely, at 6.15 p.m. New York time, Israel military aircraft were still overflying Syrian territory.

"3. Israel tanks and armoured cars are still being massed inside Syrian territory for further attack.

*"(Signed) George J. TOMEH
"Permanent Representative of Syria
to the United Nations"*

23. At 7.03 p.m. today, I received a cabled message from the Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic, through United Nations channels. This cable was dispatched from Damascus at 1023 hours Greenwich Mean Time today; the message reads as follows:

"Syria already complied with Security Council demand for immediate cease-fire but Israelis are at this moment attacking the villages of Al-Yaquteh and Al-Ouyun from the air.

*"Ibrahim MAKHOUS
"Minister for Foreign Affairs,
Syrian Arab Republic"*

24. Mr. President, that is the end of my report.

25. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General for his report. I now give the floor to the representative of the United Arab Republic.

26. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): The Council has been meeting all of today to examine the acts of aggression brutally committed by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic. It adopted a resolution this morning fixing a time limit of two hours for the parties to cease fire. While the representative of Syria announced the acceptance of his Government of that cease-fire call, the other party has tried, using one set of words or another, to refrain from specifically stating its acceptance. The Council was supposed to be reconvened by 6.30 p.m. to ascertain whether or not Israel had respected the order which the Council adopted this morning.

27. The Israel representative stated clearly that neither one hour, two hours, nor even five hours, would suit him for giving his answer. Now we know the reasons for all these manoeuvres. Only a few hours ago, and during the last meeting of the Security Council, many parts of the United Arab Republic, notably Cairo, came under heavy bombing. This is taking place following the communication of our acceptance of the cease-fire call, as prescribed by the Security Council in its two resolutions [233 (1967) and 234 (1967)] adopted on the 6th and 7th of this month, that is to say, after only a few hours.

28. This also is taking place following our compliance with the cease-fire call. And it is taking place at points far away from the front, in fact at points which are very heavily populated.

29. I shall, with your permission, Mr. President, recount the air raids that have taken place only today. Cairo was bombed for one hour beginning at 8 p.m. local time. Anshase had two air raids. Ismailia had one air raid at 10.40 p.m. local time. The Suez Canal area in general had no less than eight air raids from 12.35 until 8 p.m.

30. Between Ismailia and the Delta Road, two civilian buses have been strafed, resulting in twelve killed and thirty wounded, all civilians, including women and children. One Israel plane was shot down over Ismailia.

31. With your permission, Mr. President, I am also going to quote from a United Press International news dispatch:

“Air raid sirens screamed when Nasser finished his address and within minutes the boom of anti-aircraft guns shook buildings in Cairo.”

32. This is but a new example of the ruthlessness of the Israelis and their utter disregard and violation of the Council's resolutions. This gives further ample proof to the Council of the evil intentions of Israel. These actions, treacherous as they are, make it incumbent upon the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities and to take the necessary measures which should compel the aggressor to abide by the resolutions of the Council.

33. If, by their intention of continuing air raids on the United Arab Republic, and Cairo in particular, the Israelis and their associates are still entertaining certain dreams of intimidation, we tell them to forget about these dreams.

34. No action will affect the unity of the people of the United Arab Republic in their resolve to stand firm behind their leader.

35. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

36. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): Since the Council adjourned, I have again been in telephone communication with my Government. I am instructed to confirm that the Government of Israel has accepted the cease-fire resolution adopted by the Security Council today. Orders for the cessation of hostilities have been issued to the armed forces. I must also inform the Security Council that at this very moment extremely heavy artillery fire is being directed from Syrian positions against the Israel villages of Ma'agan, Haon, and Gadot. This shelling is an extension of the shelling which I reported to the President this morning and has been going on with increased violence throughout the day. Very heavy damage has been inflicted and there are many casualties. The places which have been under heavy attack are: Susita, B'nei-Tsefat, Geshar Amir, Gonen, Lahavot HaBashan, Shamir and She'ar Yashuv.

37. In some of these villages nearly every building and structure has been destroyed. In spite of this continuing aggression against villages and civilian populations, I wish to repeat that orders have been given to the Israel armed forces for the cessation of hostilities. I can assure the Council that on our part all fighting has stopped, except for measures of self-defence in places where we are still being attacked.

38. This morning the Syrian representative stated that Damascus had been bombed by Israel aircraft. That statement is false and without any foundation. The representative of the United Arab Republic has just stated that Cairo and other localities in Egypt have today been bombed by Israel aircraft. This is a malicious fabrication. I categorically deny it. The spreading of irresponsible and false charges of this kind only aggravates the already tense situation in the Middle East.

39. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Morocco. As there are no more places at the Security Council table, as a result of the invitations extended earlier this evening, the representative of Jordan has very kindly indicated his willingness to withdraw temporarily from his place at the Council table while the representative of Morocco makes his intervention. I appreciate the gesture of the representative of Jordan and I invite the representative of Morocco to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

40. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for having given me the floor and I also thank my colleague, the representative of Jordan, for his courtesy in giving me his seat so that I could make this brief statement.

41. In the second statement he made in the Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, referring to the resolution which the Council had just adopted and which called upon all the parties concerned in the conflict to cease immediately all military activities, said—and I shall try to quote his words from memory—“We have heard the representative of Iraq, we have heard the representative of the United Arab Republic, we have heard the representative of Syria, but not one of them told the Council that his Government has accepted the cease-fire.” Yesterday morning, the representative of the United Arab Republic sent to you, Mr. President, a very clear letter in which his Government informed you that it accepted the Security Council resolution and that consequently it accepted the cease-fire. This morning, the Syrian representative did likewise.

42. Mr. Eban left New York yesterday for London on his way to Tel-Aviv, no doubt to report to his Government on the debate in the Council. I am afraid that he acted somewhat cavalierly in leaving the Council in the middle of the debate, at a time when his presence would have been extremely valuable precisely because new and important events were taking place which the Council wished to know about and about which he himself seemed to wish to obtain some information.

43. This morning I received direct instructions from my Sovereign to lodge a protest with the Secretary-General, and with you, Mr. President, against the fact that, despite the announcement by Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Syria that they had accepted the cease-fire, the Israel land and air forces are continuing to bomb the northern zone of the Canal and Syria. These operations are being conducted on such a scale that they can hardly be described as the concluding phase of military operations or ascribed to extremely remote units which have not yet received the necessary orders from their Governments to take appropriate steps to put the cease-fire into effect.

44. On the contrary, these are very intensive aerial attacks and are being carried out with very large forces. Some people may perhaps be criticized for not having known, or realized, or evaluated the full range of armaments in Israel's possession. The surprise achieved by the Israel Air Force and the number of aircraft that have been bombing Syria throughout the day may well raise doubts about the faith

we were inclined to place in the denial of foreign assistance. With all due allowance, this attack against Syria today calls to mind the attacks of the Nazi air force on Rotterdam or the two-day raids on Poland.

45. We have heard the Israel Minister of Defence say that, even if the Arab world extended from the Arabian Gulf to the Atlantic, they would be ready to attack Algiers, Tunis and Casablanca and to occupy these territories. Of course, the Israel Government has very highly developed information media and information services which find many echoes abroad; a statement made is denied some time later, so that we are confronted with a denial, although the statement was made.

46. This attack on Cairo, after the cease-fire had been accepted by the Government, is not merely a manifestation of the Israel Government's stubborn determination to continue its aggression and to achieve certain military, psychological and political objectives. Only yesterday we heard Mr. Eban say that the Council must now turn its attention to the next phase; in other words, he considered that the military objective had been all but attained and that a different approach should now be envisaged, so that he can sit down at the negotiating table as the undisputed victor with all the trump cards in his hand.

47. This obstinacy in continuing the hostilities on the scale and with the forces I have just mentioned is perhaps an indication that those who are preparing for possible negotiations wish to ensure that on one side of the table there will be the completely vanquished, with an arrogant Power on the other. I am not asking you, Mr. President, to take the place of those who will have to settle this problem if they feel they must assume the responsibility for doing so. But, at the risk of repeating myself, I should like to say once again that if the Council had taken a firm decision to condemn the aggression at the outset of the crisis, we would certainly not be faced today with the continuance of military activity in all its forms; this, after the cease-fire, is a systematic violation of the Security Council resolution and of the decisions taken this morning after Governments parties to the conflict had informed the President of the Security Council that they had accepted the Council's call for a cease-fire.

48. Mr. Abba Eban probably felt that there was no reason for him to remain here and that the assurance of impunity which he took away with him would enable Mr. Dayan and Mr. Rabin to continue until the Arab people was brought to its knees. I consider that President Nasser's announced decision to resign in order to enable other leaders of his country to take new decisions is the act of a responsible statesman who showed great courage in addressing his people in the speech you have heard. Perhaps the Tel-Aviv Government thought that, at a time when the Egyptian National Assembly was calling for President Nasser's return to the Presidency of the Republic, the Egyptian people and the people of Cairo ought to be machine-gunned and crushed for having taken that decision with regard to a heroic leader.

49. These are the aspects of the problem that we are asking the Council to consider if it wishes to continue with

a clear mind its search for a way of extending the decisions which have been taken here yesterday and this morning. Or does Israel, showing once and for all its hatred for the Arab world now wish to prove to everyone that, since it was given a free hand to crush the Arab world, it can oblige this honourable assembly to be a witness while it consummates its crime with impunity?

50. We strongly urge the Council to try to take a bold decision. It has appealed to the opposing countries to stop the fighting. From the Arab side, you have learned of a series of decisions; on the Israel side, we see that the war goes on. Does the Security Council think this is a situation consonant with its decisions, or does it wish to demonstrate to thirteen Members of this Organization and to all those who have shown their support for the United Nations and placed their confidence in it, that the Council can be confronted with a *fait accompli* at the outset and that the aggressor can then continue to act with impunity without any reaction from the Council?

51. It is this responsibility which, with all due respect, we ask the Council to assume with the utmost gravity, because the course of events may perhaps surprise us, just as it did at the outset, and we cannot tell whether this war, not held in check at the point where it was suspended, may not break out elsewhere.

52. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, the Security Council has been convened for an emergency meeting at the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic and at the instance of the Soviet delegation in connexion with a further treacherous attack by Israel on the United Arab Republic, and particularly in connexion with the bombing of Cairo, the capital of the United Arab Republic, as well as Ismailia and other inhabited localities. Israel is continuing its aggressive acts against Syria as well, in violation of the decisions which the Council has adopted today.

53. From the statements by the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Morocco, and also from the information which we have just heard from the Secretary-General, it is abundantly clear that the armed forces of Israel are continuing their criminal aggression against the Arab States.

54. It is quite obvious that Israel is thus defying the Security Council's resolutions calling for an immediate cease-fire in the Near East. The new attacks have been made in spite of the decisions taken by the Council on 6 and 7 June [*resolutions 233 (1967) and 234 (1967)*] and also in spite of the demands made by the Council today for an immediate cessation of Israel's aggression [*resolution 235 (1967)*].

55. Is it not treachery that the bombing of Cairo was taking place at the very moment when here, in the Security Council, the representative of Israel was making hypocritical statements, trying to delude the members of the Council and attempting to distract attention from the criminal acts of Israel's aggressive forces in the Near East?

56. The speaker from Tel-Aviv was distressed by the comparisons which have been made in the Council to characterize some of Tel-Aviv's actions.

57. Israel's leaders are repeating the tragic experience of fascist aggression not only in their methods of accusing the victims of aggression and in their attempts to blame them for the crime which has been committed, but also in their "blitzkrieg" tactics. It is fully justifiable and right to say again-now that those who are at present directing the act of aggression by Israel should be put in the dock before an international tribunal such as that which, twenty years ago, condemned the crimes of the main culprits in the war against peace and humanity.

58. Indeed, there is no limit to the arrogance, hypocrisy and adventurism of Israel's present leaders. In the course of today alone they have committed crimes against peace and humanity, for which they deserve to be severely punished. The Soviet delegation believes that the Security Council can no longer overlook these acts by Israel, which is violating all principles and rules of international law, trampling upon the Charter of our Organization and deriding and sabotaging Security Council resolutions designed to restore and maintain peace.

59. The Soviet delegation proposes that the Security Council should without delay—at once, in fact—take resolute, energetic and effective measures to ensure Israel's compliance with the Security Council's decisions. The Security Council must categorically condemn Israel's disregard of its decisions; it must demand the immediate cessation of military activities by Israel and warn Tel-Aviv that failure by Israel to comply with the mandatory decisions of the Security Council will have the most serious consequences for the State of Israel, and that the Security Council will be compelled to use the powers vested in it by the Charter of the United Nations for dealing with cases of this kind.

60. The Soviet delegation believes that it should draw the attention of members of the Council to the following statement issued by the Governments of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 10 June 1967 (Moscow time):

"The participants in the meeting have considered the situation that has arisen in the Near East in consequence of Israel's aggression, which is the result of a conspiracy by certain imperialist forces, particularly the United States of America, against the Arab States. The participants have exchanged views on measures required to put an end to the aggression and avert the dangerous consequences which it might have for world peace.

"The participants in the meeting believe that they must draw the appropriate conclusions from the fact that Israel has not complied with the Security Council's decision and has not ceased military activities against the Arab States. The occupation of the territory of Arab States by Israel's forces could be used to re-establish foreign colonial rule.

"On 9 June, in spite of the fact that the Syrian Government has announced a cease-fire, Israel forces are undertaking a new offensive on the Syrian border and barbarously bombing Syrian cities.

"In their struggle against imperialism for freedom, independence, the integrity of their territory and the inalienable sovereign right to settle independently all questions relating to their domestic life and foreign policy, the peoples of the Arab countries are fighting for a just cause. The peoples of the socialist countries are entirely on their side.

"The peoples of the United Arab Republic and a number of other Arab countries have during the past years won some great historic victories in the conquest of national independence and freedom. Important social reforms have been undertaken in the interest of the working masses.

"We are confident that these gains will be preserved and that the progressive régimes will be consolidated, in spite of the difficulties facing the Arab peoples.

"In this difficult hour for the States of the Arab East, the socialist countries wish to declare their complete and whole-hearted solidarity with the just struggle of the Arab States, and to affirm that they will assist them in repelling aggression and defending their national independence and territorial integrity.

"The States participating in the meeting insist that Israel should forthwith cease military activities against neighbouring Arab States and withdraw its troops from their territory behind the armistice line.

"The United Nations has a duty to condemn the aggressor. If the Security Council does not take appropriate measures, any States which have failed to discharge their duty as members of the Security Council will bear a heavy responsibility.

"Today, as never before, there is a need for decisive and concerted action by all peace-loving and progressive forces—by all who treasure the cause of freedom and the independence of peoples.

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

"The just struggle of the Arab peoples will triumph."

61. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Syria.

62. Could we have silence in the Chamber, please?

63. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Mr. President, I thank you again for asking the rather disturbing audience in the galleries to keep silent. We know when they become silent and when

they become noisy. That has already become quite apparent to us here.

64. When we started the discussion today at the beginning of a rather trying and long meeting that went on for four hours, one point should have become clear and it is this: that the meeting was delayed for two hours only because of the tactics and manoeuvres indulged in by the Israel representative in order to prolong the meeting and in order consequently to give the Israel forces inside Syria enough time to achieve their aims and purposes—I must add, their aggressive aims and their aggressive purposes.

65. It would be cumbersome now to recall all the details of those discussions, but he submitted one argument after the other—making his acceptance or the acceptance of his authorities conditional, stressing the words “mutual acceptance” that occurred in resolution 235 (1967), and so on. One after the other, those arguments were exploded until finally we deemed it sufficient to describe his arguments as “casuistry”; “sophistry” was not enough; “mockery” was the last word—but it was not strong enough because the real description is beyond that.

66. I shall proceed to the specific points. The Secretary-General read out the two letters that I had addressed to him [paras. 20 and 22 above] on behalf of my authorities and he also read out to us what was communicated to him by the Israel representative [para. 21 above]. One point which is a cardinal and crucial one in the Israel answer is worth considering and it is this: that they will stop firing except for measures of self-defence.

67. Through you, Mr. President, I should like to put the following questions, which are based on the points contained in my two letters to the Secretary-General. We say that Israel tanks and armoured cars are still massed inside Syrian territory for further offensive action and attacks. Is that a measure of self-defence? We say that Israel aircraft are up to this moment still flying over Syrian skies. Are these measures of self-defence? We say that Israel helicopters are dropping paratroopers behind Syrian lines inside Syria to carry out sabotage activities. Are these measures of self-defence?

68. It is sufficient for the members of the Council to review one by one the points that I mentioned in my letter to discover that those are not measures of self-defence, that they are measures of clear-cut aggression. The Israel army is inside Syrian territory. It is of course meeting with very stiff resistance. But the fact remains that Israel attacked; the mere fact that Israel forces are inside our territory and that the Israel Air Force is overflying Syrian territory is clear-cut and tangible proof that Israel is attacking and continuing to attack. The sentence which says that they will not fire except as a measure of self-defence is a very false and misleading statement that should not be accepted by this august and respectable body.

69. The Israel representative mentioned a number of villages and settlements which are being attacked, which, according to his allegations, are being fired upon from the Syrian side. This action is taking place inside the demilitarized zone. It is not taking place inside Israel territory.

This action is a measure of full defence which took place only after the premeditated, massive Israel attack on Syria today.

70. I have here a United Press International news dispatch dated today and originating from Jerusalem. With the permission of the President, I should like to read it; it says:

“A United Nations report said Israel forces had driven fifteen miles inside Syria to the town of Kuneitra, only forty miles south of Damascus on the main highway leading to the capital. A well-informed Israel military source in Jerusalem said they believe the Israelis have reached Damascus outskirts.”

The report goes on to say:

“Israel forces greeted the fall of Nasser with no surprise and made it clear that the drive on Damascus was aimed at overthrowing the left-wing Socialist Ba’ath Party which Israel blames for starting the entire Middle East crisis. Israel radio appeals called on Syrians to rise up against the Syrian Government.”

This is the real aim of the massive attack perpetrated by the Israelis on Syria.

71. I have just received another telephone call from Damascus, the content of which has just been communicated to me; it is as follows:

“Columns of tanks and armoured cars from the Israel army have right now entered Syrian territory near the town of Masaba.”

72. Putting aside for the moment the interpretation of why the attack is being perpetrated, there are still all these points which I have mentioned: the overflight by the Israel Air Force of Syrian towns and cities—and by the way, Damascus was bombarded and what the Israel representative said is a complete falsehood—the massing of armoured cars, and what I have just stated about columns of armoured cars and tanks entering Syrian territory.

73. What is the reason for all that? Are these measures of self-defence? The purpose is clear. It is a Jerusalem source which states that the aim is to overthrow the Syrian régime which is so heartily disliked by the Israel authorities.

74. We have said time and again, and I have no hesitation in repeating it now, that Israel is acting on behalf of imperialist Powers whose interests in the area cannot be safe unless and until this staunch régime of Syria, that has been fighting vested imperialist interests, is overthrown. But we are not afraid to defend ourselves against overwhelming forces, which certainly are not the forces of Israel alone, equipped with the latest models of armaments which have come to them from countries already too well known.

75. But we feel that it is an honour, an honour because we are fighting a battle of the Third World, of the liberation movements in Asia and Africa. The United Arab Republic fought its battle. Jordan alone—where 15,000 civilians and soldiers have been mass-slaughtered by the war criminals of

Israel—is an example of the fact that we are fighting for the Third World.

76. To conclude, I wish once again to emphasize to the Council the gravity of the situation. If this war escalates, if Israel aggression is not stopped and stopped immediately, if their lies, falsehoods and hypocrisies are not exposed, there is a danger not only to Syria, not only to the Arab world, not only to the Middle East: the Israelis and they alone will be responsible for the escalation of the war. I think that we have spoken enough about the facts. The facts are in the hands of the Council, and it is for the Council now to take the right decision by stopping the aggressor and condemning his aggression.

77. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of Israel.

78. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): The Council has been presented with a motley collection of falsehoods and fabrications. I shall try to deal with them one by one.

79. The representative of Morocco attributed a statement to the Israel Minister of Defence, General Dayan, to the effect, if I understood him correctly, that Israel intended to occupy the territory from Tunisia to any extent of the Arab world. I challenge the representative of Morocco to bring here and now proof of that statement and to produce it to the Council. There was no such statement. There cannot be such a statement. He should not come here and make wild allegations. Let him bring his proof.

80. The representative of Morocco has again referred to alleged bombings of Cairo and other localities in Egypt. I have denied these statements as malicious fabrications. I have now before me a number of news agency dispatches and I shall read some of them. The following is from the Agence France-Presse, Cairo:

“The air-raids at Cairo stopped at 6.15 p.m. Were they Israel raids on Cairo or sham raids by Egyptian aircraft? No one in Cairo can yet say. The aircraft had their navigation lights on; the sirens sounded; anti-aircraft guns were firing. Air-raids on Port Said are also reported.”²

81. I have a dispatch from United Press International which says:

“UPI correspondents reported that Egyptian anti-aircraft batteries had been firing, but the correspondents said they could hear no bombs falling in the capital.”

82. I have before me a report from the Associated Press which, I think, is a most revealing one and perhaps provides a solution to that riddle of alleged Israel bombings. It reads as follows:

“Police and soldiers fired grenades into the air Friday night to drive back demonstrating mobs marching on downtown Cairo and a furious anti-aircraft barrage lit up the sky. The Egyptian Ministry of Information said that an air raid was in progress. However, there were no signs

of any planes in the sky and no bombs were dropped on Cairo up to 11.30 p.m.”

I think that takes care of that.

83. The representative of Morocco attributed to my Foreign Minister a certain inaccuracy in reporting the position of the Arab Governments in respect to the cease-fire resolution. If I understood him correctly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs stated, after the United Arab Republic had announced its acceptance of the resolution:

“Since the cease-fire resolution was adopted by the Security Council last night, the representative of Syria has spoken, the representative of Iraq has spoken, the representative of the United Arab Republic has spoken. I have heard and studied every word that they have said. I cannot find in any of those speeches one single sentence saying that ‘We, Syria, we, Iraq, we, the United Arab Republic, welcome and accept the cease-fire resolution.’”
[1350th meeting, para. 46.]

That statement was made on Wednesday, 7 June 1967, at the 1350th meeting of the Council which started at 2.20 p.m., and is reproduced in the verbatim record of that meeting.

84. The next day, Thursday, 8 June 1967, the Secretary-General informed the Council:

“I have just received the following communication from the Permanent Mission of the United Arab Republic to the United Nations. It is dated 8 June 1967.” [1351st meeting, para. 31.]

That communication goes on to state that Egypt had decided to accept the cease-fire resolutions on the condition that the other party ceases fire. The Secretary-General’s statement is reproduced in the verbatim record of the 1351st meeting of the Council. I mention this fact not out of pettiness, but merely to show the inaccuracy of the statements made here by Arab representatives.

85. The representative of Syria has made wild allegations of massacres in Jordan. I deny that categorically. He has no proof of what he says. He wants to inflame passions. There will soon be the opportunity to ascertain the falsehood of his statements.

86. However, more interesting was the admission of the representative of Syria that Syrian forces have been shelling and are shelling villages in Israel. That shelling started yesterday afternoon, continued all through the night and is still continuing right now at this moment. I have informed the Council of the very heavy damage to life and property which those artillery bombardments have caused to the villages and the civilian population in Israel.

87. I want to repeat again that no Israel aircraft has bombed or is bombing Damascus. I also want to deny categorically that any Israel forces are advancing towards Damascus. The Israel operations which were begun today were intended, as I stated in the Council this afternoon [1352nd meeting] and as I informed the President of the

² Quoted in French by the speaker.

Security Council in the early hours of the morning, to silence those Syrian gun positions which were shelling Israel villages. That is what the Israel forces have undertaken.

88. I repeat again that orders have been issued to the Israel forces to cease hostilities and to act only in self-defence.

89. Mr. President, I should like to refer to something more grave. I thought that in my previous intervention I might have impressed, or perhaps influenced, the representative of the Soviet Union to think again of what he has said about Israel and his infamous comparison of Israel with Hitler Germany. I only wish to say now to the representative of the Soviet Union that I still remember when one of his illustrious predecessors defended at the United Nations, with less venom though with similar violence, the charges of his Government that Israel was involved in a doctors' conspiracy to poison Soviet leaders. I also remember very well when only a short while later the Soviet Government decided to withdraw those monstrous charges. I cherish the hope that also in the present case the Soviet Government will withdraw those false charges which it now advances against the Government of Israel.

90. We have heard now the most infamous threats from the Soviet representative, threats to extinguish Israel. They remind me of the language which preceded the events which led up to the trials of Nürnberg.

91. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I should like to make this statement on the full authority of my Government.

92. The Security Council, with the full support of the United States, has adopted three resolutions calling for and demanding an unconditional cease-fire between Israel and the Arab States. The United States deems it of the gravest import that the Security Council's resolutions shall be complied with in letter and spirit by Israel and the Arab countries involved. There has been too much bloodshed and loss of life, and it is imperative that this war come to an end and that all Governments involved in this conflict should return to the urgent task of restoring peace to the Middle East.

93. The policy of my Government with respect to this situation was prophetically stated by the President of the United States on 23 May 1967. It remains the policy of our Government, as I indicated when I offered our draft resolution for the consideration of the Council yesterday. I said:

"Speaking for the United States, let me add that our view on all these many problems has been stated many times and has not changed." [1351st meeting, para. 23.]

94. It is perhaps necessary to recall what the President of the United States stated on 23 May 1967. He stated:

"The Government of the United States is deeply concerned, in particular, with three potentially explosive aspects of the present confrontation.

"First, we regret that the General Armistice Agreements have failed to prevent warlike acts from the territory of

one against another government, or against civilians, or territory, under control of another government.

"Second, we are dismayed at the hurried withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from Gaza and Sinai after more than ten years of steadfast and effective service in keeping the peace . . . We continue to regard the presence of the United Nations in the area as a matter of fundamental importance and shall support its continuance with all possible vigour.

"Third, we deplore the recent build-up of military forces and believe it a matter of urgent importance to reduce troop concentrations. The status of sensitive areas, as the Secretary-General emphasized in his report to the Security Council, such as the Gaza Strip and Gulf of Aqaba, is a particularly important aspect of the situation."

Nothing could have been more specific than the statement of the President of the United States dealing with this particular situation.

95. And then the President of the United States stated the policy of our Government, which has been a constant policy for twenty years. He stated it in explicit terms, and his statement was not matched by statements by other Governments which might have assured the avoidance of this conflict. He said:

"To the leaders of all the nations of the Near East, I wish to say what three Presidents have said before—that the United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the area.

"The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area, in any form, overt or clandestine. This has been the policy of the United States led by four Presidents—President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and myself—as well as the policy of both of our political parties.

"The United States has consistently sought to have good relations with all the States of the Near East. Regrettably, this has not always been possible, but we are convinced that our differences with individual States of the area and their differences with each other must be worked out peacefully and in accordance with accepted international practice."

96. Those words were not heeded at the time and our efforts to obtain general recognition of their import were not heeded in this Council. They were frustrated by certain members of the Council. But in presenting a draft resolution to the Security Council just yesterday, I pointed out that it was essential to our search for peace in the area that our "objective must be a decision by the warring Powers to live in peace and to establish normal relations, as contemplated and pledged by the United Nations Charter" [1351st meeting, para. 21]. And I said: "Our purpose is to provide for movement towards the final settlement of all outstanding questions between the parties which the United Nations envisaged nearly twenty years ago". [Ibid.]

97. We have had a long debate. There have been charges and counter-charges, and statements by the parties. And what is the situation in which the Security Council finds itself? Due to the fact that there is no effective United Nations machinery in the area, due to the fact that its effectiveness has been impaired by what we all know has occurred, no one here, exercising the quasi-judicial character of the Council, can at this point resolve the conflicting statements which have been made.

98. What is imperatively required here are two things which every fair-minded person must recognize. The first—if it can be done in this Council and if obstructionism will cease—is an impartial investigation by the Secretary-General of the allegations which have been made concerning the violation of the cease-fire orders which all parties that have expressed themselves here—Israel, the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria—have alleged; an investigation with adequate machinery to ascertain the state of compliance in the area. Obviously, any group called upon to decide on the conflicting charges and the conflicting statements which have been made would need this in order to make such a decision.

99. The second thing which we imperatively need is adequate machinery for the Secretary-General to implement the cease-fire resolutions which have been ordered by this Council.

100. Today, both of those requirements are lacking. Today, both are imperatively required, if we are to do the job that the Council has to do, and if we are to do it, not on the basis of accepting one party's version as against the version of another, but on the basis of impartial, objective facts established by the most impartial agency we have: the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

101. My country would support those two proposals. My country has been willing to support them throughout this debate, so that all that we do can be done in the interests of maintaining peace in the area.

102. Therefore, I make these proposals to the Council so that it can act—not on the basis of one-sided adherence to a point of view, but on the basis of established facts that satisfy fair-minded men, and also on the basis of what must really be done in a situation as complicated as this.

103. The Secretary-General is lacking the tools to do the job of implementing a cease-fire resolution, and therefore we will have what we have had in some other situations; that is, charges and counter-charges, allegations of violations of the cease-fire, which we, sitting in New York, thousands of miles from the scene are unable to resolve.

104. Finally, I say this: Debate here, accusations here, will not solve the problem. What will solve the problem is, first, ascertainment of the facts; and second, action on the ground by United Nations machinery to make sure that the cease-fire is properly implemented. Those are the two ways in which we must proceed.

105. That is the view of my Government and I convey it to the members of the Council.

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

107. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I shall confine my reply to the remarks that were made by the Israel representative in answer to the points which I raised.

108. First of all, he said that according to my own admission Syrian forces had been shelling villages inside Israel. That is not true. I did not say that. I stick by the statement which I made this morning, namely, that we accepted the cease-fire and cabled the Secretary-General, and that he received our answer at 0036 hours last night. The Syrian forces had abided by the cease-fire for one complete hour when a barrage of fire started, first in the demilitarized zone and then on a very large scale along the line of demarcation between Syria and Israel.

109. The Israel representative said that the Israel operations against Syria, which were begun today, were to silence the Syrian guns. But the operations which I have described and which go much beyond "silencing Syrian guns and Syrian positions", how do they agree with his statement?

110. Third, the Israel representative did answer two questions. One, he reaffirmed that Israel aircraft did not bombard Damascus. But he did not deny that Israel aircraft were overflying the skies of Damascus.

111. In my two letters to the Secretary-General, I raised other questions and other points; I must read them again: "1. Israel Air Force has bombarded the villages of Al-Yaquteh and Al-Ouyun near the town of Fiq inside Syrian territory." [Para. 22 above.]

112. At the moment of the telephone conversation that took place between me and Damascus, at 6.15 New York time, Israel military aircraft was still overflying Syrian territory. That he did not answer. He also did not answer the following point: that Israel forces are still firing at the civilian population in Baniyas, which is located inside Syrian territory, near the northern sector of the armistice line. He did not deny the fact that huge armoured columns had already penetrated deep into Syrian territory and are massing for an offensive.

113. Now, in the variety of answers that he gave, he tried to elude all these questions and all these facts. He also did not deny the United Press International report from Jerusalem stating that the Israel radio is appealing to the Syrians to rise up against the Syrian Government.

114. We are still, through you, Mr. President, awaiting an answer. There is also the fact which I specifically mentioned; namely, that huge amounts of Israel tanks have entered through the village of Massadeh. I am sure that the representative of the United Kingdom, to my left, who knows Syria so well, knows that very place. I am referring to a specific place from which Israel tanks are penetrating into Syrian territory. Will the Israel representative answer us whether this is correct or not?

115. Now, as long as we are on this point, I would not wish to finish my reply without referring to the intervention

made by the representative of the United States about the lack and non-existence of United Nations machinery. But between Syria and Israel there is the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission which is supposed to exist and to function. Could not facts be ascertained through that machinery? Equally, between Jordan and Israel there is a Mixed Armistice Commission. Therefore, if I understood the intervention of Mr. Goldberg, doubt is to be thrown on everything that we have reported to the Council today.

116. Why is it that I called you at 5.30 this morning, Mr. President, and woke you up from your sleep? Was I going through a phantasmagoric dream, or was I in communication with Damascus, which told me of all these facts that I related to you? And you were kind and gracious enough to call an urgent meeting of the Security Council. Surely, we are not in a dream. These are facts. I am stating that the Israel forces, in the manner that I described specifically and in detail, have entered Syrian territory. The Israel representative did not deny that, in spite of all the phrases and sentences that we have heard from him.

117. But, Mr. President, I feel it my duty again to impress upon you and upon the Council that the situation is very grave and should be dealt with with the gravity and seriousness that it deserves.

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

119. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I should like at the very outset to express my thanks to my friend and colleague, Mr. Fedorenko, through whose effort I am now participating in a debate of direct interest to my Government.

120. I have listened with interest to the statement just made by Judge Goldberg of the United States. I was astonished to hear Judge Goldberg speak about impartial investigation of cease-fire orders by the Secretary-General, with adequate machinery. I was astonished because I was hoping—apparently against hope—that Judge Goldberg would proceed to bring first issues first. I was hoping that Judge Goldberg would ask the Council to establish the facts about the aggression: Who committed the act of aggression now being considered by the Council? Who invaded land and occupied towns and villages, destroyed buildings and killed inhabitants?

121. That I thought was the first issue for the Council. If there is an intention to divert the whole question into an inquiry about who violated the cease-fire resolution adopted by the Council, I am afraid this would be a very unfortunate thing for the Security Council, the organ created to maintain peace, to help in creating an atmosphere of peace, to condemn the aggressor and invoke a Chapter embodied in the great Charter of the United Nations.

122. I was hoping that Judge Goldberg, a learned Judge, a man of law, would be able to come here as the representative of a great Member of the United Nations, a responsible Member—and I would quote him when I say “the greater the Power, the greater the responsibility” [1342nd meeting, para. 13], those were his words—and deal with the crux of

the problem. But Judge Goldberg did not come to the crux of the problem: the act of war committed against my Government, against my people, against innocent civilians of Jordan.

123. There is another question. I keep hearing a statement, repeated time and again, that the United States Government is committed to protect the territorial integrity of all nations. I keep hearing the words “all nations”. But when Jordan was invaded, when almost half of the area of Jordan was conquered, when thousands were killed, I did not hear anything about this commitment other than a speech in the Council repeating the very same statement: we are committed to all members of the Middle East, to all nations in the Middle East.

124. I hate to say this. We are a country friendly to the United States. We have to be careful about the sensitivity of a great Power, because we are a small Member. We have to be careful about choosing our terms, because we need the support of all great Powers. But what is going on cannot be defined or described with sweet words.

125. We are the victims of a crime, a war crime. We would expect the small Members to have the support of the great Powers; we would expect this because they are great, they are big, they can afford to play an objective role, a role not dictated by power politics in an election year, a role dictated, rather, by the great values of the great Powers, by the great values of the American people, by the great heritage of the American people, by the great traditions of the American people.

126. I regret to say this, but so far we have heard nothing concerning effective measures, first condemning the aggressor; second, calling for an immediate withdrawal; and third, invoking Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

127. The PRESIDENT: Before I give the floor to the next speaker on my list, the representative of Israel, I would ask the audience to kindly maintain silence; I now call on him.

128. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): The Syrian representative in his tale of the events has omitted to mention one fact, perhaps of minor importance to him, but decisive for the whole story. Did Syria declare war on Israel or did it not? This is the question. I expect him to give a clear and unequivocal answer to this question.

129. It was Syria that started the war against Israel. Much has been said about aggression and aggressors. I have an article before me, published by a very distinguished and learned jurist, René Cassin, and it reminds me of a number of very important facts in connection with positions taken by various Governments on the question of aggression. With your permission, Mr. President, I will read certain extracts from this article in French; the article was published in *Le Monde* on 3 June 1967; it says:

“On 3 January 1952, in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Soviet delegation submitted . . . six definitions, four of which referred to armed aggression. In the two others, a State was defined as an attacker State if ‘it instituted a naval

blockade of the coasts or ports of another State' or if 'it supported armed bands, which, organized in its own territory, invaded the territory of another State or refused, on being requested by the invaded State, to take any action within its power to deny such bands any aid or protection'.

"But on 3 October 1957, the delegation of the Soviet Union stated, *inter alia*, that a State shall be declared to have committed an act of economic aggression which 'first . . . takes against another State measures of economic pressure violating its sovereignty and economic independence and threatening the bases of its economic life'.

"On 14 October 1957 the Syrian delegation gave a mixed type of definition of aggression consisting of a general definition and an enumeration which did not fail to include blockade or 'the toleration of the use by . . . armed bands of its territory as a base of operations or as a point of departure for incursions into the territory of another State'."³

130. There have been acts committed against Israel through many long years, and the blockade was again introduced and imposed by Egypt in the Gulf of Aqaba on 22 May 1967. Clearly, this was an act of aggression as defined by the Soviet Union and the Syrian delegation themselves.

131. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Syria.

132. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The Israel representative has posed a question: Did Syria declare war against Israel? Did Syria start a war against Israel, or did it not? I shall answer that question.

133. The answer is: No, Syria did not declare war on Israel. Syria, and every other Arab State since the Middle East crisis arose, came to this Council. They are on record as having said: "We will not attack Israel. We shall respond only if we are attacked."

134. When the historians of this crisis study this period, they will find that, unfortunately, the Arab States were deliberately misled, that they were led to believe that Israel was not going to attack. I shall mention one such instance. One evening during the crisis—I do not recall the exact date, but it was between 5 and 6 o'clock, when the Secretary-General was giving a farewell party to the Ambassador of Tunisia—Under-Secretary Ralph Bunche told me officially, on behalf of the Secretary-General, that he had been told by the Israel representative that they were not going to attack either the United Arab Republic or Syria. He further requested me to convey that information to my Government, as he also requested the representative of the United Arab Republic. Of course, we could not but believe the distinguished Under-Secretary, and we conveyed the information. As the news comes out, we learn—in fact, it is no secret—that representatives of Western Powers in our capitals impressed upon our authorities that Israel was not going to attack either the United Arab Republic or Syria.

³ Quoted in French by the speaker.

135. But now the question arises, who attacked? In all honesty and fairness, I ask you, Mr. President, and all of the members of the Council, who attacked the United Arab Republic? In their own confession of guilt, they said: "We attacked because we knew of their intention to attack." There was no attack started by either the United Arab Republic or the Syrian Arab Republic.

136. The situation in which we now find ourselves is in full harmony and in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which states:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

137. Therefore, what has taken place between the United Arab Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic is in full conformity with the Charter. There is a Mutual Defence Pact between the two countries, and the Syrian Arab Republic was attacked, as I have said time and again, on 7 April. Israel threatened to attack Syria when the time was proper. At Syria's call, the Mutual Defence Pact was completed; there was at no time any declaration of war started by Syria against Israel but there was the application of a Mutual Defence Pact in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter.

138. The representative of Israel quoted Cassin, who is a great authority on the question of aggression, and he brought in the views of the Syrian delegation on that particular subject. I will not be misled by the diversionary tactics of the representative of Israel. The issue in the Council now is not the academic one of a definition of aggression; the issue, I repeat, is an actual aggression committed by Israel air and ground forces against Syria, forces which have already penetrated Syria.

139. Therefore, the second point that he used in his, so to speak, answer to me is completely irrelevant. Blockades, waterways, free passage, innocent passage are not being discussed now; what is being discussed, at my request, in an emergency meeting of the Security Council is the attack that was started early this morning by Israel against Syria. That is the issue, not the theoretical definition of aggression. I will not be misled by the representative of Israel and indulge in these theoretical diversions, although at another time I would not hesitate at all to do so.

140. To bring the Council back again to the heart of the problem we are discussing, which is the Israel attack on Syria, to what I have said so far, to the two letters addressed this afternoon to the Secretary-General, and to what I said about the massive march of Israel tanks and armoured columns into Syria, I want to state further that

Israel tanks are advancing without a stop in large numbers in the same area which I mentioned before, namely, Massadeh. This is a clear-cut violation of the cease-fire which, hypocritically, the Israel representative said Israel had accepted and had issued orders to cease fire.

141. The Syrian army is not attacking Israel; the Syrian army is not advancing against Israel. What we are doing inside our own territory is fighting and resisting the march and the onslaught of the huge Israel machinery against Syria.

142. Furthermore, I want to affirm once more that as we are here discussing the question of the aggression of Israel against Syria, Israel's Air Force at this very moment is still overflying Syrian territory, and I would again express the hope that the Security Council will treat this problem with the gravity it deserves and not be misled into lengthy discussions, as we were this morning and this afternoon, about subjects that are extraneous to the particular dangers we are now facing.

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

144. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): During the Council's meeting very alarming information is still being received to the effect that Israel's aggression in Syria is continuing and that armed hordes are committing more and more crimes on Syrian soil. Would you not consider it possible, Mr. President, to ask the Secretary-General to give us any information he may have at the present stage?

145. The PRESIDENT: The question has been raised by the representative of the Soviet Union that the Council should hear whether the Secretary-General has further information to submit to the Council now. I give the floor to the Secretary-General.

146. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Since my last report to the Council, I have had no confirmed information regarding the situation referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union. Therefore, I am sorry but I have no further report to submit to the Council.

147. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General, and I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

148. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, we should like to ask for one more clarification in this connexion. It is well known that our Organization has certain facilities on Syrian territory. Perhaps the distinguished Secretary-General would consider it possible to make additional inquiries to discover whether there are any reports from his representatives there.

149. The PRESIDENT: I would ask the Secretary-General whether he would like to reply to the question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union.

150. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: As I have just reported to the Council, I have no further confirmed

information from the area. We have, as the Council members are fully aware, only one source of information: that is, General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of UNTSO. Of course, he has been reporting to me regularly but some pieces of information are confirmed and some pieces of information are not confirmed. So, for the purpose of imparting correct information to the Council I have to use my own judgement whether a particular piece of information is confirmed or unconfirmed. As soon as confirmed information is available, I will make it a point to submit it to the Council as soon as possible. I have also been told by General Odd Bull that he finds it very difficult to establish direct contact with the observers in the area because of the unsettled situation.

151. Mr. KEITA (Mali) (*translated from French*): In my delegation's opinion, no one around this table is unaware of the quarter from which aggression came and why it began. However, the Council has still not come to any decision about Israel's responsibility for starting this aggression. The Council's decision to call for a cease-fire has not so far prevented the aggressor from continuing his invasion. Are we to believe that we have to wait until the invader has settled down comfortably and established control over the lands he has conquered so that he can dictate his laws to the occupied countries? If so, my delegation cannot but interpret the Council's attitude as tacit support of the aggressor.

152. You will recall, Mr. President, that as early as Monday morning during our consultations, I told you that, in my delegation's view, if an appeal for peace was to mean anything, it must be accompanied by a request for the withdrawal of the troops to their original bases. Unfortunately, that suggestion was not taken up, and we now have to face the consequences.

153. At present, despite Israel's agreement to put an end to the war, the bombing continues and innocent victims are paying with their lives.

154. I must repeat that, after condemning the act of aggression by Israel, the Council should effectively demand a cease-fire and the withdrawal of the troops to their original bases. If Israel's military successes go to its head and encourage it to continue its military activities, I feel bound to say that this bodes no good for the peace of the region.

155. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): After almost a full day of deliberations, despite the efforts made by its members to contribute to the achievement of an effective cease-fire between Syria and Israel and between Israel and the other Arab States, the Security Council is now faced with the dangerous situation resulting from the continuing Israel aggression against Syria and the other Arab States. At least, this is the situation as it appears to us at present, not only from the contradictory information provided by the news agencies but also from the information we have been given by the Israel representative himself.

156. A few moments ago, instead of telling us that the cease-fire was in effect throughout the region and that the

Israel Government and its forces had stopped making war on the Arab countries, the Israel representative sought to establish who had declared war and who had not, and how that question could be decided according to one newspaper or another—as if that technical question mattered at this stage. These are of course only pretexts for continuing what has been begun.

157. The Secretary-General has given us some items of information and he has just stated that he would only give the Council information that he could verify, information whose authenticity can be more or less verified. And we have been informed that Israel columns are on Syrian territory and its aircraft in Syrian airspace.

158. The Israel representative said: “We have stopped firing, except in self-defence.” But where is this “self-defence” taking place? Over Damascus, over Cairo, on the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic, in other words in places where neither the Israel Air Force nor the Israel armed forces have any right to be under the cease-fire arrangement. That is the crux of the question. The right of self-defence is being exercised on someone else’s territory, despite the cease-fire. What kind of reasoning is this when, even at the very moment when the cease-fire was proclaimed, Israel forces were on the territory of another country? The advance is merely being continued.

159. It is obvious that Israel, taking advantage of its treacherous attack on the United Arab Republic by which it has succeeded in damaging part of that country’s air force, is now trying to turn that treacherous attack to account by continuing the bombing and by endangering whatever is left, whatever else can be found in the United Arab Republic. As the representative of the United Arab Republic stated just now, Israel now seeks to be able to intervene in everything that takes place in that country.

160. We have also heard a statement by the Moroccan representative on this subject. How and when is an attempt being made to intervene in the skies over Cairo? We have of course seen some news agency telegrams which have been read out and which try to persuade us that nothing has happened and that there has been no intervention by the Israel Air Force.

161. The entry of Israel forces into Syria after the Syrian Government had accepted the cease-fire is a very serious and dangerous move because the cease-fire was the crux of the Security Council’s decisions. The Israel forces began their attack against Syria at that very moment, not from their own territory, but in Syria. This is something which may have dangerous consequences in the future. If in the face of this situation the Security Council does not take the initiative and condemn this new and treacherous act of aggression, which violates all the decisions made by the Council on the question today, yesterday and the day before, in the course of discussions which are still taking place, the result may be a grave and serious threat to the peace not only of the region but of the world.

162. The Israel attack and aggression has certainly been instigated and supported by certain imperialist circles from all over the world, and in particular by the imperialists of

one country, the United States of America, which, according to all the information we have received, is behind the aggression.

163. The other day we quoted a United States reporter on board one of the warships of the Sixth Fleet deployed off Crete to show that that fleet was ready to intervene on the orders of the United States Government. We know where the United States Government’s sympathies lie, despite the smile on the face of one representative. We know which side they are on.

164. Just now the United States representative made a long statement on behalf of his Government and its highest circles. He spoke in dispassionate language devoid of any partiality as between the aggressor and the victim. His words were clearly indicative of a troubled conscience because they were unclear, and even of a guilty conscience which senses the condemnation of world public opinion.

165. Instead of statements, however, we would have preferred—and peace would certainly benefit by—a more helpful attitude on his part with respect to the cease-fire: in other words, we would have preferred him to advise Israel, using every possible influence at his command, to cease firing and to put an end to this aggression which threatens to have, and might well have, either now or in the near future, fatal consequences for the States of the region where the conflict is taking place and very serious consequences for the peace of the whole world.

166. We have heard the Permanent Representative of the United States speak several times. In the past he has made statements to the effect that his Government intended to respect and even safeguard the territorial integrity and political independence of all the countries in the region. But now, when Israel is conducting a brutal act of aggression against the Arab countries, when its troops are invading and devastating the territories of the United Arab Republic, Jordan, and Syria, we may legitimately ask ourselves what steps the United States Government proposes to take with a view to giving effect to its earlier pronouncements. At all events, we see no sign of them in the draft resolution [*S/7952/Rev.1*]—which Mr. Goldberg told us about only a few minutes ago and which he presented as something that would make it possible to provide a remedy for all the harm that has been done in the Middle East—and towards the end, where it deals with the second stage, that the United States is steadfastly determined to give a bonus to the aggressor.

167. If the Security Council wishes to stay in session to listen to the statements of the Permanent Representative of Israel on academic questions, we shall certainly never be able to finish this meeting or to help to bring about a cease-fire and an end of the aggression by Israel.

168. It is time for the Security Council to find out what the situation is in the area, because it has now become dangerous. Then—and we think that the Council should already be directing its attention towards this aspect of the

matter—we must try to ensure that the aggressor will be condemned and that he will be branded as such before the whole world, as the Malian representative said only a few moments ago. The act of aggression by Israel, and all other military action constituting a flagrant violation of the resolutions we have just adopted, must be brought to an end immediately. The Council must also decide that the Israel troops which have invaded the territory of the Arab countries must be withdrawn. The Council must decide on the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces because, if they are not withdrawn, they will constitute a danger for the future because of all the military operations which could be conducted.

169. Lastly, we must certainly consider doing what the representative of India suggested this morning: we must give new life and activity to the United Nations machinery on the spot and to the Mixed Armistice Commissions. But the first thing the Council must now do is to establish whether the Israel aggression has been brought to an end; if not, the Council should immediately consider other measures to put an end to it.

170. Mr. FEDORENKO (*Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, we should like to make some remarks about the recurrent, or never-ending, statements by the representative of Tel-Aviv. The Israel representative's speeches are simply astonishing. He has rejected everything absolutely, he has flatly denied and refuted everything; and in so doing he has resorted, quite unfastidiously, to hypocrisy, cynicism and demagogy. And if for a single moment one were to believe this wild imagination of his, Israel's aggression against the Arab countries would grotesquely assume the appearance of an all-embracing act of virtue, an uncommonly lavish dispensation of benefits to the entire world.

171. Come to your senses, distinguished Ambassador. You are not in the realms above the clouds but in the dock in the Security Council, which is condemning Israel for perpetrating a monstrous act of aggression.

172. The representative of Israel has gone so far as to hold the Arabs in Cairo up to ridicule, practically saying that they are dropping bombs on themselves because the Israel Air Force has not been bombing them intensively enough or at the right time. With regard to the unbridled imagination of the Ambassador of Israel, we should like to ask whether by chance he has ever happened to drop bombs on his own head. And, if he never has, then he might try his own recipe on himself. It is not altogether impossible that this rather effective remedy might help him to sober up from the intoxication of aggression and warlike enthusiasm.

173. In order to justify aggression the representative of Israel has suddenly indulged in an academic discourse and started quoting from an article by Professor Cassin. Somebody once said about a certain priest that, in order to play dirty tricks on other people, he even learned arithmetic. In the first place, it is well known that Cassin is a supporter of the Zionist point of view. Secondly, it is precisely the Western Powers, and particularly the United States of America, which are irreconcilably opposed to drafting a definition of aggression, as is perfectly clear from

the proceedings of the fourth session of the Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression. For more than ten years the Committee has been engaged in fruitless meetings and is still unable to draft a definition of aggression, owing entirely to sabotage and violent opposition by the Western representatives. Thirdly, the Security Council is at present concerned not with some kind of academic research on definitions or terminology—let us leave that for another occasion—but with a perfectly obvious fact, namely direct and undisguised aggression by Israel against the neighbouring Arab States.

174. And in this connexion we should like to try once again to obtain an answer from the representative of Israel—who has obviously not yet thought up a form of words to reply to our question—about Tel-Aviv's intentions regarding the withdrawal of its troops from the occupied territories of Arab countries. We do not wish to abuse your kindness, Mr. President, but we cannot refrain from asking you once again when and how you would consider it possible to use the means at your disposal to enable the Security Council finally to obtain a direct answer to this question.

175. We have also heard yet another statement by the representative of the United States. It was impossible not to notice how deeply distressed the judge was at the departure of the United Nations Emergency Force from the territory of the United Arab Republic, which has now exercised its legal rights as a sovereign State and rid itself of foreign troops—once and for all, we hope. But everything points to the fact that our distinguished colleague from the United States still cannot get over the withdrawal of military contingents belonging to NATO countries, which are not of course interested in peace or the welfare of the Arab countries, but in their own selfish strategic purposes in the Near East. It looks as if people in Washington are still dreaming about the past and the opportunities they missed. It is time to abandon these wretched illusions, however much pleasure they may give to representatives of Western countries.

176. From the statement by the representative of the United States of America, it also appears that he feels obliged to delay by every possible means a solution of the most important problems involved in putting an end to the aggression, namely the withdrawal of Israel's aggressive forces behind the armistice lines and the condemnation of aggression. It is not by accident that he has entirely evaded the question of the withdrawal of Israel's forces. There is a remarkable similarity in the approach adopted by the representatives of Tel-Aviv and Washington.

177. We decisively reject this kind of approach. The Security Council must take immediate steps to condemn the aggressor and ensure that Israel's forces withdraw immediately and unconditionally behind the armistice lines. And one is bound to agree with the representative of India, Mr. Parthasarathi, that the aggressor must not be allowed to count on the possibility that his criminal aggression will have favourable results and that he will advance his own interests by means of this adventure. The only fruits of aggression are bitter ones—severe punishment and harsh penalties for violating the sovereign rights of other peoples.

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

179. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I want to thank you, Mr. President, and assure you at the outset that it is not without a great sense of hesitation that I have again asked for the floor. But in each of my interventions, I did draw the attention of the Council, time and again, to the gravity of the situation, one manifestation of which is the massing of large numbers of tanks which have already penetrated Syrian territory. This is undoubtedly an aggression and will lead to a larger aggression.

180. We say that these tanks that entered through Massadeh are advancing on the way to Damascus. Can we let them continue their advance to Damascus without trying to stop them? The Security Council, in accordance with the resolutions so far adopted, must see to it that this aggression, the advance of Israel tanks and armoured columns on Damascus, should be stopped, and stopped immediately.

181. The question has been raised about the use of United Nations machinery. I am empowered by the Syrian authorities to state categorically here that we are ready to facilitate the carrying out of any investigation in order to give the Security Council the facts by which it can judge the situation. The United Nations military observers can go to this region which I mentioned, Massadeh, and the Secretary-General can by telephone contact the Chief military observer in the area and charge him with this task, namely, to go to the area and to see and verify the advance of the Israel column, and to report to the Security Council.

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

183. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I wish to assure the Council and the representative of Syria that no armoured columns of Israel are advancing towards Damascus. Again I repeat, orders have been issued to the armed forces of Israel to cease hostilities.

184. I find myself in singular agreement with the representative of Syria in stating that Israel will facilitate the investigation which the Secretary-General may wish to institute to find out the facts about the latest events.

185. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, we feel that we must draw the Security Council's attention once again to the fact that there has not been any change for the better in the situation regarding the halting of the advance by Israel's aggressive forces into Syrian territory. According to the information being received, Israel's troops are continuing to press on into the interior of Syria. We have just heard some additional news from the representative of Syria, Ambassador Tomeh. May we once again request the Secretary-General through you, Mr. President, to take energetic steps to use the machinery available and pay all possible attention to the information emanating from this machinery, and to report to the Security Council without delay, perhaps in half an hour's time.

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

187. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I just want to emphasize what I have already said, and respectfully to request the Security Council, in its turn, to request the Secretary-General to contact the United Nations machinery on the spot, tonight—and this is possible; it can be done by telephone; we have contacted our capital quite a few times today—and to inform the Council tomorrow morning. Again I repeat, on instructions from my Government, that we are ready to give the United Nations military observers and investigators all the facilities required.

188. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of Israel.

189. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I second the motion made by the Syrian representative.

190. The PRESIDENT: May I draw the attention of Council members to the fact that motions cannot be made by countries participating in the debate but not members of the Council.

191. A proposal has been made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that we should ask the Secretary-General to use the machinery and try to get information from the area. I submit that a suggestion was made by the representative of Syria—not a motion—for our discussion: that we should ask the Secretary-General to contact the United Nations people on the spot and report tomorrow morning to the Council on developments.

192. I should like to hear the views of the members. Would there be any objection to asking the Secretary-General to supply us with all the information he can possibly get from the area through United Nations representatives? If there is no objection to that, there then comes the question as to what timing we should fix. We have had one suggestion that we should try to have the information within half an hour. The representative of Syria has suggested that we should try to get it for tomorrow morning. I am in the hands of the Council.

193. I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

194. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I must state that I was not aware, perhaps because I did not follow the translation closely, that the representative of the Soviet Union had asked that this information be transmitted, through the Secretary-General, in half an hour. Of course, I welcome that.

195. The PRESIDENT: I take it that the representative of Syria has withdrawn his suggestion. Therefore, there is only one suggestion before the Council. Before expressing any opinion on that suggestion, I should like to ask the Secretary-General whether he deems it technically possible to provide the Council with the information requested by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics within the time-limit suggested.

196. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, with reference to the request of the representative of the Soviet

Union, I have the following observations to make. First of all, as I indicated earlier in my short intervention, I received a report from General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of UNTSO, that he had lost contact with his observers in several areas because of the unsettled conditions there.

197. Secondly, in order to facilitate the collection of information, the essential condition is that the parties concerned must give all possible co-operation to the observers. So far, to my knowledge, the necessary co-operation has not been forthcoming. Therefore, I would request the parties primarily concerned to render all possible co-operation and assistance to the United Nations observers in the discharge of their responsibilities.

198. Thirdly, I should like to report to the Council that since General Odd Bull and his staff have had to leave Government House, they have no wireless communication facilities for the purpose of contacting the observers. They have had to use mostly commercial services, commercial communications, which of course are very defective for the purpose of prompt reporting. Therefore, I should like to take this opportunity of appealing to the Government of Israel, through its representative, to restore the use of Government House to General Odd Bull so that he will be in a position to reach the observers promptly for the purpose of reporting officially to me in order that I may be in a position to report accurately to the members of the Council.

199. Fourthly, one very essential element for the performance of their functions by the observers is to get freedom of movement. I think this is a must if the Security Council is to expect prompt and effective and accurate reporting from the United Nations observers on the spot. Therefore, I should also like to take this opportunity of requesting the parties primarily concerned to render all possible assistance to the United Nations observers to achieve complete freedom of movement for them.

200. If those conditions are obtained, I am sure we will get the required information as soon as possible. But I do not think it is practical to expect an accurate report in the course of thirty minutes; that is physically impossible. I have no idea how long it will take. But if those conditions are met, I am sure the reporting will be prompt. I can assure the members of the Council that as soon as I receive the necessary report which is relevant to the matter under discussion, I shall see to it that the Council members get that report as promptly as possible.

201. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, we have listened with great attention to the statement just made by the Secretary-General, U Thant. In this connexion we should like to refer to one circumstance—namely the deliberate seizure by Israel's troops of the headquarters of the United Nations observers, so as to deprive the headquarters of the possibility of reliable communications with observers in the field.

202. In my view we cannot overlook this circumstance, and we must condemn acts of this kind by Israel. This is an attack on the United Nations presence as well. We have

every reason to support the Secretary-General in his request, and to demand that Israel should immediately re-establish normal conditions for the work of the United Nations observers. This is the first point.

203. Secondly we are in favour of the idea expressed by the representative of Syria, Ambassador Tomeh, that the Secretary-General should immediately instruct the Chief of Staff of the United Nations military observers to visit all the areas mentioned by the distinguished representative of Syria, and should inform the Security Council of the actual situation without delay. We support this idea, and therefore propose that action should be taken accordingly.

204. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Israel.

205. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): I would not prolong this debate were it not for the statement just now made by the representative of the Soviet Union. I recommend to the representative of the Soviet Union that he read the Secretary-General's report to the Council, in the record of the 1347th meeting, where he will get a clear account of the events which led to the breakdown of United Nations communications in Government House. The Secretary-General stated:

“After hostilities began on the morning of 5 June, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO drew the attention of Israel and Jordan to the inviolability of the Government House area and asked them to ensure that this inviolability would be fully respected. Both sides gave him the required assurance. However, at 1330 hours local time today, approximately one company of Jordanian soldiers occupied the garden of Government House. General Bull in person protested to the Commander and asked him to withdraw his troops. He also protested in the strongest terms to the senior Jordanian delegate to the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission against the violation of United Nations premises by Jordanian soldiers, whose withdrawal within half an hour he demanded. He also informed the Israel authorities of these developments and requested them to ensure that Israel soldiers would not enter the Government House area. By then an exchange of fire had already begun between the Jordanian soldiers in the Government House garden and Israel soldiers near-by. General Bull later informed me by an emergency message that Jordanian troops had not withdrawn and were demanding to enter Government House itself and had demanded that no telephone calls be made from Government House. Firing was continuing and mortar shells were now landing within the Government House compound. United Nations Headquarters lost radio contact with UNTSO headquarters in Jerusalem at 0852 hours New York time, at which time Jordanian troops occupied Government House.” [1347th meeting, para. 20.]

206. This was the report made by General Bull. Consequently, Israel soldiers drove out Jordanian soldiers from that area, and at the risk of their lives they rescued General Bull and his staff and brought him and his party to Israel territory, where the Israel Government provided him with facilities to establish communications with United Nations Headquarters.

207. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union is asking to speak. I would inquire of him whether it is on a point of order, because the next speaker on my list is the representative of Bulgaria.

208. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I have not the slightest intention of disputing anyone's rights, which are determined by the order in which names are entered on the list of speakers. I am speaking on a point of order.

209. What I wish to say is that the past and recollections are the last things which concern us here, and that we are not especially grateful to the reader of documents who has here recalled some pages of the past. We are interested in the present. In whose hands is the United Nations headquarters at the present moment? Please do not depict your soldiery in this area as angels with wings. This is not the place for that. Do not forget yourself. Do not be carried away by this picture you are painting, but answer the request by the Secretary-General who has clearly said that Israel's forces are interfering there. What purposes are these recollections of yours meant to serve? Why are you side-stepping the issue?

210. I felt that I had to draw attention to this position taken by the representative of Israel, who is still trying to obscure the situation.

211. The PRESIDENT: I find it a little difficult to see what the point of order was. This was rather the exercise of the Soviet representative's right of reply, which should have occurred in proper order, so that the representative of Bulgaria should have had the right to speak first. I now call on the representative of Bulgaria.

212. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Before coming to the point on which I wished to speak, I should like to say that I too wished to make the comment that the Israel representative's recording apparatus seems to be running a few days late. Only a moment ago, the Secretary-General made a perfectly clear statement in which he said that the United Nations communications facilities were now in the hands of the Israel Government. He asked, if I am not mistaken, for these communications to be restored and for Government House to be returned to UNTSO. That is what I myself wanted to say. The Israel representative cited passages from past records from which one can seek to prove a great many things and tried to put the blame on the Jordanian troops.

213. The present situation is undoubtedly grave. The Secretary-General has just told us that he is without means of communication and that the Israel Government must co-operate with the United Nations if we are to receive any information. Instead of a promise that the United Nations communications facilities will be restored forthwith, all we have heard is a quotation from the records, as the Soviet Union has pointed out.

214. What I should have liked to have heard from the Israel representative is a statement that his Government will co-operate in restoring communications between United Nations personnel on the spot and the Secretary-General

and his military advisers here, not quotations from old records. It was certainly not by chance that means of communication were interrupted. If we have to wait a few hours until these communications are restored, armoured columns may be at the gates of some of the world's most ancient cities.

215. That is why I think the Council must immediately take the necessary measures to ensure that communications are restored and that General Bull or some other member of the United Nations military staff on the spot will be able to ascertain the facts and communicate them to the Secretary-General.

216. I am well aware of the difficulties, but I should like to have an answer and to know—given the co-operation which the Israel representative will presumably hasten to promise to the United Nations—how soon it will be possible to receive information about what is happening in the area. We could then decide how to proceed here and whether the Council should meet tomorrow, or suspend the meeting to await information.

217. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Syria.

218. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I listened with great attention to what the Secretary-General said about the proposal to contact the United Nations machinery on the spot to ascertain the facts. In this connexion, I wish to support most strongly what was stated in this respect by the Soviet representative, and to assure the Secretary-General, on behalf of the authorities of the Syrian Arab Republic, that we will give General Odd Bull and his assistants in the United Nations machinery all possible facilities at our disposal so that they can go into the areas specified in my letters to the Secretary-General [*paras. 20 and 22 above*] and establish the facts and convey them to the Secretary-General for the information of the Security Council.

219. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): For some little time past I have felt that we are not making any effective progress in the Council. We greatly hope that the action we took this morning will have its effect, and we know that the important question is not what we say here tonight, but what is happening in the hills of Syria and the approaches to Israel. I should be anxious, we should all be anxious, I am sure, to stay here through the night if necessary if we thought we could do any good. I should even be happy to listen to any given number of speeches from the representative of the Soviet Union. I can think of no pleasanter way of spending the night. But I would respectfully suggest that we are dealing at the moment with rumour; we are asked to form judgements on the basis of hearsay. It does us no good and it does not advance our purpose to listen to accusations and counter-accusations. We have the assurance from both parties, freely given, and we are glad to note it, that both parties will give the Secretary-General every possible assistance.

220. The Secretary-General has pointed out a way which would facilitate communications with his officers on the spot. I am sure we all give full backing to the recommendations he has put to us. It is essential that the

organization of the United Nations on the spot should be strong, indeed, reinforced, and that, in particular, it should have freedom of movement and freedom of communication. I am sure that what the Secretary-General said to us just now carries the urgent support of every member of the Council.

221. I do not believe it is profitable for us, in view of what the Secretary-General has said and in view of the known facts of the situation, to spend time wondering when we may be called together again. We are all always ready to be called at any hour of the day or night, and we are proud of this, and we should be proud.

222. I think that the right decision, if I may so suggest, is at this stage to leave it to the Secretary-General to do everything he possibly can to get us as full a report as soon as he can. He would then no doubt report to you, Mr. President, and you would then, as usual, communicate promptly to us.

223. I would hope, therefore, we would agree to call on the two parties to give every assistance and ask the Secretary-General to make every effort to get as full a report as soon as possible; and that we could now adjourn and meet again as soon as a further report is available, or, indeed, whenever there is any other development which requires our presence. This is the suggestion which I respectfully put forward to you, Mr. President.

224. The PRESIDENT: I have listened to the suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom, but before proceeding with our debate I would draw the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that the representative of the Soviet Union has, if I have understood him correctly, formally moved, first, that we request the Government of Israel to restore normal working conditions for the staff of UNTSO in Government House in Jerusalem and, secondly, that we request the Secretary-General to instruct the Chief of UNTSO to send observers to certain locations mentioned by the representative of Syria. The representative of Bulgaria has supported this motion, and I should like to learn the opinion of other members of the Council on this formal motion made by the Soviet representative. I hope I have correctly stated what the Soviet representative moved.

225. Mr. TINE (France) (*translated from French*): What I have to say does not differ greatly from what the United Kingdom representative has just proposed. My delegation's views are based on one all-important factor: the time factor. We must realize that investigations by the United Nations observers will be most effective after daybreak, which will take place very shortly in that part of the world; consequently, everything must be done to make their work effective in the next few hours, and also to restore to them the freedom of communication which they now apparently lack.

226. The Secretary-General has told us in his last statement that the task of the observers will be made much easier if the parties upon whom this depends will grant to the observers, and above all to General Bull, the communications facilities which are being denied to them, and the freedom of movement which they must have.

227. Having said this, and having taken note of this statement by the Secretary-General, I would find it reasonable that a proposal should be made, perhaps by you, Mr. President, reiterating the substance of the Secretary-General's suggestion and calling upon both parties to restore to General Bull forthwith the facilities he previously enjoyed and to grant full freedom of movement and action to the observers on the territories of both parties, so that they can provide General Bull with the facts on which he could base his report on the events taking place on either side of the armistice line. As soon as this proposal has been drafted, it would be desirable that we should adopt it unanimously and that the Secretariat should take action within the next few hours.

228. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I merely wish to say that it is clear that we are very near an agreement. We have representatives of three Permanent Members at least who seem to be agreed on the course we should follow. The idea came from the representative of the Soviet Union, the enthusiasm from the representative of the United Kingdom and the precision from the representative of France. I would have thought that on that basis we might proceed and be ready to return when the Secretary-General notifies the President that he has information that we should know about.

229. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I cannot refrain from expressing my admiration at the ready wit and British sense of humour displayed to us by our distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom. He has, of course, expressed a very attractive idea about the way in which we could while away the night. But I have some doubts. He has obviously forgotten my proletarian origin, which, I fear, is not very suitable for such exalted society—that is, the company of a British lord, even a socialist one.

230. Mr. President, I should like once more to clarify what we said in connexion with the request made by the Secretary-General to the representative of Israel here in regard to Government House. Before me I have document S/7930 dated 5 June 1967; it contains, in paragraph 13, the following text of a letter from the Secretary-General to Levi Eshkol, Prime Minister of Israel:

“Whatever the circumstances leading to the Israel occupation of Government House and its grounds, its continued occupation by Israel troops is a most serious breach of the undertaking to respect its inviolability.

“I therefore request the Government of Israel to restore the grounds and buildings of the Government House compound urgently to exclusive United Nations control. When this has been done I propose to seek a formal undertaking from both sides to respect the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization's occupation of Government House in the future.”

231. It was precisely because of this, Mr. President, that we spoke on a point of order, and in regard to the Israel representative's behaviour at this table. Such is the actual state of affairs and we should like once again to support the Secretary-General's legitimate request in this respect.

232. The PRESIDENT: I have listened carefully to the appeal made to the President by the representative of France as to whether the President could find a formula which could command unanimity in the Council. Basing myself on the statement made by the Secretary-General and on the motion made by the representative of the Soviet Union, I wonder whether it would not be possible to agree on something along the following lines: that we request the parties concerned to extend all possible co-operation to United Nations observers in the discharge of their responsibilities; that we request the Government of Israel to restore the use of Government House in Jerusalem to General Odd Bull and to re-establish freedom of movement for United Nations observers in the area; and that we then decide to adjourn and to decide the time and date of the next meeting after consultations with members as soon as, and without any delay, I have the information required from the Secretary-General, it being understood of course that the members of the Council will hold themselves available for any urgent meeting at any time should we be faced with an emergency situation again. Would such a formula be acceptable?

233. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I think that you have expressed fairly clearly what was proposed in general not only by the Soviet delegation but also by the United Kingdom representative and the representative of France. But we should like the last part to be worded more precisely, as follows: we agree that all members of the Council hold themselves available and should be ready to attend an emergency meeting at any time, but the Council should nevertheless meet again in any case not later than 10.30 tomorrow morning.

234. The PRESIDENT: With that addition, then, would my suggestion be acceptable to all members of the Council?

235. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I have no objection to the suggestion you have just made, Mr. President; but I should like to make some comments which may perhaps help us.

236. First, I said in my last statement that Israel's co-operation was essential. The Syrian representative has said, on behalf of his Government, that we could count on its co-operation. We have not received the same assurance from the Permanent Representative of Israel, although it has been supposed that he gave it. He said: "Go ahead if you wish; we agree." But the Secretary-General has asked for the return of Government House. The representative of Israel has not said that his Government agrees to this; at any rate I did not hear him say so. Perhaps I am mistaken; if so, I hope someone will correct me. The representative of Israel could certainly make such a statement here on behalf of his Government so that the Secretary-General would be in a good position to provide us with the necessary information.

237. Secondly, the Israel Government should give us all the co-operation we desire.

238. Thirdly, I must say that I agree with the Soviet Union representative's proposal that we should meet again

tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.; but I should like to ask the Secretary-General how much time it will take for us to receive the necessary information.

239. Those are the comments that I wish to make on your suggestion, Mr. President, with which I agree.

240. The PRESIDENT: In order that we might try to complete our discussion now, I would say, in reply to what the representative of Bulgaria has said, that according to my record, the representative of Israel said that his country would give every opportunity to the United Nations to facilitate investigations. In his second intervention he said that he could support the motion made by the representative of Syria. I think that this is a factual statement, but we might ask the representative of Israel whether he would wish to confirm it. That is the way I understood it, although I may be wrong. It was my understanding that the representative of Syria and the representative of Israel were quite in agreement on this point.

241. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): You have quoted me correctly, Mr. President.

242. The PRESIDENT: In these circumstances it appears that we all agree that we should request the parties concerned to extend all possible co-operation to United Nations observers in the discharge of their responsibilities, that we should request the Government of Israel to restore the use of Government House to General Odd Bull and should ask the parties to re-establish freedom of movement. I believe we are also agreed that the time and date of the next meeting will be decided after consultation with members and as soon as I have the information from the Secretary-General. This last point has been changed: the meeting will take place at 10.30 tomorrow morning.

243. In accordance with the request made by the representative of Bulgaria, I shall ask the Secretary-General whether he considers it possible to have the information required, provided these conditions are fulfilled, before 10.30 tomorrow morning.

244. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: It is rather difficult for me to conjecture at this stage about the time which would be necessary for the proper functioning of the machinery which we contemplate. First of all, I shall have to send a cable to General Odd Bull immediately, and then he will have to make contact with the observers in the field. As I reported to the Council earlier, he has lost contact with most of his observers because of the unsettled conditions in many parts of the area.

245. Secondly, if they regain freedom of movement, and if the parties primarily concerned render them all possible co-operation and assistance—and it is already, as members of the Council are aware, six o'clock in the morning in the area—if all those conditions are met, I am confident that I shall have some very substantive material to communicate to the Security Council before the convening of the meeting tomorrow morning.

246. The PRESIDENT: In those circumstances, could we agree to adjourn now, on the understanding, of course, that

all members will hold themselves available for an urgent meeting at any time should we be faced with an emergency situation?

247. I give the floor to the representative of Syria.

248. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): For the record, I wish to state that I have just received information from the Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic to the effect that an attack from Massadeh, to which I have referred, has already started.

249. During the intervention of the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, he stated that we were now dealing with "rumour" and "hearsay". I was indeed astonished to hear that, for, since early this morning, we have not been dealing with rumour and hearsay; we have been dealing with facts and names, which I submitted to the Council, in two letters to the Secretary-General, and in the various statements that I made. I also challenged the representative of Israel to disprove those facts which I

submitted. Therefore, I take great exception to the two words used by the representative of the United Kingdom. We are dealing with a clear-cut case of aggression, with a violation of a cease-fire, of a resolution that was adopted this morning. Names of villages and of other places have been given. These are not rumour and hearsay. However, my astonishment disappeared when I found the complete agreement between the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom and that of the Israel representative. This much I should like to say.

250. The PRESIDENT: I take note of this statement which the representative of Syria wishes included in the record of this meeting.

251. Since there is no objection to the procedure which I have suggested, we shall adjourn now on the understanding that I have outlined.

The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.